



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

~~THIRTY SEVENTH~~ GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 70

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1976

SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MP. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I have been informed that there are some forty Grade IX students in the House of Assembly from the Glovertown Regional High School. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Sparkes and Mr. Feltham. I know all hon. members join me in welcoming these young people to the House of Assembly and in expressing the hope that their visit here will be an interesting and informative one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MP. SPEAKER: I have also been informed that another group of students, fifty-three in number, from Foxtrap Junior High School are present. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Best and Mr. Raymond. To the young men and women from Foxtrap Junior High School as well the House extends a sincere welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MP. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to announce the awarding of two contracts that are very important to the district of Placentia. The first one being a contract awarded to Hynes Construction of Dunville for the construction of a community stage at Little Harbour East. The amount of the contract, Mr. Speaker, is for \$157,000. The facility will be a two story building. The top will have a lunch room and office facilities and space for fishermen to use for netting and for repairing fishing gear. The first floor of the building will have an area set aside for salting fish, for the processing of salt fish, for the packaging of herring and, hopefully, for the establishment of a filleting line.

The fishermen's committee will be undertaking negotiations with a fish processor to establish a filleting line and the Department of Fisheries will lease the facility then to the processor whom the fishermen will decide upon. According to the latest figures, Mr.

MR. W. CARTER:

Speaker, there are thirty-eight fishermen in Little Harbour East and I might add all good fishermen, mostly year round fishermen. Their total landings for 1975 were in excess of 1 million pounds of fish for a total value of \$100,000 plus quite a substantial lobster fishery as well.

The second project, Mr. Speaker, concerns the awarding of a contract in the amount of \$51,700 for the repair and upgrading of a community stage at Merasheen Island, Placentia Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: Merasheen Island, Mr. Speaker, was resettled some years ago but despite that thirty fishermen still fish in the area during the Summer and approximately fifteen continue to fish through the Winter. In fact there are three or four longliners in the area all year around. These fishermen, Mr. Speaker, produced 2,000 quintals of salt fish last Winter, 2,000 quintals of salt fish with a total value of approximately \$80,000. Mr. Speaker, because of the activity in the area and the productivity of the fishermen, the department realized that the fish handling facility on that Island is necessary and that the expenditure that we have undertaken there will certainly go a long ways to bringing it back to a condition where it will become a viable fishing operation.

MR. NEARY: There is no possibility of moving the people back there?

MR. W. CARTER: No. The repairs, Mr. Speaker, will involve the general upgrading of the facility, walls, roof, doors, windows and making some repairs to the floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

o o o

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the announcement made by the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Fisheries, and I wonder if he could tell the House how many other cases there are of settlements being evacuated by organized effort as part of the relocation of population

MR. SMALLWOOD:

as part of the centralization programme, how many other places there are where the people have moved out of but come back for the purpose of the fishery because that was part of the whole theme, the whole philosophy of centralization or relocation of population, that a place might be very good for fishing but not so good to live in all the year around, not so good for the children, not so good to get teachers, not so good to get hospital or nursing services but good to produce fish in the fishing season though the people doing the fishing might live somewhere else for the bulk of the year.

The people of Flat Islands which was called Port Elizabeth latterly were insistent, absolutely adamant in their determination to move off the Island and go in on the main. Now they did not want to go to any other place that already existed. They wanted a new place altogether and they choose a place whose name I forget.

MR. NEARY: Red Harbour.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Red Harbour that is right. They choose a place called Red Harbour and insisted that they should go there and continue to be a separate community of their own but that they should be able to continue fishing.

Now to what extent - I wonder if the minister can tell us - to what extent is that characteristic? Are there very many places from which the people have moved themselves or with help or even without help but who go back there to fish? For instance, how many islands in Bonavista Bay? Do they still go out to Fair Islands, to Bragg's Island, to Greens Island, to Hare Island and so on and so on, Flat Islands? Do they still go out to - well not the outer Gooseberry, I dare say the inner Gooseberry - do they still go out fishing though they live somewhere else? Could the minister give us some light on this extraordinarily fascinating subject regarding a place good to earn your living but not necessarily good to live in and rear your family in?

MR. W. CARTEP: Mr. Speaker, I am not able -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I realize the hon. member is about to reply to questions asked by the hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) and the hon. member for Burin-Placentia (Mr. Canning) also was going to comment on the ministerial statement. So what I was going to do was to recognize the hon. gentleman to my right and if there were then questions they could be answered at one time by the Minister of Fisheries.

The hon. member for Burin-Placentia.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, Merasheen Island is my home, my former home. That is where I was born. And I am delighted today to hear the minister's statement. I think it is another case that is a clear example of his going in the right direction. There is quite a story that I cannot tell at this time about the Island of Merasheen. It was abandoned, Mr. Speaker. The original idea of Merasheen by the government that I was involved with was it was supposed to be a place to centralize. Merasheen Island was in the center of Placentia Bay, a large island, twenty-one miles long and about five or six miles wide, nine miles wide in its widest part. It had a wonderful harbour and it was central in the bay, not too far from Cape St. Mary's. It has been a very important little settlement down through the years.

But when I was growing up the people from the other islands and the people from the bottom of the bay both West and East of us came to Merasheen to fish during the Summer season. I think it was with that knowledge or that information that the government had at the time, or the Department of Fisheries had at the time, that inspired them first to go to Merasheen. They set up there a salt fish plant and at the time it was comparative to the one that the hon. minister is setting up at Admiral's Beach except this, at a later date, will be more modernized. Mr. Speaker, for today we put -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow a question?

He said that to Merasheen Island fishermen came from other islands,

MR. SMALLWOOD:

other parts of the bay. Do they still do that, to fish?

MR. CANNING: No, Mr. Speaker, they do not do it. And what is more the center did not attract these people. Unfortunately, perhaps, I do not know. But that was the general idea, that the people in the smaller places where they had ten or fifteen families, some places as low as three families who were fishing, we thought they would land their fish there because they were within a radius of not more than ten miles, fifteen miles, at the most, away. But that was the general idea.

What we did there, what the government did there, we modernized the settlement as much as we possibly could at that time. We brought them electricity. We had built there a road where they could fish in Winter and Summer because out of Little Merasheen you could fish in Winter, a more sheltered area. And it was a place where herring was pretty plentiful in the Winter at that time and of course the outer grounds from Cape St. Mary's in, Merasheen Bank, anybody who knows the bay, White Sail, Bennett's Bank, Oderin Bank, and other banks in the vicinity out to the Southwest of the Island. But what we did there was we made the place - we gave them what facilities we could at that time including electricity and the plant itself. The plant itself cost, I think, somewhere around \$50,000 or \$60,000 at that time in that vicinity, somewhere between \$50,000 and \$80,000. There was a wharf there. We had pumps there and gradually modernized it, what we could put there.

We had Fishery Products come there for a few years, first collecting fish then landing ice which is something the minister intends doing this year, I think. Perhaps they have done a little of it in the past few years. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we tried to make a model station with hopes that it would attract the people from the other areas and the center would grow to perhaps 5,000 or 6,000 people. But it did not happen, Mr. Speaker. Strangely enough the people there were doing well. They made more money.

MR. CANNING:

They had better fish. They were co-operative. But they moved, Mr. Speaker, which is one example, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that the government did not entice those people to move. They did not order them to move. They never told them to move. I never mentioned moving to them because we made the port as good a port as they would have gotten on the mainland or better because they were nearer the fishing grounds. But anyway the trend there in the bay which had gone on for about fifty or sixty or seventy years, people moving from isolation caught on and they moved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, clear proof of this, that they were not enticed to move, they were not asked to move, they were not even paid to move, is the fact that they moved into Placentia and the government decided they would not help them to move because they did not think it was a good idea. They were not given any money to go there until such time as so many left that we were compelled. I myself went to the government and said this, I said, "The people of Merasheen are going to move. They are moving. They have been moving for years and the government now should to prevent any shacks being built or poor houses being built in Placentia area - that was where they were going, that was their right. I asked for the grants that were given and it was given to them.

Mr. Speaker, since then they have returned to the Island, gradually. About seven years ago there were two or three people who went back there. They went up to five. They have gone to twenty and now they are there fishing the whole season around. I am glad to hear the minister today announce that he is going to keep that plant going and there is money for it to be kept in repair. And I wish him all the luck with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CAPTEP: Mr. Speaker, I am allowed to respond to the question put to me by the hon. member for Twillingate. I am not able to give the House a complete list of places that have been resettled

MR. W. CARTER:

From where fishermen now fish -

MR. ROBERTS: Re-resettled.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes re-resettled. I do know -

MR. SMALLWOOD: On a seasonal basis.

MR. W. CARTER: On a seasonal basis. I know of course that Merasheen - Tacks Beach I think was a resettled area and there are fishermen going back there for lobster and other fish.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Wood's Island.

MR. W. CARTER: Woods Island, my colleague the Minister of Rural Development -

MR. NEARY: There are two families on Wood's Island all year around.

MR. W. CARTER: - visited Wood's Island -

MR. SIMMONS: Woody Island.

MR. W. CARTER: - Woody Island a few weeks ago where some very interesting things are taking place. My colleague here, who is a former native of Flat Island, Bonavista Bay, tells me that people go back there during the Summer and fish and, of course, our other colleague from Merasheen, and Woods Island I think it is in Bay Of Islands -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Right you are, yes.

MR. W. CARTER: - several places in Green Bay, Round Harbour and other places where people go back, places that have been resettled but are now the location of some seasonal fishing operations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to table the results of the most recent meeting of the Rural Development Authority where twenty applications were approved for loans totalling \$250,000 and creating forty-nine permanent jobs and twenty-seven -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Totalling how much?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Two hundred and twenty-five thousand, twenty

MR. LUNDFIGAN:

applications approved, forty-nine permanent jobs, twenty-seven seasonal jobs. Nine of these had ARDA grants involved which will be jointly announced by the Minister of DPEF and myself. I could go on and give some details.

MR. SIMMONS: We want the details.

MR. LUNDFIGAN: I will have some of the information distributed to the House when copies of this thing can be taken off. There is more detail, I think, than I have given in any of the recent statements. We have about 100 loan applications pending at the moment, about 100 loan applications and about seventy grant applications.

I think members should realize that under the programme we have the Rural Development Authority has the authority to loan at the present moment \$15,000 in the way of a direct loan which

Mr. Lundrigan.

can be amortized over a five year period interest free.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Up to \$15,000?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Up to \$15,000.

There is also a small grant programme which is a federal/provincial fifty/fifty cost-shared grant which usually relates to industries of a particular type, manufacturing in particular. And of the twenty applications that were approved nine of those qualified as well for grants. But I do not want to mention the grants at the moment because I think it is only fair for me to allow my federal colleague as well to participate in the announcement. And secondly we will make another announcement later on about another ARDA grant which will stimulate or at least make a firm beginning regarding the eel industry in this Province.

Now some of the grants and loans that have been approved, I will just mention some of them, Mr. Speaker, seeing the information is being requested. There were forty-nine permanent jobs and twenty-seven seasonal jobs. It is the best variety of applications that we have received since the programme started, since the Rural Development Authority programme started. Some of them are very, very novel as my colleague from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) can attest. I will just mention some of them. One is a loan for an industry in the Bonavista Bay area, \$15,000 on the erection or the expansion of a hog raising industry, which is very, very successful at the moment. A total capital cost of \$22,000 for the expansion. We loan \$15,000. There are two full-time jobs and three part-time jobs involved. We have a sound recording industry situated on the West Coast to establish a recording studio to try and prevent the export of a lot of our Newfoundland talent, the recording talent, to be done in Toronto where there are millions of dollars being made off Newfoundland artists out of Toronto. This project involves the setting up, by three Newfoundlanders, of a sound recording industry. It involves \$12,000 on our part, with a \$24,000 capital expansion or capital investment. There is also an ARDA grant involved. Another

Mr. Lundrigan.

type of industry is a paper product's manufacturing industry in the Central Newfoundland area for the expansion of new paper products with foreign markets involved at a total capital cost of \$61,000, building on an existing industry which is already very successful. We loan \$15,000. It creates five full-time jobs.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The paper will be fabricated?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes, it is using existing paper which is already manufactured in Grand Falls to process or remanufacture into a more finished product. There is also an existing industry there that has been successful in doing a similar type operation and it is being expanded to meet an international market. There is no ARDA grant involved.

Another one is on the Avalon Peninsula, \$15,000 to reactivate and expand on an existing tourist facility that was one time very prosperous and has slowed down considerably. The hon. member for Port de Grave district would perhaps be interested in that particular one. There is \$15,000 involved. There are six full-time jobs. The existing individual has put \$80,000 of his own money into it.

MR. NEARY: What was this?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It is a tourist facility.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What do you mean for tourists?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Its cabins and development of a tourist area, a very beautiful location, and it is certainly one that we feel will be very prosperous in that particular area.

MR. DAWE: In what particular area is the hon. minister referring to?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Well the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe) will know.

There is another very, very novel type industry that we have loaned \$12,200 for, a \$24,000 capital cost, an ARDA grant involved is for the fertilizer manufacturing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The markets have been established.

MR. NEARY: - fertilizer.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Would the hon. member wish me to allow him to respond now or is he just interjecting?

MR. NEARY: Go ahead.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: He is just interjecting.

Seriously, this is a very serious project.

There has been a great deal of participation by the Federal Agricultural Department in this project. A great deal of experimentation has been done. A very reputable company has supported the marketing of the product. There are four full-time jobs, and it is involving processing of poultry manure, dry peat, quick lime and so on to produce an organic fertilizer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Drying it and bagging it?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes. We are very confident about it. It is a novel thing. It has never been done to our knowledge -

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a marvel that it did not come before.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - successfully before.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where is it at?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It is located in an area where there is an abundance of the raw material required. The hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) can attest to that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the minister indicate where the peat is to come from to dry it?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot. But there has been a problem with getting the proper dry heat required as a - what would you call it? - one of the required materials necessary, but there has been some new technology developed in the world, particularly in Finland to be able to accommodate that particular problem.

Another industry that we have supported is on the Avalon Peninsula area, a \$24,000 capital cost. We have loaned \$12,100.

Mr. Lundrigan.

It involves two full-time jobs. It is the manufacturing of polished stone products. And if anybody would care to look at the display case in the lobby you will see some of the best polished stone handicraft that we have in the Province today, and it is not the only good quality product that we have. The member from Bell Island (Mr. Doody) or representing Bell Island and the member representing Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), who is not here, can perhaps attest to the quality of that kind of product that we are manufacturing in the Province. We have supported the project, and we are very confident about it. I would like for hon. members to look in the display case just to see the quality of the stone handicraft that is being developed.

We have supported the expansion of a very successful industry in the Burin Peninsula area, wood working, roof trusses in particular, \$11,600, two full-time jobs and the hon. member representing Grand Bank (Mr. Hickman) can indicate that the business is very successful. Historically it is a very successful business, and we are happy to participate in it.

In Western Newfoundland we have loaned \$6,000 for tourist facilities, particularly in the hunting and fishing aspect. Another small loan of \$2,000 to help a hospitality home on the Avalon Peninsula. That is a special programme that we have with a maximum input of \$2,000 for the hospitality homes.

Furniture, refurbishing: We have loaned \$12,300, a capital cost of \$24,000 with an ARDA grant involved, and that business is also very successful. Sawmilling in Central Newfoundland, in the Bonavista North area, a loan of \$7,500 for a \$25,000 capital cost, which will supplement an existing mill and help decentralize their operation to the point where the woods operation will be independent of the sawmill operation as much as possible. Electric sign manufacturing, the Avalon Peninsula

Mr. Lundrigan.

to take advantage of a market, two very qualified persons involved in the electrical field, that can meet what is an existing solid market demand. One of the best sign painters in the Province from Carbonear - I would like to mention the name of this particular area, directly in the Carbonear area. We have loaned \$6,200 for an existing enterprise that is able to expand and we are very confident, and there is very professional work involved.

In Central Newfoundland we have loaned \$30,000 to support an industry, with eighty-four people involved, but it will not mean eighty-four new jobs. It will mean supplementing existing jobs. There are actually seventy-five full-time and one part-time job involved.

MR. NEARY: Is that sawmilling or what?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is involved in timber harvesting.

Electronics servicing and repair for the Avalon Peninsula area - there is only a \$3,600 loan. That will be expanded we think relating to electronic equipment hopefully to supplement the ability of the particular area to meet the demands of the fishing industry for electronic equipment. Timber harvesting in the Bonavista Bay area, \$15,000, a \$33,000 capital cost; \$12,000 on a \$27,000 capital cost for sawmilling and finished lumber products in the Trinity Bay area; fish processing in St. Mary's Bay, which is always good news for the hon. member in a district that has not really gotten its full measure of benefits under the programme, because I guess there has not been the number of applications, \$15,000 - that involves the herring industry - and wood working in the Bonavista Bay area of \$15,000 for two full-time jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And another little small one, \$1,500 for another very small supplementary type of lumber operation.

MR. NEARY: Is that the complete list?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is the complete list of twenty.

Your Honour, there were something like twenty-six loan applications received, five where we have to make minor adjustments, twenty of the twenty-six were approved. We think they are excellent applications. Actually in recent months the response from the public has been somewhat overwhelming, and I would like to sort of draw out my colleague's attention in Treasury Board to that particular fact. We are trying to get a quick turn around period, and we are not happy with the turn around period. It is three and four and five weeks. We would like for it to be a little less than that, because we feel that the purpose of this programme is to be quick and responsive and flexible. Unfortunately, we cannot approve every application we receive, and we try to base it on people we think have some ingredients for success and hopefully based on people that have already had some proven success in a particular field.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is good to stand again and welcome the announcement about additional jobs. We on this side are always pleased to hear of any effort to put the public's money, or the money from the public treasury into creating additional job opportunities. If I were to take the time that he did I would comment on some of the particular items, some interesting ones there. I suppose the one that catches the imagination most, both of me and the Minister of Transportation and Communications is the one for sound recording on the West Coast. It is not a well known fact, Mr. Speaker, that the minister, among his many talents, of course, is a singer and has an album recorded and I hope -

MP. WHITE: It is a single. It is a single.

MR. SIMMONS: - particularly - without my band he did it too, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: No wonder it did not sell 'Roger'.

MR. SIMMONS: I hope particularly for the success of that industry on the West Coast because, hopefully, the Minister of Transportation could get back to his first calling and, at least, in that situation the public could turn him off when they want to.

But to the larger subject, Mr. Speaker, there are some interesting projects in there. I listened attentively to what the minister had to say about the nature of the projects. We are still not really in a position to adjudicate the overall effect of the programme. We are not really in a position to judge whether the loan decisions, or decisions to grant loans are in keeping with the spirit and the law of the Rural Development Authority because we are not being given the full information. We are being given some fairly selected information from the minister and, of course, he is discrete enough that what he chooses to select out for our consumption is the kind of thing which is pretty impressive

MR. SIMMONS: and on that I congratulate him.

I hope that the information he is tabling today is the kind of information we have been asking for for a couple of years, namely (1) the name of the applicant, (2) the community, (3) the category of the loan application, and (4) the amount of the loan. And I say to the minister again, it is not enough to do otherwise. It is not enough to stand and give us the choice tidbits. We would like to have all the information, Mr. Speaker, not all but the kinds of information I have just suggested again so that we can, as the legislators here in the Province, make an impartial adjudication as to whether the money is being properly assigned and whether the programme is being properly pursued. Until we get that kind of information we in the Official Opposition are not in any better position than before to decide whether the programme is being properly administered or whether it still has the overtones of a slush fund which it did have originally.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I commend the hon. gentleman, the minister, for the statement he has made and I congratulate him on the number of little industries that he has announced. The total is something around 100 jobs and believe me, Mr. Speaker, every job, not 100 jobs, but every one job created in Newfoundland is a triumph, is a victory and a badly needed victory indeed. These are not spectacular enterprises, they employ two or three or five or eight or ten men or women or men and women and in one case we had twenty or thirty people employed which is a pretty respectable size for a new industry creating jobs at which people can earn a living.

I was especially interested in the minister's announcement

MR. SMALLWOOD: of a little industry to take poultry manure and peat bog and to dry both, to dehydrate both, mix them and make a manure for lawns and gardens of which, in our Province, there must be scores and scores and scores of thousands of dollars worth used, all of it imported into the Province.

Now we import into Newfoundland about a couple of million dollars worth of poultry feeds, grains of one kind, cereals of one kind and another, grown in Western Canada, ground up into meal and mixed in certain proportions, bagged and brought into the Province. A couple of million dollars of Newfoundland money going out of the Province to produce animal and poultry feeds. Now these feeds are brought in and they produce eggs, they produce broiler meat and they produce pork and they produce beef. They also produce manure. Now the beef and the eggs and the broilers and the mutton and the lamb are all consumed and are not lost but the manure for the most part is lost. This is an industry which is to take the manure and dry it, dehydrate it, take the moisture out of it, the same with peat bog which we already have here, we do not have to import, mix the two, bag it and make manure for lawns, for lawn grass and for gardens.

The only thing that leaves me stumped is the cost of dehydrating it. The cost of creating heat is growing ever greater. Whether you use oil, or electricity or any other kind of artificial heat you have to have the heat to dehydrate these two raw materials. I was hoping the minister would tell us what that was and perhaps if he would be willing to tell me privately who it is, where it is and some of the detail of it because I desperately hope that it is sound and that it will succeed, because God knows we have the raw material. We have the manure and we have the peat bog. If these can be dehydrated economically,

MR. SMALLWOOD: mixed and bagged and sold, then you have got a little industry that may employ twenty or thirty people in the course of time.

MR. NEARY: Then we can start growing mushrooms.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do congratulate the hon. minister. If he can give us that information I am sure the House would be interested to hear it.

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The concept the hon. member is talking about is a very big challenge -

MR. ROBERTS: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has come up.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not begrudge the minister the chance to say whatever he wishes to say but we have already been twenty or twenty-five minutes on a statement. Then the hon. gentleman representing other parties have the right to comment, and I realize that the minister has a right to respond to questions, but my point of order is this, Sir; would Your Honour let us have a ruling as to when a response or a question or a response to a question becomes a debate because if so all of us would like to get into it. We have now spent, Sir, forty minutes of the four hours that the House will sit this afternoon, on two ministerial statements, both of which have an importance in their own right, but surely, Sir, not of sufficient importance to justify this sort of time being spent on them. I am quite willing to hear whatever the minister has to say and indeed am looking forward to it, but I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if there ought not to be some way that this matter cannot be taken care of in debate or in the Oral Question Period instead of on this Ministerial Statement thing.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. House Leader on the point of order.

MR. WELLS: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is customary for the minister to be allowed to make a brief comment or explanation in response across the House but I will go further and say, Mr. Speaker, that that is to be used very, very sparingly and should only amount to a word or two. If questions arise out of a **Ministerial Statement** I feel that they should be put in the **Oral Question Period** Mr. Speaker, and dealt with there.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: In view of the hon. Leader of the Opposition's natural shyness about good news I will refrain from any comment at this moment and solve the problem completely.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order in this respect, not in all respects, in this respect the practice in the Legislature, both through its precedence since comments on **Ministerial Statements** have been permitted in recent practice, and in this respect our practice is similar to that in the House of Commons and the comment of Beauchesne there reads, "When a minister makes a statement on government policy or ministerial administration it is now firmly established that the Leader of the Opposition, or the Chiefs of recognized groups," and here I should add our practice allows a member speaking on behalf of one of those, so such people, "to ask explanations and make a few remarks".

Now to make a few remarks needs no comment. To ask explanations; I have always interpreted if an hon. member has the right to ask explanations then presumably the minister should have a right to give brief replies.'

MR. SPEAKER:

There would not be much sense in allowing an honourable member entitled to speak to ask for explanations if the minister were then left forbidden by the rules to reply. I would suggest that what would be permitted would not be a developed series of questions and answers as in the Oral Question Period but since an hon. member is entitled to ask explanations, then an hon. minister will be entitled to give a brief reply to that request.

The hon. Minister of Rural and Industrial Development if he wishes.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I still stick by my position that because of the Leader of the Opposition's propensity and proclivity to shy away from good news and I will -

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - deliver my statement to the hon. member privately.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman was recognized in order to give any explanation if he so wished.

o o o

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not have a report to present but I have a question of a point of order which I believe should be raised here. On Friday the Minister of Municipal Affairs in his capacity as Chairman of the special committee which was constituted under Standing Order 84 (a) presented a report to the House indicating the members to serve on two of the committees, I believe the Public Accounts Committee and the Standing Orders Committee. According to our rules 84 (c) is the relevant citation, Your Honour, of Standing Orders, that those committees do not exist until the House has concurred in the membership. I notice there is nothing on our Order Paper today to indicate that such a motion is to be presented. I have checked the journals of the House and no motion was made or concurred in.

MR. ROBERTS:

So my question really - I think it is an oversight on the part of us all - but my question of the government House Leader - and this, I think, is the appropriate place to raise it, Mr. Speaker, would be whether he is prepared to move the necessary motion which is simply that the report be concurred in. I am not sure if it is debatable or not. But for our part I would undertake not to debate it. I think we want the committee appointed. But anyway I raise the point, Your Honour, for whatever is appropriate action.

MR. WELLS: What I will do, Mr. Speaker, is consult with the table on the proper procedure for that and we can do it probably and get it out of the way tomorrow or whenever it is necessary.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Fisheries. It is one I am sure which he has anticipated. Could the minister tell us the administration's position with respect to the reports - as far as I know that is all we have at this stage - the reports of an arrangement that has been worked out between the government of Canada, through their Minister of State for the Fisheries Mr. LeBlanc on one hand, and the government of the Soviet Union on the other hand, respecting red fish and in particular can the minister tell us whether this arrangement will ensure a continuity of supply to the fishing plants particularly along the Southwest Coast that depend upon the red fish and that as we all know have been threatened with possible closure.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CAPTER: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the announcement that came from Moscow from the Minister of Fisheries that red fish, that certain stocks under the Russian, ICNAF quota would be coming back to Canada. But I am not sure that I like the method by which it was accomplished, with respect to the trading off of certain caplin stocks

MR. W. CARTEP:

to the Russians in return for these red fish quotas. I cannot directly answer the question put to me, Mr. Speaker, because the quantities have not been announced, the terms of the agreement have not been announced. We are not aware of what the ratio will be. For example, how much caplin are we going to allow the Russians to take in return for how much red fish.

MR. ROBERTS: It may not be ton for ton.

MR. W. CARTEP: I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the quantity will be staggering. I suspect that by no means will it be a ton for ton trade off. I have a feeling that it will be many many tons of caplin in return for a ton of red fish.

MR. W. CARTER:

There are certain aspects of it, Mr. Speaker, that I think must cause some concern. One in that the area for which the quotas are being traded, for example, the Hamilton Banks, is one area where it is very, very difficult to have a close surveillance. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that last year the Port of St. John's was closed to the Russians. One of the principal reasons for that action on the part of Ottawa was the fact that the Russians did violate their caplin quota and the violation amounted to about I believe 100 per cent. That is something we have to be very careful about.

I am not sure, for example, that Canada should now be referring the matter to ICNAP when according to reports there is every likelihood that we will be removing ourselves from that body after the Montreal June meeting of ICNAP. Certainly if we are going to declare a 200 mile limit then we will have to disassociate from ICNAP. Another very important factor which must be taken into account, Mr. Speaker, and must be the cause of some concern to all Newfoundlanders, is the fact that caplin is a very important food fish. Without caplin we do not have any cod and other species of fish. So certainly we cannot allow the Russians, or anybody for that matter, to overfish or to ravage that particular species.

At the present time, I should tell the House, there are in excess of 340,000 metric tons of caplin being taken from our Continental Shelf area. Of that 340,000 metric tons, Mr. Speaker, 202,000 metric tons are being taken, at least supposed to be taken, by the Russians. And we have every reason to believe, and certainly Ottawa does, that that amount is being upped, is being increased considerably by violations. Norway, for example; I think they take around 60,000 metric tons. The unfortunate part about it is that Canada is only now taking 30,000 metric tons or a very small percentage, actually less than ten per cent of the actual amount of caplin taken from the Continental Shelf.

My answer, Mr. Speaker, has been maybe too long but I think the matter is sufficiently important to warrant a little

MR. W. CARTER:

elaboration. I have very strong reservations as to the method employed by the federal Minister of Fisheries to bring about the situation that we now have. I welcome the -

MR. SMALLWOOD: His parliamentary assistant was virtually denouncing him today, publicly.

MR. W. CARTER: I realize. I welcome the announcement that we are going to get red fish. And again to answer your question it will have a very, very beneficial effect on the future operation of our plants on the Southwest Coast of the Province. That aspect of it I welcome and I commend the minister for it. I am not sure, and until I get the actual figures that he is talking about and the terms of the agreement, I am not sure I like or can approve of the deal as it applies to caplin.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. With reference to the minister's answer, and I thank the minister, I think it is a very fair answer, Can the minister indicate - he gave some figures of the total number of tons of caplin which are being caught each year and it seemed like an awful lot of caplin indeed - can the minister indicate whether the advice which he has is that we have - do we have any surplus of caplin on the - I gather the Hamilton Banks is the only area where there is a caplin stock sufficient to justify fishing it - but the advice the minister has, do we have a surplus of caplin?

If so can the minister give us any indication of the size of that surplus? If we are catching - I think the minister said - 340,000 metric tons of caplin a year, can the stock sustain that? That is the same question the other way around.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that even the people in Ottawa, the federal scientists and biologists can answer that question because there is another weakness in the whole arrangement. I do not think there has been sufficient scientific research. I do not believe that there exists at the moment sufficient scientific data to really designate what will be a sustainable yield. I think -

MR. ROBERTS: On the caplin?

MR. W. CARTER: On the caplin. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is a matter of standing in the dark. We know what has happened to the cod resource. The Russians are probably more than anybody else guilty of ravaging that stock and certainly I do not think we should allow it to happen to the caplin.

Another very important point is that if Canada had announced its intentions or even had taken the necessary action to declare a 200 mile limit then this trade off would not have been necessary because we would then have control. In 1977 we would have control of the red fish stocks and other stocks on our Continental Shelf.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And the caplin.

MR. W. CARTER: And the caplin too but -

MR. ROBERTS: Is it not correct that even if we announced it now in Montreal we cannot take it for twelve months thereafter, is that not the ICNAF thing?

MR. W. CARTER: No, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER MOGENSEN: It could be a federal agreement. We do not know.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It could be a treaty.

MR. ROBERTS: But the ICNAF thing requires a twelve month out as I understand the ICNAF agreement.

MR. W. CARTER: No, Mr. Speaker, ICNAF must be served notice six months prior to the end of a calendar year of a member nation's intention to withdraw from that body.

MR. ROBERTS: So if notice is given at the meeting in Montreal -

MR. W. CARTER: Notice must be given. Notice must be given on the June 3rd. meeting.

MR. ROBERTS: A fortnight from now then we can be in control by 1 January 1977, is that correct?

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, but if we do not serve notice at that June meeting then we are locked into ICNAF for at least another twelve months. But, Mr. Speaker, I think what has happened --

PREMIER MOORES: The bilaterals agreed.

MR. W. CARTER: Bilaterals, it seems to me that Canada, we appear to be too anxious to negotiate these bilaterals and I am wondering, you know, by the time they are finished will there be any need for a 200 mile declaration? In fact, will a 200 mile declaration be of any use to Canada, when we are going to be trading off caplin for red fish and allowing this country to fish for that species here and somewhere else. I am afraid that what we are doing now just might preclude any benefits that we could derive from the formal declaration of a 200 mile limit.

MR. ROBERTS: Iceland has not found a better road.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition had his time back this morning if he would still make the statement that he was delighted about this announcement, and after hearing the official position from the minister.

Would the minister indicate to the House, because of the lack of surveillance -

MR. ROBERTS: He is pinning his faith to the Southwest Coast.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

MR. NEARY: - because of the lack of surveillance in the area is it possible that the Russians may be trying to get at the cod in that area apart from the caplin? Is this a possibility?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: I have no doubt that there is a considerable cod by-catch, for example, and the Pamilton Banks is one of the last great resource of cod left, I suppose, in the Northwest Atlantic, in the world for that matter, and I suspect that there will be a considerable by-catch of cod. When you have a directed fishery for a particular species, for example, in this case caplin, you know, you also catch other species as well. For example, we know that certain European countries are catching

8588
6586

MR. W. CARTER: considerable red fish, flat fish and flounder in their directed cod fishery but I suspect the Russians will be using the same ploy. It will not only be the caplin that they will be taking back to Russia, no doubt there will be a lot of cod for which they do not have quotas and that are being caught illegally.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister tell the House if there will be a strongly worded telegram or letter of protest going off to the Federal Minister of Fisheries or the Prime Minister of Canada in connection with making agreements behind our backs without prior consultation? And if so would the minister tell the House if the minister intends to bring a resolution into the House to make it unanimous so that we can all get in on the act and protest this sort of goings on.

MR. MORGAN: It cannot be unanimous; the Opposition will not vote for it.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I can say this much, tell the House, that the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa and his officials will be well equated with the position of this minister and of the government and, I presume, of the Newfoundland people.

PREMIER MOORES: He will want to find out what is wrong.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, I think he will be well aware of what our feelings are before that agreement -

MR. NEARY: Before he gets out of Russia I hope.

MR. W. CARTER: - has been negotiated at the Montreal ICNAF meeting.

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

7
MR. STRACHAN: A question for the acting Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation. In view of the current crisis in the fuel situation in Nain, one of a number of recurring situations, I wonder if the minister is now prepared to change his earlier publicly stated view that it is easier and cheaper to fly fuel into the community rather than to come to an agreement with oil companies on a shared-cost programme to build bulk storage facilities or, as is done in the Northwest Territories and Arctic Quebec, where the government absorbs the total cost of the bulk storage facilities?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. acting Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation.

X
MR. WELLS: This matter came up during the Winter and it has come up in years past many times, and this Winter the department found that the only way, Mr. Speaker, was to fly in the fuel. At the time I said that we had, and government had, for some time been after the oil companies to put storage facilities in, and the oil companies had refused, which is correct. Since then the Labrador Services Division has been studying the matter and feels that it may be in the long run cheaper and better and more satisfactory to all concerned for the Labrador Services Division to make a start on providing oil storage facilities. But the position of government is not definite on that yet. But it is the way the thinking is tending, that on a gradual basis something ought to be done along those lines.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

X
MR. STRACHAN: I accept that position, but I would like - I do not know how I do this in the House - but if the minister would table in the House the amount of fuel flown into the Northern community and the cost per gallon to ship it in by air freight, if this could be done at the end of the season or if it can be given?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

X
MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. I wonder if the minister would tell the House whether or not he had a chance to visit the section of the Trans-Canada Highway West of Grand Falls over the weekend and whether or

Mr. White:

not be intends to make any improvements to that area while we are waiting for the contracts to be let and the Trans-Canada to be rebuilt?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on the weekend I did visit the area where the unfortunate accident occurred recently and inspected the water levels, examined the water levels on the Exploit's River and the damage to the Trans-Canada Highway section, and also inspected the condition of the detour now being used. A decision is being made to the effect that tenders for the Trans-Canada Highway upgrading will be completed on June 2, and a decision is now being made to carry out improvements to the detour and to consider paving it. We have to look at the cost and to determine the cost, we have to ask for bids from contractors and companies in the area who do have paving equipment. However, it will be stipulated to the successful bidder on the highway upgrading that the work is to commence immediately, in other words shortly after June 2.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MRS. MACISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice. I would like to ask the minister if there is any truth to the possible rumour that Magistrates Court will be moved from St. George's shortly?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: I have not even heard the rumour, Mr. Speaker, and may I assure the hon. member that there is absolutely no truth that this great ancient and historic courthouse will be moved from the capital of the West Coast, St. George's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir. It is a very, very serious matter in connection

Mr. Neary.

with a report that was released in Ottawa today by the Federal Department of National Health and Welfare in connection with asbestosis, a study that was done in all the various mining communities across Canada where asbestos is being mined. Does the minister have an advance copy and if not is the minister going to send immediately to get a copy because of the special reference that is made to the mining of asbestos in Baie Verte and the exposure, the health hazards existing in that community at this particular moment?

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

MR. COSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen any federal reports yet on asbestosis or anything else of that nature. And until I or my officials do I could not verify or not verify that there was anything specifically said about Baie Verte. It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that asbestos itself is a substance that has to be treated with every care. There has to be the highest standards of health and safety. That is realized by this administration which has been extremely active in the field of improving health and safety in the Province, far more than in earlier years. There is a committee of cabinet ministers and a sub-committee of officials who have reviewed the whole situation. There are reports now before cabinet. But I will certainly see if we have not already got a copy of this report that it is obtained.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary. Could the minister undertake, because obviously the minister did not anticipate the question and neither did the minister seem to know very much about it, but the report was released this morning, would the minister undertake without delay this afternoon to get a copy of that report because the very lives of these people in the community of Baie Verte especially the workers with the mining company are being threatened according to this report. Would the minister undertake to get it this afternoon? Call up on the telephone if necessary and ask to have it sent down.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Education. I wonder if the minister is in a position to inform the House whether or not his department has undertaken any systematic effort to determine the success or otherwise of the equivalency programme?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the study to determine the success. Last year there were a considerable number of people who wrote the equivalency exam and of course, the results were very rewarding for these people. But officially I do not know if there has been a formal study made as to the success of it. I will attempt to find out if there has been.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary. I wonder also if the minister knows whether there is any attempt or whether there will be an attempt to have these GED exams Newfoundland normed because at the moment they are American normed?

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MP. HOUSE: I do not think there is any attempt to have them standardized for Newfoundland. I think they are national, the same ones being used in other provinces of Canada. But again as I said I will get the information, what we have, on it and report back.

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

MR. STRACHAN: A question for the Minister of Mines and Energy. Could the minister tell us whether he has reached a final decision on whether or not to equalize electricity rates within this Province? And more specifically to equalize electricity rates for the Labrador Coast and other areas in Labrador which are supplied by diesel electricity?

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the electricity rates are equalized now. In the hydro areas we have equalized hydro rates. They are the same across the Province.

MR. NEARY: They are not.

MR. CROSBIE: If the hon. gentleman will just wait until I complete my answer. In the hydro areas we have equalized hydro rates. They are the same in the City of St. John's as they are in the community of St. Phillips, and so on across the Province. With respect to diesel systems there is a different rate system. For the first 500 kilowatt hours per month the hydro rate is in effect and after that the rate increases and it is more expensive than in the hydro areas because the operation of diesel systems is far more expensive than is the case in hydro areas.

As the hon. gentleman knows we have in the estimates passed by the House, or hopefully soon to be passed by the House, the amount of \$11 million to meet the costs of the rural system in excess of the revenue that is brought in. The estimates also include \$2.5 million

MR. CROSBIE:

For certain needed capital expenditures in rural areas where the revenue is not generated sufficient to meet those expenditures. In addition in the estimates are included a number of other millions of dollars of subsidies in connection with the general hydro system so that the government is already heavily subsidizing the energy costs both in and outside of the regional areas.

Now with respect to the question as to whether government has decided to institute any rate change in the diesel areas, the answer is no the government has decided there will be no change. The Province cannot institute that change at this time. We will review the situation again next year. With respect to the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area, as hon. gentlemen know there has been a contract awarded to bring a transmission line to the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area from the Upper Churchill. This is going to cost the people of the Province, and it will cost our credit, some \$18 million to \$20 million over

Mr. Crosbie.

the next two years. That line is expected to be finished in the Fall of 1977 so that by the Fall of 1977 the people in the Happy Valley - Coose Bay - North West River area will be receiving hydro power. At that time, of course, they will pay the same for their energy as people do in the other areas of the Province that have hydro power. And that is being done because it is possible to do it, and we are doing it. With respect to communities along the Coast of Labrador, the hon. gentleman knows there is no economic or feasible way that hydro power can be delivered to them. The cost is simply out of the question. They live in small isolated communities, and whether or not some day in the future -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Unless it could be transmitted by wires.

MR. CROSBIE: Right, or somehow flung through the air and not on a transmission line.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or flanges.

MR. CROSBIE: Or flanges. Is that wireless? The hon. gentleman is being very helpful here. The position is that they are going to be on diesel systems for a long time to come yet.

Now once the Happy Valley - Coose Bay area goes on the diesel system a considerable number of people will be taken off it. I am not sure of the exact number. I suppose there must be 5,000 or 6,000 at least households in that area. We would then review the situation again and see how many customers are left on diesel areas and see whether we can reach to change the rates, you know, and then it may be possible. So we will have another look at it next year. But the position this year is that the government has come to the conclusion that there can be no change.

MR. STAGGILL: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Could the minister undertaken then to look into the sum of \$1 million, additional money, which Hydro get from the native fund, that is through the Federal/Provincial agreement, money which is given by Ottawa for native people within this Province, and out of that \$4.5 million Hydro gets \$1 million; could he undertake to look into it and see how that money is spent and whether it could be used to subsidize our electricity rates?

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, that money, at least, the only money that I know of under that agreement that is being spent is in connection with improving and extending the generating facilities in that particular part of Labrador, improving the diesel generators or adding them or whatever. Now it may be possible that in those areas money under that agreement could be used to subsidize even more electricity rates. They are heavily subsidized now with the present rate structure, as I am sure the hon. gentleman understands. So that certainly could be checked. For example, we have a situation there at Black Tickle now where the new fish plant is completed there, and they are going to require more power. It will cost - I think the figure is \$600,000 to put in additional generating facilities. And the annual subsidy, if the rates remain the same, will be \$200,000 a year, just to subsidize the power for - what is it? - 138 people residing at Black Tickle. This is the kind of thing that you get into, and it is very, very expensive. But anyway I will check and see whether monies under that agreement can be used for subsidy purposes. But there already is a heavy subsidy.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Public Works and Services, acting, Sir. Would the minister tell the House if the statement made by the Public Work's official, who was upset with the probe of the Health Science Complex's project, if that statement was made with the knowledge of the minister or was it just a leak in the minister's department? The story leaked out to The Evening Telegram on the weekend.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: The statement was part of an internal departmental document, and I would assume that somebody got their hands on it. But it certainly was not an official statement by the person concerned.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Has the minister undertaken an investigation to see if the official concerned, a Mr. Brophy, did in fact give The Evening Telegram the story or if they got it secondhand? Has he asked how the story originated, if in fact it did originate in the minister's department? And if not would the minister undertake an investigation to find out?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I have not asked, Mr. Speaker, nor would it be my intention to ask. I know Mr. Brophy, and I know him to be an honest man, and I doubt very much if he would make that available. It is just something that happens every now and then. It is something circulating through the building, mislaid somewhere and somebody in the press picks it up. It was only in one paper. It was not released officially. An enterprising newspaper picked that up.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Is the minister concerned about the fact that this matter became public, an internal memo, in that a civil servant is objecting to the announcement made by the Premier and a decision taken by the cabinet - a civil servant is objecting to this? He does not think it is the right thing. Is the minister concerned about that, and has he discussed it with Mr. Brophy?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if things have changed in the last few years. I think this government relies on the advice of its officials and government has to make a decision. The advice

Mr. Rousseau.

we get is not always the advice we follow. That is government's job, and that is what we were elected to do. So we have a group of civil servants who have no fear of giving their advice.

MR. NEARY: So civil servants run the Province now, and not the government, not the Premier?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is very much appreciated. But when we get the advice from civil servants, government then makes its decision as to what course they will follow.

MR. NEARY: This was not advice. This was a condemnation of the government, not advice.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

My question is for the Acting Minister of Recreation. In view of the fact that in last Spring's, 1975 budget, there were nine areas of the Province named as areas where stadia would be built, none of the nine was the district of Ferryland. Would the Acting Minister of Recreation explain how he can justify the fact that a stadium is going to be built in the Ferryland area this year when last year it was not in the budget and a freeze was said to have been put on the building of all stadia ever since the Spring of last year?

MR. NEARY: The by-election.

MR. SPEAKER: The Acting Minister of Recreation.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, it has nothing to do, as the hon. member suggests, with the by-election. The commitment was given in writing by the minister at the time, the hon. Mr. Doyle, in August of 1975 and since then the various things that I outlined the other day have followed. There is no question of a new commitment being given, now, this year. It was given in August, 1975.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I am dissatisfied with the answer and under Standing Order 31 (g) I wish to debate it on the Late Show.

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

MR. LUSH: A question for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. A short time ago the minister was announcing about the family garden plots and I think he mentioned that the one in the Goulds will not be carried on this year. To my understanding that was a very successful venture. I wonder if the minister is in a position to explain to the House why the one in the Goulds is not being carried on this year?

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

MR. POUSSÉAU: We are certainly very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that the plot in the Goulds is not going to be continued. Unfortunately last year when we had the space it was rented and we were unable to rent it again this year. It is very difficult when a lot of peoples' hard work went into it and we had to move from that plot. I suggested

MR. ROUSSEAU:

on earlier occasions that I would like to be able to see people who had a plot last year have the same one this year because a lot of people put a lot of work into it. But unfortunately the first year of the programme we learn from our mistakes, the mistakes you make just as long as you do not repeat them, and we have not repeated them this year. The plot we have now is on Crown land that we will be able to have. We did not know last year that this would not be available. But the programme was very successful. It was an unfortunate situation in that respect. But we will make sure in future in St. John's, as well as the other areas of the Province, that the land we use will be available to us for longer periods of time. It could not be anticipated last year that the permission to rent this land would be withdrawn in one year. We could not assume that at all, and it is an unfortunate situation, but I am sure it will not happen again.

MR. SPEAKER: The thirty minutes has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Order 3, Committee of Ways and Means. The motion is that I leave the Chair. The debate was adjourned by the hon. member for Eagle River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I had been asked by a number of hon. members to drop the debate on the budget speech and to carry on on the Throne Speech. I had considered it. I know some members desire to leave this House or get out of the cuckoo's nest. But since I will be returning to Labrador after this House closes and nobody will be seeing me again until the House convenes, which may be next year, I thought we might inject a little bit of Labrador common sense into what had to be said here. I will try and keep my comments very short and to the point.

I felt I particularly wanted to talk because of my reaction and feeling from Labrador to the Premier's announcement last week of the attempt to try and regain Churchill Falls power. I know the situation

MR. STRAGHAN:

fairly well in Labrador, at least the Labrador Coast and slightly in Happy Valley-Coose Bay but more in the Coast, so I felt that I wanted to indicate something of the feelings there. I also want to talk a little bit about a problem that we have in this Province which does not often get aired in St. John's, and that is the problem of separatism as we call it, Labrador separatism. I want to challenge some myths, some unfounded statements in St. John's from the newspapers and people who have never been to Labrador.

Before I enter into my short discourse on this I would like to indicate right from the start that I am not a separatist by any means. I would not be standing in this House and I would not be sitting on either of the parties sides if I was a separatist. I do not believe in it. Although I may add at the same time that in the end analysis, as far as many Labrador people are concerned, it may have to come. Of course at that time one makes one's decision. But at the moment, certainly as far as I am concerned, our fight and concern should be to try and keep this Province as one, as a whole Province. And to that point I agree one hundred per cent.

What I state here is almost in the form of a warning. It is almost in the form of letting St. John's, and government here in St. John's, know what is happening in Labrador with the people there and their feelings, their emotions towards the Island part of the Province.

Getting back to the statement by the Premier, I should state that of all the people in the Province who welcomed that statement - and I think one would have to be a fool not to welcome such a statement - of all the people the people of Labrador welcomed it more than anyone else. Whereas the concerns of this House and the concerns of St. John's and the people of the Island are centered around the need for electrical power from Labrador, our concerns in Labrador are far deeper and far more fundamental than just the acquisition of electrical power. We are the actual neighbors of the Province of

MR. STPACHAN:

Quebec. We are joined by a long boundary to that very unruly and very arrogant province.

We have listened, and I have seen and listened over months and years, to propaganda fed from the Province of Quebec that we belong to them. They still have not accepted the 1927 decision and that is fairly well known. We have seen maps and charts distributed throughout Quebec which shows no border whatsoever, which shows the landmarks of Quebec stretching to the Atlantic Coast and encompassing all of Labrador. We are pretty well fed up to our teeth with continual threats and blackmail emanating from that Province about how it is going to eventually control us.

We see on Quebec tourist brochures our very own Torngat Mountains which are situated almost entirely within the boundaries of this Province being heralded and touted around Canada as the Quebec Alps. In recent weeks -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Are those mountains in the hon. gentleman's district?

MR. STPACHAN: Yes, yes. The Torngat Mountains. In fact I should add that the Torngat Mountains contain the only two glaciers in this Province. Small glaciers they are but there are two small glaciers on them.

In recent weeks we have sat in wonder as to what exactly was going on between this government and the government of Quebec. And I am talking here of the people in Labrador who did not know what was going on, who were ignorant of the facts.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Has the hon. gentleman seen either of those glaciers?

MR. STRACHAN: No, I have seen photographs of them. People in Labrador who are ignorant of the facts of what was going on were up in arms. I had many calls at the statement of Mr. Cournoyer to barter or try to negotiate away part of Labrador untrue as it may have been. And also emanating totally from Quebec the people of Labrador hardly heard the Minister of Finance's denial of such negotiations. We accepted the fact that what the minister said was true and we understand that point. But unfortunately in Labrador

MR. STACHAN:

they were so upset by it that they did not hear the statement by the minister. All they heard was the first statement by the Minister of Natural Resources of Quebec and they were fairly well up in arms and were not prepared to listen to anything more. In fact they had come to the stage of believing not one word anyone was saying. All they really felt was someone was playing around with them for other motives, motives of maybe pure, selfish greed. They attributed the greed both to Quebec and to the government here in St. John's because that is how they perceive the government.

The government is a remote bureaucracy in St. John's, even more remote because of the geographic differences of the two parts of the Province. Because of a lack of real hard news, of real information and because many places cannot receive information with no radio, no television, no newspapers, then they did not know what was happening and what was going on.

Mr. Strachan.

We in this House here then made debate, as we did last Thursday, debate the Upper Churchill regarding it only as a source of hydro electricity. And the point I am trying to state is that the people of Labrador debate that resource, the resource, the technology provides us, electrical power, but they also debate because they are concerned about their own most important resource and that is the people of Labrador themselves. They feel that they are being raided, they are being emptied, they are drained by a guerrilla force that does not even have to come into the Province to get at their resources. It sets an imaginary line, and this is how Quebec regards the border, as an imaginary line. We can call it a border but Quebec sees it as a totally imaginary line, and they can try to pick off our resources as we try to sell them to the rest of Canada. The people have seen their resources being picked off by Quebec, and they have wondered all the time as to whether the schemes Quebec was dreaming up was to start picking off next their land, as they proposed, and eventually, of course, the people of Labrador.

At no previous time in the history of this Province, I believe. - I am talking of Labrador - have the people of Labrador really needed reassurance and reassurance they were not getting until last Thursday, and I think the announcement that was made last Thursday, from what I can gather, gave the people of Labrador a great deal of reassurance that this Province was firmly, once and for all, going to take firm action about the situation with Quebec, and it would take strong action if necessary. I think, of course, that the action that was taken comes just in time, and I think not just in time for the Churchill power acquisition, but just in time for Labrador as well. The government forced into a crisis situation has reacted strongly, and

Mr. Strachan.

I certainly, and many people in Labrador applaud that movement. But we feel that such strong action needs to be taken in many other areas of resource development in Labrador. And we often ask the question, "Why do we have to wait until we are cornered before we can react in such a forceful and necessary manner?"

The people of Labrador have felt that they are being traded, as I said, by St. John's that no direction was coming from St. John's or coming from a government centred in St. John's, that there was little enough concern by the government for them let alone any strong guiding force. There was a vacuum then in Labrador, and I say the vacuum was only appeased to a certain extent by the Premier's announcement last week. **That the Premier's statement will satisfy a great deal of the emotional concern felt within Labrador I have no doubt will happen. People do feel happier and feel that at last may be something is happening to join this Province into one.**

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. member permit a question? Has he any evidence whatsoever to indicate that the reaction that he welcomes to the Premier's statement, along the Coast of Labrador, with which the hon. gentleman is so familiar, is equalled or paralleled in Western Labrador? Is there the same depth of emotional feeling and satisfaction and approval in Western Labrador near the boundary as there is out on the coast which, after all, is another country almost?

MR. STRACHAN: I certainly cannot answer that. Probably the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture would be more informed on that situation. I have never been to Labrador West myself apart from passing through there. So I do not know the situation, and the feelings there. I certainly can only talk for the Labrador Coast and to a certain extent for Happy Valley - Goose Bay where I spend considerable time. I have indications from Labrador West that there are certain

Mr. Strachan.

people there who are stated to be separatists or people who are only trying to bring attention to their problems, and are not really basically separatists nor are they pro-Quebec. And this is a point I was trying to get to which may explain it. I have read in St. John's articles in The Evening Telegram, The Daily News, I have listened to CBC, to constant talk about union between Labrador and Quebec. I have lived in Labrador seven years, and I have never met one person who wants to have anything to do with Quebec. That is totally a foreign attitude. It is an ignorant attitude by people who are writing about Labrador in St. John's, but who have never been to Labrador. In fact the people of Labrador, rather than discuss Quebec or certainly they do not want to get into bed with Quebec - in fact many of them have a very narrow, almost bigoted attitude towards Quebec. And when you see the territorial demands that Quebec makes on Labrador and makes on this Province then one can understand why the back reaction by the Labrador people is equally as narrow. They view Quebec as being the aggressor. There is no question about that. As far as they are concerned, Quebec is the aggressor. And that is the viewpoint of all Labradorians that I know. It may be a bigoted viewpoint for the Labrador people to feel, but certainly it is not a viewpoint of brotherly love or a feeling that should be shown to a neighbouring Province in this great nation of Canada. But it cannot be any more bigoted than the territorial demands of the Quebec 's Minister of Natural Resources.

Labrador, as far as I know, and the people of Labrador do not hold out their arms to Quebec. They may hold out their boot, but they certainly do not hold out their arms to them. The point I was trying to get to here is that I feel that the action which was taken last week should only be a start. It should not be regarded as a one-piece action. There should be action which should be followed up in dealing with all the resources of Labrador

Mr. Strachan.

so that they are not traded or sold off to Quebec nor should Labrador be regarded only as a place in which the resources are sent to the Island. Labrador equally will get the same feelings for the Island portion, if the Island regards Labrador exactly the same way as Quebec regards Labrador, a place where resources can be drained, can be tapped, and can be taken from. There are people actually living in Labrador, people who want to remain there, and they are of concern **too, not only the hydro power, not only the uranium, not only the iron ore or the forests.**

My plea, essentially, is that the government should follow up this strong action to gain back the resources of Labrador by further strong action so that they can gain back the people of Labrador. I constantly here in the House and in St. John's - I am fed with people who laugh or titter or feel it is rather stupid, that **emotional outcry from** Labrador, and pass it off as being unrealistic and impractical. If the emotion presently being expressed by Labrador people against the Island portion is not satisfied with further strong action by governments of this Province, then I **assert** that the practicality which people say is now missing - you see the emotion is there but no practicality - then the practicality which they say is missing will come, and the realism which they say is not there will also grow. It will also come. Then, of course, you have reached the danger point where you put the emotion together with the practicality and the realism, and you are on a road of no return. I feel that within the next five, six, seven years, if this Province is going to maintain itself as one unified Province, then there has to be a whole different attitude by government in St. John's and by the bureaucracy towards Labrador. I often hear people say that when we ask for this that we are asking for more money, we are asking for more funds in Labrador. That is not necessarily

Mr. Strachan.

true. Of course, we need more roads. My district has not one road in it. Of course we need a lot of things. But what we are asking for is not only funds being spent in that part of the Province, which is providing such a great deal for the Province, but we are also asking for concern. We are also asking for a presence. We are asking for people to be there to come and talk to people and be concerned with the problems, not to pass them off as being too far away or it is too long or too cold or too miserable to go there. What we are asking for then is a process of consultation, a process of which a government, or a reasonable type of government, or some recognition is given to Labrador, real, true, deep recognition, an empathy which is absent now.

I am sure then that such thoughts as I have expressed about the emotions of Labrador are small compared to the problems facing the Premier and the problems facing the Minister of Mines and Energy as they go into negotiations with Quebec for the Churchill Falls power. They need their cool heads, and they need their cold logic to see their way through, and I appreciate that. But most

MR. STPACHAN:

Labrador people do not appreciate that because they do not know what is going on. They have not access to the hard facts and they are not concerned. They are mostly concerned with their emotions. They are mostly concerned with their feelings. It is a feeling which is often encouraged by isolation. If anyone has studied, as I have, the effects of isolation on people then one can very easily understand why emotion can very quickly start to rule your life, of which your whole life is based on one deep feeling. This is what Labrador is at the moment.

The point that I was trying to get and the final point here that I am trying to express is that unless something happens, unless this government, this House and the people of this Island make an attempt to start to understand the people there and their problems then there will be - and I warn you again and will do it again and again - there will be in the future some real deep concern. All of the sudden you are going to be upset and angry at something which takes part in Labrador and you will not know what has hit you.

I do not agree with much of this but I can understand their emotions and their feelings and it is for me to present their feelings here in the House. I would be cowardly if I did not. I see that as my point. Again I say that I am not a separatist. I believe in unity. But I believe that we must make this attempt. I was slightly saddened last Thursday when the resolution which was before the House here was not adopted at the last minute on Thursday night. My sad feelings, my deep feelings, were caused because I felt that the government allowed themselves to get caught up in the bickering of the House, or our political differences within the House, and did not think about the people outside of the House, many of whom do not know what is going on.

I thought that for the people of Labrador alone they should have been right and due to present that resolution and carry it on. It is Opposition's business as I see it to attack -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is it too late even now to do it?

MR. STPACHAN: I certainly do not think so but I was deeply saddened by the fact because I think we are here to serve the people of this Province. What was happening was that our internal family squabbles, our dirty linen in here was affecting a resolution, a resolution which is very much needed by the people of Labrador more than anybody else in the Province because they wanted to see, at least in my district, and I believe also in the center of Labrador, they wanted to see very clearly that Quebec was being told where to get off. I think that by not presenting that resolution, I certainly was saddened, and I think that many people in Labrador were too because this was the kind of thing they were looking for, the news they were looking for. This is what they were looking to this House for. And their concerns about whether different parties wish to argue and squabble in the House do not matter to the people of Nain or the people of Black Tickle or the people of Mary's Harbour or the people of Happy Valley. They are not interested in the squabbles. They are interested in what essentially comes out of it at the end. That is why I present this point. That is all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burin-Placentia.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, it is almost twenty-seven years since I first stood in this House to take part in a debate. It was not debate on a budget. It was a debate on the Address in Reply and I had greater latitude. Mr. Speaker, I will try to be relevant and not stray too far to have to be called to order because I like good order in this House. I am all for it. I try to keep it.

Mr. Speaker, my heading note today is a modern expression that our boys and girls would use if I told them we were \$600 million in debt in 1971 and we are now \$1,800 million in debt or more, three times that. Mr. Speaker, the youth of the Province would ask me, "How come?" If I told them my district and the entire Burin Peninsula in 1971-1972 was flourishing and not one man or woman who was healthy

MP. CANNING:

and needed work and wanted to work but were unemployed. If I painted a picture of it today, of unemployment, uncertainty I think the youth would ask me, "How come? How come this gloomy budget?"

If I told our youth, the young men and women of today, the rulers of tomorrow, young men and women who are to come in here after I am gone, if I told them the successful story of the Liberal government in Newfoundland from 1949 to 1971, perhaps to 1971, Mr. Speaker, but maybe not. Perhaps I should say 1967-1968, after the mid 1960's. If I told them of the law and order experienced in this House up to that day and up to the day that the Minister of Mines and Energy started crisscrossing the floor of this House, if I told them the turmoil started then and has continued ever since, when this House really has not been a decent place for any good man or woman to be who are interested in the Province, or who want to carry on the work of the Province. Mr. Speaker, again they would ask me, "How come? Why has this happened?". They would ask me why I was here. Why I stayed here so long or why I tried to come back and why I am here again.

Mr. Speaker, the time at my disposal is not enough, is not long enough to go into that. I am sorry that I did not have the opportunity to speak in the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I do not think I would have any longer time, would I?

MP. ROBERTS: No, forty-five is all.

MP. CANNING: But anyway I would have had the same time, forty-five minutes. I would have had greater latitude perhaps. But if I were to go on now and tell why I was here, what happened in the period I was here, why I was defeated after having done so much for my district, why three years elapsed and the people of Placentia West asked me to come back again, Mr. Speaker, why did I beat a much younger man, a learned man of whom the Tories boast, not the people of Placentia West, Mr. Speaker, I could tell them. Again I am sure they would ask me, "How come?".

MR. CANNING:

Mr. Speaker, if I told them of the great men who passed through this side of the House both in government and opposition during my time, if I told them of the Opposition of this House previous to 1972, from 1949 to 1972, if I told them of the great men, gentlemen they were, of how much they had the Province at heart, a lot of them, many of them or most of them, how they behaved themselves here, how they respected the Chair, how the business of the House was carried out as it should be with all respect and decorum attached to it, and then if I told them what it has been like since the day I came in last Fall, what has gone on here, the way this House has acted, if I told them of the government, so many we have not heard from yet, if I told them that the budget passed through the House in a few minutes which we were not given an opportunity to debate, if I tell them on the Burin Peninsula we did not get an opportunity to debate the budget on the fishery, the most important industry of the Island and a department which I think at the moment has a good man - sometimes I look over at him and find that I served in this House with him and I wonder

MR. CANNING: why he was not noticed, why he was not taken in then, because Mr. Speaker, he had as much experience then in the fishery as he has now. He is the son of a fisherman and came from a fishing outpost. He knows the life of a fisherman. He knows the importance of the fishermen.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they would ask me, "How come?" I could tell them. I will leave the House to guess. We have intelligent men here, I hope. As I go through the few remarks I am going to make this afternoon I hope they will look at it with an open mind, the things I ask or the things I say. I hope they will be broad enough, I hope they have courage enough, I hope they have interest in Newfoundland to the extent that they will listen and perhaps my forty-five minutes will not be wasted.

Mr. Speaker, if I told again the youth - I said my headline was, "How Come" and these are some of the questions they would put to me, or if they put to me, how I would answer them. If I told them what our problems were in 1949 when we suffered isolation, degradation and poverty and we were the poorest in the country, if I told them of the almost miraculous change and our rapid strides to catch up, if I told them of the men who with scanty budgets, laboured and sweated to bring in a budget, to bring in a budget, the money to be divided as equally as possible, the few millions that they had that made Newfoundland what she was in 1970, Mr. Speaker, they would ask me, "How come? How did they do it?"

Then if I tell them after five years that the Tory Government brought this Province to a standstill they would ask me, "How come?" If the youth of my district in Placentia West have heard the stories from their parents that every single year from 1949 to 1971 that district forged ahead, it forged ahead faster than any other area in this Province, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be so vain as to say that I did it. No, Mr. Speaker, I did it under a Liberal Government which during that time was Liberal, was looking after

MR. GANNING: the poor of Newfoundland, was trying to bring it ahead and God knows we did.

I get a little bit mixed up or confused when I say they or we because I was never a part of the government. When I say we, the government, I am not correct. I was not a part of the government. I was a backbencher, Mr. Speaker. I was a backbencher because I did exactly what I am going to do here today, and I did not fit into the political scheme, I did not fit into the system, so I spoke my mind. And there were times, Mr. Speaker, that I tread on the wrong toes and I do not mean our leader's toes. But I tread on the toes of those that he had to go along with. He was the leader of this Province, he wanted to remain leader and unfortunately he had to along with the people who never wanted to see me in the government.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that caused the Liberal Government to go down, that I was not there. But I feel I could have contributed. I think I could have made a contribution as great or greater in the main industry of this land, the one thing that I was very much interested in, that I knew all about when I came into this, what used to be known - I knew as much as any Newfoundlander about it. I came in here as a seaman. I came as a man who had fished during his high school, who had spent six years with the greatest seamen of the world, who then again did not want to go back to the sea, who had to go to university to prepare himself at a late age to be settling down, to prepare himself to be able to settle down, and then had to fish my way through the university. I think I came in well prepared. Mr. Speaker, I often thought I was when I saw school teachers, as Ministers of Fisheries, when I saw men as Minister of Fisheries who knew nothing about it. I often thought, I did not want to go in for the money, I did not want to go in for the glory, but I often thought and wished - I were there. **And one thing I**

MR. CANNING: did outside of it I think I contributed more to the Department of Fisheries in the twenty-three years I was here than anybody who went in there. Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I could tell the story, a part of the story that I mentioned here this afternoon when we tried to modernize the salt fish on Merasheen Island, and if I could tell the story of the Atlantic fish coming into Marystown, I had something to do with it, not very much, but I did not find them.

But, Mr. Speaker, the man who found them gave me the opportunity to meet them first when they came here to choose a site. He gave me that. He asked me to go to the airport and meet them, take them to the hotel. Mr. Speaker, I took them to the hotel. They were looking for a site in Newfoundland. They wanted to know about the fishery. They wanted to know about the plants. They wanted to know about the wages. They wanted to know where they could get their skipners, their engineers, and, of course, it just suited me because I had them.

Mr. Speaker, I told them things that day that I think I would have gotten rapped over the knuckles for. I did not go down and betray the Premier. I do not betray leaders that I am with. If I had to betray them I think I would leave them first and slip quietly out unless I was certain that I could contribute something to the Province, where I would turn against them openly.

But, Mr. Speaker, I did go out on a limb. But I think he would want me to say it, what I told them. I said, "Now Marystown is in my district, it is on the Burin Peninsula,"

I told them the great port it was, I told them we had the men and we had the women, which we did, to operate the plant. But I also told them that the Premier of the Province was a politician and there was a danger that when they would meet him later in the day he might

MR. CANNING: persuade them to go to Bay Bulls, St. Mary's Bay, with all due respect to it, but it was not the place to set up a deep sea fishery at that time. Pe may want them to go to Long Harbour, or some other place, but I am telling you now that if you want to make a success of this plant you will go to Marystown. And it was not politics. I persuaded them that it was not because I was there. I told them I was pretty safe there. I told them that I could win an election if an election came without their being there, which I did for years. Mr. Speaker, at another time I will tell the success of that because that plant revolutionized the, I would say, the deep sea fishery of Newfoundland. For the first time the plants bucked up around them because they had to in order to keep their men.

Mr. Canning.

Mr. Speaker, that would be a success story I could tell them. If they asked me about the shipyard, why it was operating at full-time in 1972 with contracts, with signed contracts and contracts in the offing to keep it going even greater for the next two or three years, and I would then tell them that today between layoffs, things do not look too promising and they would ask me, "How come?" Mr. Speaker, I could tell them. Mr. Speaker, then if they ask me about the great university we built, if they ask me the number of people who have gone through the university, and I tell them there will be cuts in the Budget Speech - in the budget there was a cut for the university - they will ask me, "How come?"

Mr. Speaker, again if the youth of my district were to come in here, and I told them the number of civil servants in the House of Assembly, if I told them the great thing that we did when we built this great Confederation Building, that we put all the departments or practically all the departments under one roof, in one place for efficiency, and for convenience, and then I showed them the number of buildings in St. John's today, and if I told them the Civil Service has increased in the number of civil servants, which I have not got except I know it is something terrible, far beyond the number needed - I have asked the question, but I did not get the answer - Mr. Speaker, then if I told them what I would tell them, that there is an over-abundance, whatever you might call it, of civil servants that the Tories brought in and who are housed in good Tory buildings in St. John's, leased to the government, Mr. Speaker, they would ask me, "How come?"

Mr. Speaker, I think during the next three years I will be giving the answers every now and then when it is appropriate, when it is fitting to most of those questions. I think in the Speech from the Throne and on other occasions when it is right and proper

Mr. Canning:

you will be hearing from me, . . . this House will be hearing from me.

Mr. Speaker, I am not an economist. I do not know too much about finance. I never had . . . reason to learn it. I was never involved in any big money deals so I am not an authority on it, and I will leave that judgement for others.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that I do know from my experience here in the House, from my experience in dealing with my district, from my following the government of this Province for twenty-seven years, there is one thing I have learned enough to know, and this is not doom, this is not politics - Mr. Speaker, anything else I say here today, because, Mr. Speaker, I have no notion of staying here in this House any longer than I have to. I am not going to say how long it is. When I spend another term in this House, Mr. Speaker, I will have given to this Province to the best of my ability, I have given to my people - however long it lasts, I do not know, say it will last three years - twenty-six and six are thirty-two. Mr. Speaker, that is far over half a working lifetime. So I will be content that I have done what I could do for the people of Newfoundland. I think I will be able to look anybody in the face and say, "The past number of years I have done what I could." There were times that I wished I could do more and perhaps there were times that I did not do enough. But in my own conscience I feel that in my position as an ordinary member of this House I did my duty well. I am not an egotist I am not boastful, because, Mr. Speaker, if I were I certainly can boast about my district. Mr. Speaker, when I went into the district in 1949 there is a staggering figure that if I told - I would not tell the youth. It would take too long to answer if I told them "How come?" The average wage of a fisherman in Placentia Bay in 1951-1952 was \$380 a year. Mr. Speaker, last year

Mr. Canning.

and this did not come from the Tory Government, they did not have anything to do with it - last year, Mr. Speaker, I do not know the average wage of a fisherman, the inshore fishermen and the draggers, except I know this, that there are deckhands in my district last year who made \$13,000. There are mates who made \$15,000, and there are skippers who made \$30,000. Mr. Speaker, that is not exaggerated. I can give a higher figure than that. I can give a figure, Mr. Speaker, of a skipper in this Province last year who made \$40,000. I am not saying he is in my district. Perhaps he is outside of it. Because if I do I will be making it so obvious to the people outside this House, but I should not worry about that because people outside this House will not hear it. It will not be in the papers, Mr. Speaker. And before I am finished today perhaps if I have time enough, I may tell why it will not be in the papers. But I will leave that for another time, but it will be told in this House by me if I have my health and strength and I am still here.

Mr. Speaker, I was commenting on the fact - I am not apologizing for it, I just stated that I am not too well versed in finance, but I do know that at this moment this Province is in dire straits, it never was before. And, Mr. Speaker, like I said I am not saying this for politics. I am saying it because I feel that I should say it, and I should know it, because I have been involved with the government so long. We are in dire straits. My district today has stopped its progress. And, Mr. Speaker, I will not go over these three or four years of what happened in the district, because I may again wander too far from the subject, and I may be called to order. But, Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I am going to do today. Mr. Speaker, the only hope that is left for this House and left for this Province, a hope that I think is left for it, I am going to tell you. - Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Canning.

I do not want to be too, what looks like, political, but, Mr. Speaker, I have no faith in this government of today here as it is.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to offend the members on the opposite side. I got good friends over there. I guess they are all my friends. I do not know if they will all be my friends when I am finished, but Mr. Speaker, they are there, that I have faith in as men. I have faith in the Minister of Fisheries,

MR. CANNING:

I am watching the Minister of Economic Development hoping I am going to have faith in him. These are two new men, Mr. Speaker. I have faith in two others over there who today are feeling and have felt for some time as I felt down through the years, lots of times. I walked out of this House. My leader knew it. And I did not vote for certain bills, not many, twice I think which was a fairly good record. It would be a record for the government that a conscientious member or a fellow who is in the backbenches and did not have to be directly responsible for the government's actions to only find occasion to walk out twice.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be well if I told when I voted against the bills. One was not so important. The other was. I do not know to this day on the more important one if I did right or I did wrong. I do not know if my leader or the government, the leader of the government or anyone in the House knew I walked out. I walked out during the IWA voting. I was not here. I made myself absent. Mr. Speaker, I will not comment on it further but about a year after when I went up and I saw the camps that my constituents had lived in before that, when I saw the conditions that they worked under, when I saw how they sweat and toiled for a few dollars, some of them breaking themselves up, I at least consoled myself that perhaps I did right.

The other occasion, Mr. Speaker, was when the provincial government cut off the bounty on schooners. At the time I did not think they should cut it off. I was very much interested in schooners and I had some people who wanted to build them. The Minister of Fisheries of that day who was not a Liberal, he was a Tory that the Liberal Party had brought in for political reasons - I have often tried to find out what they were but I really do not know. But you have to have political reasons to take a Tory and bring him in and put him into the Department of Fisheries in Liberal Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I have no confidence in the speech of the budget. I have no confidence in the government. I cannot see anything

MR. CANNING:

ahead as is for me here as someone in the Opposition but a boring three or four years, the most boring I will ever spend in my life. I am judging

from last November when we opened House. I am judging what has gone on here since last November because, Mr. Speaker, if that is the government across the other side of the House, and that is the showing that they are going to give every year from now until the day that they will have to call another election - Mr. Speaker, I have not heard from them, I am only judging them from their silence. I do not know what their policy is. I do not know where the Premier expects to go from here. I have not got a clue.

If when I came in the Premier had gotten up like a Premier, like a leader of a government and talked to the House, talked to his members, and talked to the Opposition, and if he admitted a dozen mistakes in the last three or four years, or twenty mistakes, and said, "I made them" but "This is Newfoundland. This is our Province. I made terrible mistakes but I am not going to make them anymore. I am going to try and correct them", Mr. Speaker, I would have gotten interested. If the ministers of the different departments had gotten up during the budget and given an account of their sums that they spent in their department - and some of them, I believe, would have gotten up if they had to have the opportunity. They did not and do not tell me it was not fixed. Do not tell me that we are up until this day in the year and young men in this House did not get a chance to speak to the budget speech, their maiden speech, something they looked forward to. Do not blame the Opposition for that. Do not blame me for it or anybody over here. We have not heard from the young men on the other side and I would like to hear from them because when I look over at them I say, "There is a fellow over there from a district", and I judge him to be honest and sincere as I was when I came in, who yet did not have a chance to even speak to the House.

What a session! No budget debate! I would have liked very much to have gone down through the items in the Minister of Fisheries

MR. CANNING:

budget. I can tell him now that I was ready for him and it was not criticism. I can assure you that. It was whatever I could put into it to help him. I tell him now that in the next three or four years, although I may be fed up, at any time that I can do anything for him, if he keeps on as he is going now - he is one of the few that I know where they are going.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the legislatures are in the other provinces or the other Eastern provinces of Canada. I wish I did. But I am just wondering do they carry on like we carry

on here? Mr. Speaker, over here on my side, behind me, are how many - twelve? Thirteen? - we have thirteen or fourteen men here and, Mr. Speaker, I believe this, that behind me now are men, young men most of them, who are just as sincere, just as determined and as interested in their district as I was when I came in here.

Mr. Speaker, those of them who have spoken have certainly given a good account of themselves. I am sorry that I will not have the opportunity, even if they do in the next few days, as I am going to be unavoidably absent from the House perhaps for the rest of the session. I am sorry that I will not hear them. I guess their districts want to hear them and I hope that this House will at least have the decency or courtesy, to carry on here long enough to let them speak, let them get on their feet, let them get used to the House of Assembly. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, they will play a good, fair, honest part, honest game in this Opposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that they are the nucleus and I have great faith in them. I have no merchants behind me. I have no big contractors. I have nobody, and I say nobody, around me here who was born with a silver spoon in their mouth, not one of them. I think that there are fourteen or fifteen, the best Newfoundlanders we have today. Mr. Speaker, what am I going to advise this House? What am I going to tell them today that would be worthy of me, be worthy of a man who has spent more time in one district than any other man living? I have a record in this House today, Mr. Speaker, that

MR. CANNING:

I do not think will ever be broken again. I have a record but none. There are people here who have as many elections, not people, there is a man here today, a man who almost has my record, I mean as a member, but he did not stand in his own native district as often as I did

MR. CANNING: With the majorities that I had and then go out and then come back with one of the big majorities of the last election. You know, Mr. Speaker, if I do not speak my mind, if I am not sincere today, and if I am playing politics, what you call politics, you know you get mixed up in politics, things that are political are good when they are good but the meaning of politics across Newfoundland today is when you are deceiving, or when you are a hypocrite, That is making politics. But Mr. Speaker, I stand here this afternoon, as sincere as ever I have been in my life or ever will be again, Perhaps I will hurt people, I do not know. I do not know of any enemies I have in the world today, before I spoke here today, I do not know if I am going to have them after I go out, but if I do I cannot help it.

Mr. Speaker, this Province, in my opinion at the present moment is broke, It is an awful situation to think that we have to cut down on our Health, the number of hospital beds, something that I stood up in the House for, and I begged for. I suppose I prayed that we would improve our medical facilities. I stood up and I begged for and this House begged for, in those days, better education facilities. We were pretty proud the day our university opened, Mr. Speaker. I was pretty proud the day it opened. But, Mr. Speaker, I was more proud, or prouder when I left the district, a district that I had gone in and I did not have a degree, I had three years -- they used to call it Teachers' Training, then they called it Education I, II, and III, in preparation for teaching, and Mr. Speaker, when I left the district I could look back at it, in the smallest nook, the smallest harbour, the smallest port with ten or a dozen families, that during those years had people with degrees, they had an opportunity to get to the university for the first time in the history of Newfoundland and Mr. Speaker, I am not one who thinks it is a waste of time.

Mr. Speaker, I say now again I have faith in certain people on the other side of the House, great regard for them. There

MR. CANNING: are others I have not, I cannot help that. And the only hope I see now - the political game is being played and the way politics are going in Newfoundland, what the people are asking, what the people in my district are asking and what the people in my district want, Mr. Speaker, is the answers to the questions I have asked.

MR. NEARY: Taxi drivers for instance want to get their insurance renewed.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, they want answers to the questions that the hon. member, who has just interrupted me, the questions he has asked.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. CANNING: The questions he has asked in the last three months, or however long we are here has set the people thinking. He has them to the point where they want the answers. Some of them know them. Some of them I would like to have. I am just as suspicious of what he asked as he is. Mr. Speaker, there are people on the other side of the House, on the government side of the House who want the answers to them. There are young men who came in here with all the good intentions in the world, they want to know are these things true. There are people over there who want to know the conclusions that I am going to come to today, what I am going to advise, in the next few minutes, can be done.

Mr. Speaker, those questions I have asked can be answered well by two people in this House who I know pretty well. There are two men over here on this side of the House who can stand up and answer those questions, answer them during the next two or three years and set this Province straight. And, Mr. Speaker, one of those is the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), the other, Mr. Speaker, who can do greater justice perhaps to answering those questions and to setting this House and this government straight, and who can one day become the government and go straight. He is younger. He is brilliant. And he has stability. Mr. Speaker, he too, as the Leader of this Opposition, the Official Opposition, he too is going

MR. CANNING: to have to answer those questions that I told you that the youth in my district would ask, the people in Newfoundland will ask, he is going to have to answer those in the next few years. He is going to have to answer to the common people of Newfoundland - I hate the word common - to the great people of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Ordinary, the ordinary Newfoundlander.

MR. CANNING: The ordinary Newfoundlander, the ordinary worker, the wage earner. Because, Mr. Speaker, that is what gave this House sixteen members in Opposition. We were not voted for by the money crowd. We were not voted for by contractors. We were not voted for by those who got a conglomeration of companies, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. CANNING: The people who put us on this side of the House, and the people who sent me back are the ordinary people of Newfoundland, the people who built Newfoundland, who made Newfoundland what it is. And the people, Mr. Speaker, who put me here were the common people.

Again, I wish I were on the Speech from the Throne, I could tell the story of my opposition, tell the story of the few, the handful, the few of them, who moved in there, into the district, they are there, the people whom I will be talking about today, that I have been talking about, the few who moved in. I built Marystown for them and they came in and then history repeated itself. They gave me the stab in the back for giving them somewhere to make a decent living.

But, Mr. Speaker, the night before the election when the big guns came up from St. John's, the heavy artillery - I often wondered why they goofed in calling themselves the heavy guns and the heavy artillery when they were coming up to go against me. I was the only one who literally knew what big guns were and what heavy artillery was. No, Mr. Speaker, the offspring of the merchants of St. John's, the men who we had to fight for Confederation, no longer on Water Street -

MR. NEARY: The anti-Confederates.

MR. CANNING: - no, they had moved inland a little bit. It took them twenty-three years to get control again, and unfortunately they have it at the moment. They barely got it though. Because even St. John's almost woke up.

The Minister of Mines and Energy almost got it.

MR. BOYD: St. John's West almost woke up.

MR. CANNING: Yes, St. John's West woke up. I would say today they are wider awake than then. I would say if he had to go back today he would not get his 300 he needed.

No, Mr. Speaker, he came up. The fellow who had sat in this House with me as a Liberal, the man who I had supported in the Cabinet, the man who came in and went into the Cabinet, you know, passed me by, the little fellow over there -

MR. NEARY: Passed us all by.

MR. CANNING: He came up. He was the big gun who was going to come up in Placentia West, up to the district that I grew up in in poverty, where I had to work like a slave at twelve years old, that I had made a better place to live in, he came up to keep me from getting in there. He brought a fellow with him who was hooked -

MR. NEARY: He was out in Port aux Basques too, name calling.

MR. CANNING: He was up supporting a good man -

MR. NEARY: He got the Harbour Le Cou cuckoo before he left.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER: I should point out to the hon. gentleman that the forty-five minutes has transpired.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I will ask leave of the House to continue for a few minutes.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. CANNING: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I did not realize my time was going so fast. I was concentrating on what I was saying here. I will have to be fast, quick and to the point.

Mr. Speaker, when I went off on the tangent of when the big guns came up to trounce me, I was saying that the Leader of this House will have to answer many of those questions that I have put before the House today. Mr. Speaker, the other man who can answer that is the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentleman - if I tried to give this House the picture of Newfoundland, my district, and the rest of Newfoundland when he took over, what he did for Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, I would just not have the time. It is a great story. It is a great history, Mr. Speaker, up to a point. If I am here another twenty-three years in this House and try to give him credit now and then I would not be here long enough to give him credit for what he did. Mr. Speaker, I do not hold any grudge against him. I admire him today as much as I admired him when I followed him pretty faithfully. But, Mr. Speaker, he is one man in this House who yet has something to give to this Province, if he gives it. Mr. Speaker, there is yet time for this hon. gentleman to go down in history as a great. But what I am going to ask him to do now, Mr. Speaker - I do not know if he is going to do it - Mr. Speaker, if that hon. gentleman gets up in this House when he has to speak to the Speech from the Throne next week or later this week and tells the true story of the Liberal Government up through

Mr. Canning

the years and if he comes to the point where he got hooked and he tells the truth, Mr. Speaker, I will try to write a history of my time in politics, after I am finished here. Mr. Speaker, this Province was Liberal, the government was Liberal, but they came to the point when they strayed. I referred to it a little earlier where a Tory was taken in. Mr. Speaker, it came to the point where the party got too many Tories, and the control of politics in this Province slipped over to other people, people with money. Unfortunately, I think, - very unfortunately for the party anyway - that that hon. gentleman did not keep his sights on the people who had helped him out when he fought that hard battle. I am afraid that he got caught up in a system. - I do not blame him for it, I pity him for it - Mr. Speaker, that led this Province to become Tory again. No, Mr. Speaker, if he gets up in this House of Assembly and he tells the story up to 1966 or 1968, and if he tells the story of the trouble he had with certain people, certain contractors, certain business people who tried to get hold of politics or hold of the government in this Province, if he tells it, and tells it straight, Mr. Speaker, and if he makes this side of the House unanimous in so doing - and Mr. Speaker, I do not mean any coalition, no coalition from the other side, no. I am not going to advise him today to get up and tell that story and then lead this side of the House. No, Mr. Speaker, we have a leader that he made. I think we got a leader who copied some qualities from him, some good qualities from him. We have a leader here, Mr. Speaker, to say he is brilliant is not enough, and I mean it. A lot of people will not agree with me. They will have to pretend something about him like he is poor looking or he is not brilliant or he is not an orator, Mr. Speaker, you remember how they unearthed and uprooted the great leader I had.

Mr. Speaker, no, I cannot go into it. I would not ask the indulgence of the House to tell the story of when they turned on him.

MR. MORGAN: Tell the story.

MR. CANNING: Well, all right, I will just say that it was a campaign of hatred. He was accused of being a rogue. He had robbed the Province. He was a robber, Mr. Speaker, right up to the point, and after they got in, Mr. Speaker, they banged down his doors.

MR. NEARY: A corrupt administration.

MR. CANNING: Corruption. But, Mr. Speaker, that is all we have heard since. No, Mr. Speaker, they had nothing to turn to, nothing to sway the people with.

Mr. Speaker, if he gets up in this House and he tells that story, and if he is honest and sincere, and tells the way he got hooked, because that is what happened, he got hooked by the Tories here in St. John's and elsewhere. He got hooked by the contractors. If ever a man was hooked, he was hooked. He got panicky, and that was natural, I suppose. The time came when he said to himself, "I want to stay here - Perhaps he wanted to stay to finish something - where do I turn? Do I give in to those fellows or do I go back to the people of Newfoundland and tell them the story?" Perhaps he should have told it then. No, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member had to play Tory. He played Tory, Mr. Speaker, and they got him. The ones who had supported him, and the ones that he had supported, the fifteen or twenty millionaires who were made in Newfoundland of the government - and that is no exaggeration, Mr. Speaker, because I -

MR. CROSBIE: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): A point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's time was up, and we were giving him extra time so he could conclude his remarks. Is he going to be much longer, you know?

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. gentleman does not like what I am saying, but I cannot help that. I wish I could say something to make him happy. Mr. Speaker, that is it since we came

Mr. Canning.

here. Any time anyone offends them over there, they will either call a point of order, if they can find one, or if not they will laugh. They will talk across the House or they will talk to each other, and they will drown it out. Mr. Speaker, I am going to finish up shortly, soon as I can. I want to be careful. I am making a serious speech, Mr. Speaker, a more serious than any I have made since I came to the House. And I will say again, Mr. Speaker, if that hon. gentleman will rise in this House, and tell the truth, the whole truth, and the whole story and fear nobody, be as fearless, be as brutal if he has to, as he was in Confederation, when he was fighting a good cause - and I can assure him now he will be fighting a cause just as great, because I think, Mr. Speaker, that the situation, comparatively speaking, in Newfoundland today is far worse than when we entered Confederation with \$1.5 billion budget to look after a small Province just over 500,000. Mr. Speaker, with the cutting of services today, I think, it is just as serious as that. Get up and tell the story, make this side of the House unanimous, support our leader, our young leader. That is what we should have today. There should be somebody younger than I, from my district, in here now.

Mr. Canning:

I wish there was with the experience I have had, from what I have seen, what I have gone through. Let them get behind him, Mr. Speaker, and play a good Opposition. And Mr. Speaker let the ones on the other side who may be Liberals, or whatever they might be, or the people who are for Newfoundland try to control the Tory Government, try to prevent the big contracts. Because, Mr. Speaker, if I had the money, the money that should not have gone into the contracts for the last ten years, the amount of money that was overpaid the contractors, the amount of money that was wasted, the mistakes that were made, like throwing it in for the buying back of the Churchill Falls, Mr. Speaker, if it were given to me I would run this Province very well for the next four or five years. The first thing I would do is buy back the refinery in Come By Chance which overlooks my Bay. Mr. Speaker, that is the hope for this Province at the moment.

I think the questions that I have asked or the insinuations or the hints and the examples I have given are enough. I think every honest and sincere Newfoundlander in this House understands it. I think they do, and I think the Premier understands, I am sorry, when you are twenty-three years calling the hon. member for Twillingate, the Premier you are apt to do it when you are trying to rush through with the time that the House has so generously given to me, Mr. Speaker. He agrees with me, he can tell the story. There is nobody left here to tell it any better, Mr. Speaker. Only one could tell it as well, who is a great orator, who is a great leader. And I can assure you despite the fact that they will try to crucify him, and they will try to sneer at him from across the House, and jeer at him, talk about his image he has a great political future in this Province. And Mr. Speaker, I hope I will be with him or behind him the day he will take over this government and try to run Newfoundland as I visualize it should be run, or as I want it run for the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! Before I recognize any other member I would like to welcome to the gallery Mr. Martin Addersley,

Mr. Speaker (Mr. Young):

National President of the Social Credit Party of Canada.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): I trust his stay in both the House and in Newfoundland will be enjoyable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member for Naskaupí.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few comments on what I feel to be of an important nature in this particular speech which is now taking place in the House of Assembly, and refer to some points made by the hon. member from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) who is a very good colleague of mine in more ways than just being a representative from another part of the Province. A question was also raised by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), I believe, during that member's speech, and I think he asked for a clarification of the different sections of Labrador in terms of industry and social structure and that sort of thing, I am not sure if that was the exact question, but something relating to that, I believe.

And I am sure that other members who have come before me in this hon. House of Assembly have explained these points much better than I can, but just briefly, I think every member realizes that the industrialized areas of Labrador West, Churchill Falls, Wabush, Labrador City are different in social texture and the economics than other parts of Labrador, particularly the coastal section of our part of the Province, the district now represented by the member from Eagle River and a part of it by the Leader of the Opposition. And there is a different structure as well in the districts which I represent. The two more eastern districts enjoy the traditional lifestyle of fishing and trapping in the coastal communities, and in the communities where I live most of the income, prior to the construction of Goose Air Base at least, was based on the economics of the fur trade and the International Grenfell Association. Some of the serviced industries related to that.

And I suppose the different lifestyles in Labrador, and I think Labrador is unique in many of its problems today, it certainly was

Mr. Goudier:

in the past, although I suppose the basic ingredient that all people of this Province have, at least I feel, was the necessity to stay alive, and the only way to do that was to live off the land or off the seas. We did it a little differently in our part of the Province as opposed to the Island portion of the Province, but nevertheless the basic objective was met in that it was staying alive no matter what the measures were to do that.

I would also like to refer to the point made by the hon. member from Eagle River regarding the feelings of separatism which have come up over the last number of years in Labrador and again recently in Labrador West, I believe, is what the member mentioned. There was some play of it in the media a few months ago. I do not believe either, I agree with the member, that I do not think there is a necessity, I do not think there should be a separation of the two parts of this Province at this point in time in terms of being separate Provinces or perhaps Labrador being a separate territory. I do not think the people of Labrador should have to do that or should have to feel that they have to separate. I would like to see the Province continue as one Province, both sections, although I also agree that there may come a time in the not too distant future that these feelings are going to once again grow stronger, and I do not think they are related to any particular political party at this point in time as they were in the last number of years past.

I think it is a feeling which lie within the people of Labrador that they are getting a raw deal, I cannot think of any other term to use right now, or perhaps they are not getting enough benefits or whatever. But my suggestion about how we may in one or several ways overcome that feeling is for the establishment of a regional government centre, if I can use that, in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area. Obviously there are quite a number of branches of the Provincial and Federal Governments located there now, the Department of Forestry and Agriculture, Fisheries and this sort of thing. And I think without exception the representatives in Happy Valley-Goose Bay and other parts of Labrador who work for these departments are

Mr. Goudie:

doing a very, very good job. And they have admitted to me, some of them, during private conversations, that they realize that there are unique or different problems in Labrador, and they do exist. Whether people in other parts of the Province want to recognize that or not it does not really matter, there are different problems. And I do not think that people living in the Northern part of the Province should be penalized for living there. I am not suggesting they be commended for living there either but they should not at least be penalized for that.

I think the effective use of a regional government centre in Labrador would give the people of Labrador a stronger feeling of belonging as opposed to - I do not know if this feeling exists on the opposite side of the House, but I do know it exists on this side of the House to some degree. I have made this suggestion to a number of hon. members on this side, not in the House, but privately, and the consensus was, at least in my interpretation, that should a regional centre be set up in Labrador then that is going to foster the feelings of separatism. I think it will have the opposite effect, I think it would have the effect of unifying the two parts of the Province as opposed to separating. It has not been done yet. There is no basis I do not think for that sort of argument, that it would separate the Province. I think the only way we are going to find out whether it will work or not is to do it. and I am now publicly urging this government to take this step and to establish branches of all government departments in Labrador, and we will find out once and for all whether or not it will work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: The hon. member for Eagle River also made an interesting point, I think, about Quebec not accepting the Labrador Border or the Border as it exists right now, at least between the two parts of the Province, I do not think they ever have. I have travelled, not extensively, but at least to some degree in the Province of Quebec and others parts of Canada and some of the textbooks I know in some of

May 25, 1976

Tape 2908

PK - 5

Mr. Goudie:

the schools in Quebec still indicate that there is no border,
that Labrador is a part of Quebec. My own personal feeling is

MR. GOUDIE:

that Labrador is not, and I doubt very much if it ever will be, a part of that Province. When I began I wanted to illustrate or perhaps tell a couple of stories if you want to call them that, to illustrate the type of lifestyle that we had in Labrador that perhaps reflects or helped to reflect an attitude which exists there now. I mean that was the traditional lifestyle of living off the land. Perhaps this would answer some of the questions that the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) might have.

There are five people in this city as this point in time, at least five. I travelled with them yesterday on the flight from Goose Bay to here to St. John's who have come into the city to negotiate and fight for, if you will, what they feel - and I agree - is a good case. These are five people from the Indian portion of the community of North West River. There are two basic Indian communities in Labrador, one in the district of Eagle River at Davis Inlet and one in my district at North West River. About half of the population of that community in my district is of Indian origin. I have a few drops of Indian blood myself and some Inuit as well.

But there is one particular person alive in Labrador now who, just coincidentally, is one of the lead players in a play which is being presented in my area at the moment called The Ecstasy of Rita Joe. He plays the Indian father and he, I believe, is perhaps the only person left alive in Labrador, at least, who was educated under Sir Wilfred Grenfell's scheme of taking promising young people out of various communities in Labrador and taking them to various parts of the world for education. This particular man was educated in Boston. He came back to live and trap for twenty-odd years in Labrador and he told me the story one day about a trip he was making from Minipi Lake, which is South of the dividing line of the Churchill River, to North West River where he was living and he was travelling in company with one other man.

MR. GOUDIE:

There was a short-cut, as we call it, to get to the community. He wanted to get home for Christmas, as most of the trappers wanted to, when they were coming back from their trap lines. He did not know the short way of getting to the community but they encountered a band of Indians, twenty or thirty people, who were travelling in the same direction and knew this shorter way to travel. They travelled in company with them. One evening, hauling their sleds and walking in snowshoes in December, one evening the leader of the group suggested that they stop an hour earlier and this man and his companion were quite happy because walking for ten or twelve hours a day, as the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) knows, in snowshoes, hauling several hundred pounds of supplies and fur and so on on your sled, for up to eighteen or twenty days, to get home, is not the easiest way of travelling. So they welcomed this additional hour break.

The next morning this gentleman asked the leader of the group why on that particular evening the stop was made an hour earlier. He said, "My wife had to deliver a baby." And she did. She delivered the baby herself that evening in the extra hour and the next morning had the baby strapped to her back and was hauling a sled again. That sort of life, I think, builds moral and other fibers into the characteristics of human beings and dictates a certain lifestyle that they will lead. I am of the feeling that that sort of life or lifestyle and moral fiber, if you will, is passed on to their descendants. There are many stories that are told like that every day. I will tell one more. I enjoy telling stories I guess.

People in North West River and Mud Lake, before Happy Valley Goose Bay was ever dreamt of, before the base was constructed in the late 1930's and early 1940's, lived off the land by travelling into an area which is now known as the Smallwood Reservoir or the height of land as we referred to it trapping for three, four, five months at a time. The only way to navigate that river in the Fall was by canoe, in an eighteen, twenty foot freighter canoe with four and five

MR. GOUDIE:

months supply of food aboard. The method of getting these canoes up through the rapids of the Churchill River, which is quite a feat in any man's language, was to track the canoes, that is one person attached himself to one end of a towing or a hauling line and walked up the shoreline while the other man stood in the canoe in the white waters with several hundreds of pounds of supplies aboard and poled, used a pole to get up through the rapids.

Now on this particular occasion - by the way there were only two or three drownings in the years that have been recorded in that sort of activity. But there is one particular incident; a young man of seventeen years was in his third year of trapping on the Height of Land and he was towing this canoe up through the rapids when the tide caught the canoe the wrong way. The only recourse was to hold on as hard as he could to make sure that that canoe did not overturn and the man in the canoe lose his life. He held onto a boulder which was big enough that he could just get his arms around and dragged that boulder about twenty feet across the beach. When he stood up after the canoe was taken ashore, when he stood up and removed his shirt to inspect the damage, he was burned right to the bone down across his back, a kid seventeen years of age.

I guess the only reason I am telling these things is to try and illustrate that there was a certain lifestyle in Labrador. That lifestyle has changed with the coming of industry in Labrador West. The military activity over the years in my district - and that military activity or presence, at least, is going to be drastically reduced by the end of June by the USAF, at least, to a staff of I believe ten people.

There is one little interesting development taking place there now which I will just mention in passing. That is there are 222, I believe, non-appropriated-fund employees who are not going to get any benefits out of that move, as opposed to appropriated-fund employees, even though they have worked twenty-five, thirty years in the area. It appears they cannot be helped. I know the member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau)

MR. GOUDIE:

has been working closely with that group for a number of months and I can understand the frustration that he has experienced in trying to help these people. Apparently from the federal and provincial levels of government, at least, provincial legislation, there is no way that they can be helped. That is why I wrote a letter to three ministers last week suggesting that a committee be set up similar to the one - or at least a committee with a mandate - set up similar to that of the Come By Chance Task Force to see if there is any way that these people can be dealt with and some benefit come from their twenty-five and thirty years of labour. They are not going to qualify for unemployment insurance apparently until after their severance pay has been used up. That may or may not be a fair measure. I do not know. I am not familiar enough with unemployment insurance benefits - I have never drawn it myself - to know whether that is a fair measure or not. But it would seem that after thirty years of labour that a man is entitled to some benefits.

MR. WELLS: That is the thing that involves the U.S. pension contribution?

MR. GOUDIE: Yes it does. That is the one. I do not know. Perhaps as the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) pointed out Quebec is the aggressor. But I know when I sat here in this House last week and listened to the ministerial statement brought down by the Premier there were tears in my eyes. I do not normally cry but at least there was quite a wild thumping of my heart to realize that finally this Province is going to take steps, and I hope they prove to be the proper steps, to regain the power from Churchill Falls.

I am not going to say it was sold down the drain because I am not setting myself up to be any kind of a judge. But judging from the figures quoted in the press and the figures mentioned that day and the benefit that Quebec is reaping from the power out of Labrador and compared with the benefits this Province is reaping from that same source of energy there does not seem to be any sort of

MR. GOUDIE:

a equitable comparison to me. And you can imagine the frustration and the feelings of the people of Labrador when they look West to that hydro development and realize that it is all going down to New York, to Montreal to the Gaspé Peninsula I suppose - I do not know - at least West of us and we are paying - well I will not get into light bills. I have already had an opportunity to speak on that when I presented a couple of petitions. But let us say we are not getting our electric power in Happy Valley-Goose Bay and other parts of Labrador for any sort of a bargain. I will leave it at that.

Mr. Goudie.

I just wanted to get up and bring the attention of this hon. House, and the hon. members within it to what I feel are a few problems of Labrador, and I suppose it was well-timed in one sense. The hon. member from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning) indicated he was a little upset that a number of backbenchers on both sides of the House had not gotten up and made their maiden speeches yet. I suppose this can be considered my maiden speech, I do not know. But regardless of political affiliation, I think the Leader of the Opposition made reference to this in passing awhile ago. Just speaking for my own personal individual case, I am not tied all that strongly politically, at least not yet. I do not imagine I will be around the House as long, I do not think I want to be around the House as long as the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning). But as I mentioned the Leader of the Opposition referred to my having gone with a winner when I sought election in this House, and that basically is about what it was. I happened to be pro-Labrador, and I will stay that way, and I still think that one of the solutions to keeping this Province unified, if indeed that is what we want, because there is no doubt about the economic future of Labrador, at least for the next fifty or sixty years, and thus no doubt about the economic future of this Province, if it remains a whole Province, and that is to get a regional government centre, an effective regional government centre, I feel, located in Labrador. If it comes about and it is decided that Happy Valley - Goose Bay is the appropriate place to locate it, that is fine. But I am not really concerned all that much with the location of the thing as long as it gets there and it works properly.

This attitude or this situation - perhaps not an attitude, but a situation - where we almost have colonialism: This Province

Mr. Goudie.

objected in 1949, I assume, one of the things they objected to was being run from across the seas. and they decided to join Canada or Canada to sort of join it, I do not know. - it depends on which side of the coin you are sitting on, I suppose, both arguments have been presented - but we in Labrador are being run in exactly the same fashion, colonialism, and that is not the answer. I do not think there is anyway, that a government sitting in a city, and probably one of the most southern parts of this Province, can expect to understand the problems of Labrador, all of the problems, not just the industrialized area of Labrador West or the coastal communities or even the district where I come from, but understand all of the problems of Labrador. I think the two gentlemen sitting opposite, the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) and the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) travelled to parts of Labrador last Winter during the recess, and they admitted privately - I do not think I am revealing any secrets or anything - that they feel that there are unique problems or different problems - maybe not unique - but different problems in Labrador. And I would recommend to every member of this House - I know I am personally going to try to get to as many parts of this Province as I can while I am elected to understand this end of it, and I would hope that members from down this way would get up our way as well and have a look. There is lots of good fishing and lots of good hunting, and there are also an awful lot of problems in our part of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Young): The hon. member for Twillingate.

X MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, first of all may I say -

MR. J. CARTER: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. gentleman has already spoken in this debate, and that is the ruling.

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

MR. SMALLWOOD: - may I say how much I enjoyed the speech of the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning). I do not think I ever failed to enjoy a speech by that same hon. member. And I had the pleasure of hearing one particular speech that he delivered that I thought at the time, and have thought ever since, was one of the finest speeches ever delivered in this House. It was a speech that moved people deeply. It poured out of his heart. He had spent five years in the Royal Navy, had come back, resumed fishing and then gone in the university and at my invitation he entered politics as the candidate for that district. And in his first speech he moved every member of this House. We had never heard anything like it and nothing like it has ever been heard since, in the House of Assembly. It was a very remarkable speech. He has never equalled it himself since then, and I doubt if he ever will. Time passes, and conditions change and a man sometimes, some men get older, some do not, of course. I approved, virtually, everything that he said in his speech. I agreed with, virtually, every statement that he made, not all, but virtually all.

I disagree completely with one thing that he said when he implied very clearly that the members on this side of the House were elected by the people. He did not like the term, common people, though Abraham Lincoln liked it and used it. The ordinary people - the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) suggested he would use - they elected the members on this side but on the other side of the House his implication was that they were elected by the money bags, the aristocrats, the snobocracy and the plutocracy and everybody but the common people, the ordinary people, the breadwinners, the heads of families, the ordinary Newfoundlanders. Now I disagree completely with that. I do not think for one moment that the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture was elected in Labrador West or whatever the name of that constituency is now.

MR. DODDY: Menihok.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - Menihok, by anyone but the ordinary working class people

MR. SMALLWOOD:

of that part of Labrador, and they are overwhelmingly more than most constituencies working class people, trade union hands, militant trade union people, and they elected him, and they turned down the Liberal candidate, and they turned down the Liberal Reform candidate and they elected the hon. minister.

Now I would say, too, that the hon. member who just spoke, who just resumed his seat, the member for the central part of Labrador - what is that called? - Naskaupi was elected as much by the ordinary common people of that constituency as was any member on either side of this House. And I would say that the hon. gentleman who represents the coast of Labrador, but that is called after the river, Eagle River, was elected by the ordinary people of that part of our Province. I would say that the hon. Leader of the Opposition in the next constituency, coming South, was elected by the ordinary people such as you find all over this Province. And that the hon. member, brilliant, clever young member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), who has impressed this House so much by the common sense and knowledge and sincerity of his speeches, was elected also similarly by the ordinary people of that constituency. I would say that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, in Green Bay was elected by the ordinary people, because you might say there are no other people in Green Bay, but just ordinary, regular run, fun of the mill Newfoundlanders, and they elected him in that constituency. I would say that the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) and the hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development in Grand Falls and the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) and myself in Twillingate district and the hon. member for Fogo (Capt. Winsor) district and the gentleman who was elected and then lost the seat, because he was elected by too few of a majority, was elected by the ordinary people, and the

MR. SMALLWOOD.

hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications. Every member of this House bar none, without even a solitary exception, every last member of this House was elected by a majority or a plurality, as the case might be, of the ordinary run of the mill Newfoundlanders. So you cannot point to the members across the floor and say, "These they are, they represent the plutocracy, they represent the aristocracy, they represent the wealth of Newfoundland." It is not true. It is just not true, you see. It might be good

MR. SMALLWOOD: propoganda but it is false propoganda. I do not mean for one moment that my hon. friend, who is my friend, and has always been my friend, made a false charge or indulged in a bit of false propoganda. I do not mean that. But I say that it is false. It is not true. It is not correct.

No, Sir, the members of this House, on this side of the House, were not elected by Liberals. The members on that side of the House were not elected by Tories. That is no longer the criterion in voting in this Province. If to say that the members across were elected by Tories and those on this side were elected by Liberals is to say that a majority of Newfoundlanders are Tories and that is not true. A majority of the people of Newfoundland today are not Tories, nor are they Liberals. They are neither Liberal nor Tory. The overwhelming majority of our people today are not Liberal, they are not Tory. They are against the government or they are against the Opposition as the case might be.

That is the dividing line. And smart politicians will wake up to that. Smart politicians will realize the meaning of that. There is meaning to that. It has significance, real significance, powerful significance and any politician who does not realize it and does not understand it and draw the necessary and the inevitable deductions from it is no politician. Whatever else he is he is no politician. He could even be a menace to his own party.

I believe that on this side of the House you have eight or ten hon. members, all good men, all of them without exception, but I believe that you have eight or ten most excellent M.H.A.'s, most excellent M.H.A.'s, a credit to the House, a credit to the Province and a credit to Canada. I will not name them, that would be invidious and my own judgement could be wrong so I will not name anyone. And on the other side of the House you have rather more than the same number, a rather larger number of the same type of members who are a credit to the House, a credit to the province, and a credit to Canada. And let us not have

MR. SMALLWOOD: any childish nonsense, any silly, foolish nonsense that all the merit is over here and all the demerit is over there. That is childish, childish nonsense.

MR. MURPHY: Who said that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No one said it. No one said it. And I do not believe that the hon. gentleman would say it, not for a moment, because I do not believe that the hon. gentleman thinks that way. I believe in fact he went out of his way to refer to some of the fine men over on the other side of the House, if I remember right. He said more or less in his way what I have just said in mine.

Mr. Speaker, I had the personal pleasure and the great honour to invite some outstanding men into public life in Newfoundland. I did, as Leader of the Liberal Party, which I founded. I founded the Liberal Party. I called the Founding Convention and they elected me to be its leader. And, except the couple of last general elections, I personally chose every candidate of the Liberal Party, both provincially and federally. That was the only way there was, at that time. The hon. Minister of Fisheries I chose as the Liberal candidate and I chose the district, which was the district of White Bay North, and that was true of every candidate of the Liberal Party both provincially and federally, except for the last couple when a new system was brought in.

Now it was the same way with the Tory Party.

MR. NEARY: I had an awful job to get you to choose me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well I did make the choice though.

MR. NEARY: It took me ten years to get on the list.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, nevertheless I pride myself on the fact that I made it. And I brought - well for a while the hon. gentleman was skirmishing around, flirting in other directions politically. It took him all but ten years to realize the right side.

MR. DOODY: And do a great service to the Province further if he had to get Mr. McGrath elected.

MR. NEARY: The NDP.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Speaker, I had the honour to bring Dr. Fred

MR. SMALLWOOD: Rowe into public life. It was on my invitation. And Edward Spencer, I brought Edward Spencer in and Eric Jones. I brought in those three men. They came in at my personal invitation and they followed my leadership. And John T. Cheeseman, and Dr. James McGrath, and Beaton J. Abbott, it was at my personal invitation that they entered public life and became candidates of the Liberal Party and members of this House, by virtue of the votes of the people. I brought in Philip J. Lewis and John Mahoney, Mr. Justice Mahoney of the Supreme Court, I brought in Mr. John C. Crosbie and I brought in Mr. T. Alec Hickman. It was at my invitation that they entered public life, at my invitation, and they came in under my leadership. I brought in Mr. Clyde Wells. I brought in Mr. Rupert Bartlett, the present Judge Bartlett. I brought in Mr. Arthur Mifflin who is now his Lordship the Chief Justice of Newfoundland. It was at my invitation that Arthur Mifflin entered public life and became a Liberal candidate and sat in this House under my leadership.

MR. J. CARTEP: Who requested Dr. Valdmanis?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was at my invitation that Aiden Maloney came in, Stephen Neary came in, Gerald Hill came in, Myles Murray came in, he is another judge, Rupert Bartlett came in, he is another judge, Max Jane came in, Alec Moores, of Harbour Grace, Harold Starkes, Issac Mercer, and I could go on and on and on and on -

MR. NEARY: Val Earle.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - literally dozens, Val Earle, literally dozens of Newfoundlanders accepted my invitation to come in to politics, to become candidates of the Liberal Party and sat in this Chamber under my leadership.

MR. NEARY: And you put a few of the fellows up in Ottawa too, besides that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And in addition to those who came into this House there were some who went into the House of Commons, and I may say there were some who went into the Senate of Canada and they are there now in the Senate at this moment, at my

MR. SMALLWOOD: suggestion and my prompting.

DR. FARRELL: Sounds like a maiden speech.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On my recommendation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do know something about the Liberal Party and its history and the inside story of it. I know about the throat-cutting. I know about the back stabbing. I know about deep gratitude and I know about deep ingratitude.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have had more experience of ingratitude than any man alive in Newfoundland today.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no man who has had the experience I have had with base ingratitude.

MR. NEARY: True. True. That is true, by members on both sides of the House, at the present.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about insolvency, about bankruptcy, about this Province and the possibility or the probability, the impossibility or the improbability of the government of our Province going bankrupt. I want to say a word about that. And I want to say that in my opinion it will not go bankrupt. In my opinion it will not be declared insolvent. A private company cannot go insolvent. Many private companies go insolvent. They are put into liquidation. They are bankrupt. Their liabilities are greater than their assets, the liabilities that they have to pay compared with the assets on which they can realize. They may have assets but they cannot realize on them and so as their liabilities are greater than their assets a court will declare them insolvent, as the refinery was declared at Come By Chance. And companies have been declared bankrupt.

But when you talk of a government you are in another field. It is another element. For Newfoundland to go bankrupt it means that the government are not able to pay the interest and sinking funds of

MR. SMALLWOOD: the public debt. The amount now is \$125 millions, slightly more than \$125 million a year, \$125,250,000, \$125.250 million, It is a lot of money but that is \$125 million in a budget of \$1.25 billion, \$1,250 millions a year, this year, is our budget, \$1,250 million, of which \$125 million is to service the public debt. For Newfoundland to go bankrupt it has first of all to fail to service the debt. It must fail to find and pay over the \$125 million. Is that likely? It is

Mr. Smallwood:

highly unlikely. Is it possible? It is all but impossible. Because you see, Mr. Speaker, if the only revenue that the government took in in a year was \$125 million and enough left over to pay the members of this House their sessional indemnity and expenses, and at least a rock-bottom minimum number of civil servants, if the government took in just that much it would not be bankrupt. To go bankrupt it has to fail to pay its bills, especially its statutory bills, especially its contractual bills, especially its bills outside of the Province, especially its bills owed to banks and insurance companies and trust funds and pension funds, money borrowed outside of the Province. There is no chance that that will not be paid. But, Sir, it can happen. It can happen that to pay it will impose a burden, a financial burden on the government and on the people that will be intolerable, intolerable. I will put it to you; suppose five years from now the yearly cost of the public debt, the yearly cost is \$250 millions or \$300 million, well over a quarter of a billion dollars, suppose that is the result of our borrowing, and the borrowing is done on a contractual basis, we contract with this bank or this underwriter or that banking firm, we contract with them that they will buy our bonds, \$20 million worth of bonds, \$50 million worth of bonds, and we will pay them a certain rate of interest for fifteen years, for twenty years, and we will put so much aside in the sinking fund each year and that is all done by contract, suppose we do that, and the annual cost of it runs up to a quarter of a billion, and then stuck with that debt, stuck with that fixed rate of interest, stuck with that fixed rate of sinking fund, the value of money begins to fall, and the revenue of the government drops precipitately, drops drastically, suppose that happens? You are then left with a monumental public service, you are left - you have now at the moment, you have I think the Minister of Finance told us, is it 28,000 or 30,000 Newfoundlanders getting their pay from the public chest? Was it 28,000?

MR. DOODY: 28,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: 28,000. If this keeps on -

MR. DOODY: 28,500, nearly 29,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nearly 29,000 persons whose only income is what they get from the public chest.

MR. DOODY: \$350 million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$350 millions a year.

Now suppose that goes on increasing, and suppose five years from now, which is no time, no time - this government have almost five years to go constitutionally before they must have another election - suppose the cost of servicing the debt becomes \$250 million or \$300 million a year, and suppose the cost of servicing the 28,000 or 29,000, the number goes up to 30,000, 31,000, the number of teachers increases, the number of doctors increases, the number of nurses increases, the numbers of civil servants increase, and say instead of 28,000 you have got 32,000 five, six years from now and you have got a public debt cost of a quarter of a billion a year. At that point you are still not insolvent. You can still cut, you could put in a cut.

first of all, you could cut your 32,000 down to 28,000, you could lay-off 4,000. You could then, with those that were left, with your 28,000, you could put in a 10 per cent or 15 per cent wage reduction. You could always balance the budget. You do not need to go broke, You do not need to go bankrupt. But to stay solvent, you might have to impose such sacrifices on the people as were all but unbearable. Not only that, that is the cost of what you had, but you would have to stop adding to what you had. You would have to stop adding to the numbers of doctors and teachers and nurses and civil servants, you would have to stop adding to the numbers of miles of roads, the new roads you would build or rebuild, you would have to stop adding to the number of miles of roads paved, you would have to stop adding to the numbers of water and sewer systems, you would have to stop adding to the numbers of artisan wells, and stop adding to the numbers of parks and stop adding to everything. Stop adding, and you would not go broke. But I say to you, Sir, and I say to the government that if they persist in keeping on as they are going, as they have gone for five years, they

Mr. Smallwood:

are now in their fifth year, incredible increases in expenditures, incredible, so great that in the current year - now, Mr. Speaker, this is an incredible thing I am going to say, it is not true, it is impossible, it is fantastic, it is crazy, it is not true because it cannot be true, it sounds like the mouthing of a maniac or a fool but the fact is nevertheless, nevertheless this year the increase, just the increase in the government's budget over last year, over the year just ended, the increase this year of a quarter of a billion dollars increase, is equal to the grand total money spent by the Government of Newfoundland for the first fifteen, sixteen years of our life as a Province. This year, just the jump, just the increase in the budget is equal to the grand total spending by the government for the first fifteen years. In other words for more than half our career as a Province, fifteen years, we are not thirty years old yet. This is fantastic, this is crazy, this is insane, this is lunacy. Now notwithstanding that, however, we are not bankrupt. I do not think for one moment that the government are going to spend \$1.25 billion this year. I know that there will be a session in the Fall. This House will be called together in the Fall. When we temporarily finish the agenda that is before us now, a week, ten days, two weeks, three weeks from now the House, I venture to guess, will not be adjourning, I venture to guess it will be prorogued, and that in the Fall a new session will be called, it will not be a resumption of the present session, it will be a new session with a Speech from the Throne. And in that new session there will be a new budget, and then - I do not need to wait until then, I know now what is going to happen, what is going to happen in the new budget is, and all praise to them for doing it, I will hail that new budget far more than anyone else perhaps in this Chamber, except the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister without Portfolio and the former Minister and the former Government Leader of the House. The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) and I, we will

Mr. Smallwood:

welcome the new budget in the Fall if it is what I think now it is going to be, and that is a budget that will vastly reduce the nominal expenditure that is in the presently existing budget.

MR. MORGAN: Are they going to sit over there as well?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No they will have to stay where they are, and we will stay where we are.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

At least we will. I do not know what the official Opposition will do. Because when you have an Opposition whose leader says, "Let us borrow and borrow and spend and spend," when you have a leader talking that way, I cannot even pretend to guess what their attitude will be in the Fall. I know one thing they will jeer and they will sneer and they will talk about the bluff and they will talk about the deceit, all of which will be correct. I would not mind that if in the end they would say, "Well for Newfoundland's sake we are going to vote for this new budget," which is what I will do. I will vote for it. Right now, I say right now, I am going to vote for the new budget that is coming in here next Fall and I will do it not for the sake of the government, I will do it for the sake of Newfoundland because we have got to come up with a wrong turn in Newfoundland. We have got to.

Nobody knows it more than the Minister of Finance. He is a party man. He is going to put the bravest face possible on it. Look I am saying this now but I said it in 1968. It was not my voice but they were my words, 1968. "It must not be supposed", I said in this chamber in 1968, "It must not be supposed that the problem which confronts the present government -

MR. HICKEY — Who said that, anyway?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said I am saying that now. These are my words that I am uttering today. "It must not be supposed that the problem which confronts the present government is altogether new. It may be much, much more serious, more pressing, more urgent but it is not new. Indeed it is discouragingly unnew." These words of mine in 1968, uttered here in this chamber, show. Here is what is was, "Notwithstanding the somewhat stern economies that we propose to make in our expenditures, it will still require \$248 million. That figure will be an increase of \$30 million over the present year." In 1968 the budget jumped \$30 million over the preceding year and brought it up to \$248 million, less than quarter of a billion.

MP. SMALLWOOD:

We estimate revenue in the coming year of \$248 million which will leave us a surplus of approximately \$260,000, not quarter of a billion but quarter of a million, a modest surplus. The capital account expenditure for the coming year, 1968-1969 will be \$69 million." Now again in that same year the Minister of Finance said -- and this is just nine years ago -- "Mr. Speaker, when I speak of reduction in the rate at which we have been expanding our public services these past eighteen years I know that my words can only have the effect, in the very first instance, of striking dismay into the breasts of all Newfoundlanders who understand the imperative character of our need in this Province for expansion and still more expansion of these very services. We began our life as a Province of Canada with public services that were a shame and disgrace to North American civilization. Our roads and schools and hospitals and municipal services and a host of other aspects of our public services were a reproach to the conditions of our Island home for centuries before, a reproach to the form and quality of early British Colonial rule on this Island, a reproach to the conduct of the West Country merchants who used this Island as merely a convenient mooring place for their fishing ships for whole centuries on end, a reproach to our forefathers who lacked the perception and wisdom to seize the opportunity, when it was originally offered them, to become part of great Canada more than a century ago. A reproach to our people and public men generally, but above all a reproach and a revelation of the inherent fundamental weakness of our economy in those years immediately preceding the coming of Confederation.

Whatever the cause -- and on this opinions may vary -- whatever the cause the brutal fact of the matter is that we began our life as a Province of Canada with levels and standards of public service that were a total anachronism in North America. Those levels and standards were so low eighteen years ago that a new generation that has grown up in Newfoundland since then would find themselves quite incapable

MR. SMALLWOOD:

of understanding the depths in which we all lived on this Island⁸ This was spoken nine years ago. Indeed, Sir, many if not most of us who actually lived most of our lives under such conditions find it today quite difficult to recall vividly what they were like.

"We have made great progress indeed along the road of improvement and it is not pleasant to be forced by the sheer weight of circumstances to reduce, even for a year or two, the determined effort that we have been making to bring these services in line with the levels and standards of, at least, the neighboring provinces. In these eighteen years past we have narrowed greatly the gulf that lay between them and us. Notwithstanding what I have said I repeat my belief, and that of my colleagues, that for a space we must indeed reduce the rate of growth."

Now those words uttered in this chamber nine years ago in the budget speech spoke of slowing the pace. It was a matter of profoundest regret that the need should be there to do it but the need was there to reduce the speed, the tempo of our advance, of our improvement, extension, expansion, broadening, deepening, the public service, the numbers of roads and the amount of paving, water and sewerage, everything that you could imagine, health services, social welfare services. The time had come, nine years ago, to slow down the march.

Now I say to the House that the time has doubly come now when we must do it. The alternative is not that we will go broke. So long as you take in enough money each year to pay the debts on your contracted debt, as long as you do that, you do not go broke but you can make everybody pay through the nose for it.

The other day in Halifax the Minister of Finance of that Province delivered his budget. Would the Minister of Finance who perhaps has read that speech - and if he has not, will he get it and read it. Without a doubt he will find it down in his office. If not I will lend him my copy, but would the minister pay special

MR. SMALLWOOD:

attention to this sentence by the Minister of Finance of Nova Scotia. He says, "The people demand a high level of health care and a first-class education for their children, reasonable and proper demands", he says. "Were we to respond to every request to build and staff hospitals and educational establishments and to provide every sophisticated and expensive service desired we would be on the way to creating a province of healthy, well-educated paupers." See that we are not doing that. See that we are not raising up a well-educated, healthy race of Newfoundland people living on charity from Ottawa.

Already, right now in the current year every productive industry that we have got in the Province, all of them put together, fisheries in all their branches, the forest industry, including pulp and paper, saw mills, all wood products, the mining industry, the agricultural industry, all the factories, everything we have in our Province today will turn into our people in the form of wages and salaries, commissions and fees, about \$1 billion.

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$1 billion will go into the pockets of our people this year, originating in our own economy, and from Ottawa \$1.25 billion. Ottawa will pay to the Newfoundland people this year, either directly from government in Ottawa to people in Newfoundland, or from government in Ottawa to government in St. John's, and government in St. John's to the people, either directly or indirectly, Ottawa will pay into the pockets of our Newfoundland people this year \$1.25 billion. In other words, if something were to happen, God forbid, if something were to happen to dry up the \$1.25 billion coming in from Ottawa and Newfoundland lost that \$1.25 billion this year and had only the \$1 billion, how would Newfoundlanders live? And she would not even have the \$1 billion because I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the \$1 billion that will go into the Newfoundland people's pockets this year originating in Newfoundland, will not originate unless that \$1.25 billion continues to come in from Ottawa. Because if you eliminate the sales that will be made this year by the local industries that we have, if you eliminate sales in those industries paid for by Ottawa money, then it will not be a billion, a thousand million going into the pockets of our people this year. Probably it will be down to seven or eight hundred millions.

Now try to picture the income of the people of Newfoundland being cut from \$2.25 billion down to seven or eight hundred million, to one-third, reduced down to one-third of what, in fact, it will be. Now that is not going to happen but this is what I mean when I say that a province can be living on charity. A province can be a glorified poorhouse. A province can be a colony, a dependent colony on a country and the country is Canada.

There is only one cure. The Minister of Industrial Development and Rural Development and the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, those three ministers and perhaps the Minister of Tourism, because what he is

MR. SMALLWOOD: trying to develop is a natural resource, they will understand. And they will understand what it is that is our real problem in Newfoundland and what it is that is the solution, and the only solution. That is why I applaud with great heartiness and great sincerity and great earnestness, every statement that the Minister of Industrial Development makes and every statement the Minister of Fisheries makes and every statement the Minister of Forestry makes showing development, creation of things that will create new jobs and give people a new opportunity to earn new income. That is why I applaud it.

I said in 1969, through the lips of Mr. Earle when he was Minister of Finance; "Mr. Speaker," he said, "Education, as we have all come to understand, is one of the great purposes of our lives. And that statement is truer in no part of the world than it is in Newfoundland. We have come to understand as well that roads are of quite fundamental importance to the Province's health, happiness and strength. We have a clearer appreciation today than we ever had of the vital importance of hospitals and other public health facilities. We realize vividly the importance of municipal development to the democratic process in Newfoundland. We are fully appreciative, as no previous administration ever was in our history, that man does not live by bread alone but must have also things of the spirit, including such developments as arts and culture centres. The importance of these things it would be quite impossible to exaggerate. They indeed are the things for which we live and by which we live. They are the principal purposes of our lives. These things should not be regarded as means to greater ends for surely there cannot be greater ends than these things in themselves." All right! That is the innocent and the harmless preamble.

But, Sir, these things have got to be paid for. Schools must be built and maintained and these cost great sums of money. Teachers have got to be well trained and paid

MR. SMALLWOOD

adequate salaries and given satisfactory working conditions, and these cost great sums of money. And so with all the rest. They cost great sums and they will cost increasingly greater sums in the years ahead. The problem is easy to state but not quite so easy to solve. The problem is, where are the dollars to come from to pay for these things?

Now I gave the answer to that. I have only a few minutes left I am sorry to say. "Our view" this was again through Mr. Earle's lips, "Our view is quite simply stated. It is that there must be unparalleled economic expansion. There must be economic development to a degree that we have never known in the past. Industries of many kinds must be developed. Some of these will be based four-square upon the natural resources with which Providence has so generously endowed us. Others will be based upon raw materials to be brought into the Province. Important new industrial enterprises will be based upon the use of cheaply priced power. Some industries will be based upon the facts of our great all-weather harbours and the astonishing development in the construction of super-sized bulk carriers on the oceans of the world. Still others will be based upon the existence of great air freight and air cargo marshalling yards in this Province. These industries must directly provide and be the indirect means of providing accumulative total of a quarter of a million jobs -

MR. J. CARTER: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. J. CARTER: The hon. gentleman's time has run out?

MR. SPEAKER: No, that is not the case.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. These industries must directly provide and be the indirect means of providing accumulative total of a quarter of a million jobs in this Province. It is only the existence of a quarter of a million jobs in the next twenty years - and this was 1969 - that will enable our Province to grow at a rate that will make the people prosperous and the Province financially strong."

MR. SMALLWOOD: We just cannot go on as we are going, Mr. Speaker, without courting disaster, not insolvency, not bankruptcy. We need never go bankrupt. So long as we can continue to take enough money from all sources to pay the interest on the debt and the sinking fund, we will not go broke. But the people can go broke. The population can go broke. The standard of living can fall disasterously. The government can be just an agency to collect enough money to pay the bond holders, the money lenders outside Newfoundland. We are heading strongly in that direction and I plead once again, for the tenth time I plead with the government, if they insist on passing this \$1.25 billion budget, I plead with them to come in in the Fall with a budget lopping off some hundreds of millions of dollars, and in the budget of next Spring really bring in a sacrifice budget for the sake of Newfoundland and her people.

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

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words to say in the topic of the Address and the Budget Speech.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I have to mention three great natural resources in Newfoundland. Each time I drive through the Province as I did over the holiday, I drove from here to Corner Brook, I cannot help thinking about the great natural resources of rock, wood and water.

Now I know that a lot has been done for the forests in the Province, and a lot has been done by making use of water, but very little is being done to make use of rock. I do not know what the answer to it is, but if somebody could come up with some way to make use of the rock, stone that is in our Province -

MR. SMALLWOOD: We would have the richest Province in Canada.

MR. WOODROW: Right.

MR. L. WOODROW :

It would certainly create a lot of employment in the Province.

MR. NEARY: Have you ever been down to Petites.

MR. WOODROW: Petites, yes, and Flat Rock and all these places.

Now really what I want to do also, I have been listening to the various speakers this afternoon, I want to toss out a few bouquets. First of all I am going to speak - I want this to go on the record - I am going to speak of the Minister of Mines and Energy or the member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). Now I want to say I am thinking of Newfoundlanders who are presently alive, not those who have passed on to their eternal reward. One time I placed him among the top ten, but today I place him among the greatest Newfoundlanders that ever lived.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: In fact, a terrific man, a great Newfoundlander.

Now I am not saying this because he agrees with everything that I say, because I believe that when I brought the motion in this House to have the "Our Father" said at the beginning of each day, I believe he was the first one to disagree with it. But in fact, that did not mean a thing to me. I still respect him, and I always will as long as I am alive.

MR. NEARY: If you could get that crowd over there back on the Ten Commandments.

MR. WOODROW: Very good.

Now I recall -

MR. SIMMONS: They did not want you praying to them.

MR. WOODROW: Right, say all you like.

I recall when I was in the House during the Fall session, and the question came up concerning the Lower Churchill. I knew very little about it. - I admit I knew very little about it - but I said when I spoke about it, "I am going to take it on the authority of the Minister of Mines and Energy." And I know he was not lying. I know he was using the talents that he has in the interests of our own beloved Province of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: And Labrador.

MR. WOODROW: And Labrador, of course.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Now next I want to mention my good friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: No, I am trying to be honest and sincere.

I said I had a few bouquets to throw out or to toss out. And I think that from what I have heard I believe that what I am saying is just as important as what has been said today, and for that matter any day in this hon. House of Assembly.-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: - because after all we are all, I hope, working as honest, down to earth, good Newfoundlanders working for our Province, for the good of our Province in general and, of course, for the good of our district in particular. Now speaking of my hon. friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), I think he is a sincere man, and he is a builder, and he is not a man who wants to tear down. Do you know what I would like to see him do, Mr. Speaker? I would like to see him walk across the floor of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: I think he could be a great addition to this government, because, as I said, he is a man - in fact he really - naturally, in fact, he just wants to build up. He cannot tear down. Others can get up and they can tear down. They can keep at it day in and day out. I have seen it in fact in almost every walk of life. Naturally the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) is interested in Labrador, and in his own district, and every hon. member in this House must notice that when he speaks he speaks with sincerity. He speaks, in fact, as a good Newfoundlander and a good Labradorian.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: And I think really for a man like that you have to give him praise. Now I am, in fact, I think, qualified to give this praise,

Mr. Woodrow.

because after all I have had a background over the years where I think I am in a position whereby I can study the character of people. But, of course, I cannot forget my hon. colleague, the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie). He, in fact, is just as much interested in Labrador and Newfoundland as his hon. friend or I should say our hon. friend, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). So I think it is nice. It is good when you can stand up and talk about hon. members in this fashion or in this way.

Now I also want to say that I think what makes the Progressive Conservative Government of Newfoundland and Labrador a great one, at this particular time, is the fact that members in its own party can get up and offer constructive criticism. We have seen it from the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter).

MR. J. CARTER: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: When they are speaking, in fact they are offering constructive criticism. Why, in fact, in some governments if this was the case maybe - as the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) says - they would be shafted overnight. But we say they are not that way. In fact this government are prepared, to listen to the criticisms, especially to the constructive criticisms of its own members. Now the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has gone -

MR. NEARY: Ask the Liberal majority over there, and you will find out.

MR. WOODROW: It will be a long day before that happens.

MR. J. CARTER: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: After all he is the only Tory in the House according to the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood).

MR. NEARY: He is just a big overgrown galoot.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Order. It is unparliamentary. It is unparliamentary.

MR. WOODROW: Well that is your opinion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I have to agree and disagree with the member from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). I am going to agree with him first of all on the debate -

MR. ROBERTS: That is quaint.

MR. WOODROW: I am going to let the hon. Leader of the Opposition have his way first.

MR. ROBERTS: I am just asking a word that by association the hon. gentleman brings to mind, quaint.

MR. WOODROW: When the hon. Leader finishes I will continue.

MR. ROBERTS: Continue.

MR. WOODROW: Thank you.

I agree with him when he speaks on the debate of the estimates. I feel that every estimate in this hon. House should be discussed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: I have heard, in fact, the debate on the estimates earlier in the session, and I think that I feel that a lot of unnecessary discussion took place, absolutely. So I, therefore, feel and I would certainly go along with my hon. colleague from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). Let us divide them up, say, the four or five hours so that everybody can have some time to debate each estimate that is brought to the House. I feel it is sometimes a matter of a question and an answer period. You know, hon. members go into a long discussion. In fact I have certain hon. members in mind. I am not going to mention them. I think a lot of the things said could be summarized. Because sometimes, I think, if you get up and start raving off a long, long time, what is happening? In fact you are only playing politics. And I think the people of Newfoundland, as the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said, I think it was here on Friday, he said, "The people of Newfoundland cannot be fooled any more. They are going to vote for the man." So, therefore, no matter what we say, we get up and rave on and on. I do not really think that people

Mr. Woodrow.

are going to admire us for that. They are going to admire us for being honest and sincere in trying to help them. Now I would just like - and I think that this is important - I would like to delve into a couple or maybe two or three, depending on the time I have, of the various departments, and I am coming first to the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. WOODROW:

Now, Mr. Speaker, wherever I go in the Province of Newfoundland - in fact only yesterday - I am sorry the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) is not here - I happened to be in a part of his district. I was in there visiting some friends of mine. I was in Embree. I noticed over there that the people are looking for water and sewerage. In fact you could go on and on. There are a lot of places in rural Newfoundland where yet people have not got the essential and necessary things of life and that is water and sewerage.

Now I would naturally like to speak about my own district, the district of Bay Of Islands. I just, in fact, want to outline, even though a lot has been done in that district, Mr. Speaker, in regards to water and sewerage, I still want to outline that a lot yet remains to be done. In the urban area of the Bay Of Islands district water and sewerage and housing is cared for or looked after, whatever word you want to use, by the city council of Corner Brook. I sometimes wonder - I am not proposing this - but I sometimes wonder if it would not be better, in fact, if perhaps all the Bay Of Islands was a part of the city of Corner Brook. I am not saying I agree with it or disagree with it, but it makes me wonder sometimes if it would not be a good thing for all the Bay Of Islands to be a part of the city of Corner Brook.

Now even in the city of Corner Brook there are still anywhere from fifteen to twenty families without the service of water and sewerage. I had a letter today from my hon. friend in Ottawa, Jack Marshall, and we have been working together to try to bring water and sewerage in the George Town Road area to something like, not twenty families, but twenty people.

Now moving down on the South Shore of the district of the Bay Of Islands - and I hope that hon. members will not think I am being biased or the like for talking about my own district, I think it would be good if hon. members would get up and speak of the needs of their districts, outline them, whether it be water and sewerage or whether it

MR. WOODROW:

be fisheries or what have you. Moving down to Mount Moriah which is a suburb, I suppose you would say, of the City of Corner Brook, they have a complete water and sewerage system. This was installed in 1975 and it cost \$750,000. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word of gratitude to the council of Mount Moriah and their chairman, Garland Vardy. Garland Vardy engineered this thing himself. He saved money. He was not, in fact, going around trying to spend as much money as he had. In fact he was entitled even to spend more money. But he saved money for the Province.

MR. NEARY: He would make a good Minister of Finance.

MR. WOODROW: Well I would say he would make a good one. He certainly would make a good one. He will be coming into St. John's, in fact, to see me maybe in a week or two.

MR. DOODY: Send him down to see me.

MR. WOODROW: I may even send him down to the Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Send him down to see me.

MR. WOODROW: Very good. Now moving down the South Shore of Bay Of Islands we have Halfway Point.

MR. PROCTOR: John's Beach

MR. WOODROW: Yes we will come to John's Beach after a while, hon. minister. Halfway Point are not after a water system. In fact the people in Halfway Point have been, as the hon. Minister of Forestry knows, they really have been great people. They have been very energetic people.

DR. FARRELL: Fantastic people.

MR. WOODROW: Fantastic is right. They are not looking for a water system. They live sort of under a hill and the water flows out. But however they have mentioned to me, in fact, over the past three or four months, that a sewerage system is badly needed because, in fact, the sewerage from the houses up above go down to the houses on the lower side. There was a new road built there a couple of years ago and I will be after the hon. Minister of Transportation and

MR. WOODROW:

Communications to get a bit of pavement done this Summer.

So moving on then to Benoit's Cove which really - I had something to do with the population down there when we moved the people from Wood's Island. I am sort of glad that the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is not here because, you know, he gets pretty hot under the collar when you talk of relocation.

MR. J. CARTER: Very emotional.

MR. WOODROW: Very emotional. But in any case this community has increased rapidly. It has become a great community. In fact we have a beautiful school there, a beautiful church, and house, and convent and it is being built up rapidly now where the people are moving out of the urban area of Corner Brook and building in Benoit's Cove.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who built it up? Who was the P.P. there at the time?

MR. WOODROW: You see him before you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that so?

MR. WOODROW: Absolutely.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: You see him before you. And a lot of hard work - I always have to say that I cannot forget the hand that the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) played in it. I would be unfair, in fact, not to -

MR. SMALLWOOD: All I did was foot the bills.

MR. WOODROW: Right. I would be unfair not to mention that.

Mr. Speaker, it is six o'clock. Shall I adjourn the debate?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has adjourned the debate. I now leave the Chair until eight o'clock this evening.

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

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

MR. L. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, during my talk this afternoon I was giving praise to some hon. members, I thought praise where praise was due. And I also got into a speech, I suppose, I should say on the need for water and sewerage in the district of the Bay of Islands. And when I talk about this topic, Mr. Speaker, I also realize that there are fifty other districts in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and I realize how important water and sewerage must be to all of the districts. In fact, I would like to know if there was only some way to find a cost, to get a cost figure on the amount that is needed to put water and sewerage in all of the districts of our Province, The cost would be astronomical.

When I finished, Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the community of Benoit's Cove, which has grown rapidly over the past fifteen years. In fact, it is incredible if you had gone to that community, as I did, in 1956 and saw about, roughly speaking, maybe 300 people there, and today, in fact, it has grown to a large community, I suppose it is up to maybe 2,500 people. It certainly has that number when you take in Halfway Point with it.

So I say that in this community there is also a great need for water and sewerage. The people are there, in fact, living very closer to each other, and I hope that in a reasonable time I know the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is listening to what I am saying, and I want him to realize, and I want the Administration to realize that even though I am outlining the needs of the district of Bay of Islands I am still reasonable, Mr. Speaker. As I say I realize there are still fifty other districts, and I am man enough and big enough, in fact, to go along with what I feel that will be an honest deal for the district of the Bay of Islands by the Administration.

MR. NEARY: It would not cause the minister to have a stroke, would it?

MR. WOODROW: I would not want to cause him any serious heart attacks or anything of that nature.

MR. DOODY: Minor tremors.

MR. WOODROW: Minor tremors.

But I know as I speak I can see a little dimple in his cheek there every now and again. But I want to let him know I am still being reasonable and you cannot be any more than that.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am still moving down the South Shore -

MR. DOODY: How far are we now?

MR. WOODROW: We are down to Frenchman's Cove now, down to Frenchman's Cove. And I would like also to say that the people in this area are looking for a water and sewerage system. And of course, you know, they do not really complain, say, to the member, say, from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) or the member from some other district; they make their needs known to the member from the Bay of Islands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, in the Summer of 1975 something happened along that Shore which made and which is going to make the communities of York Harbour and Lark Harbour very important in the Bay of Islands. And what happened was in 1975 the road was paved from Frenchman's Cove to Lark Harbour; the cost, I understand, was \$770,000. Now the paving of this road, Mr. Speaker, is going to make a big difference, it is going to make a difference in every respect in the communities of York Harbour and Lark Harbour, and it is going to make a big difference, Mr. Speaker, in the number of tourists and the number of people who are going to visit there. I was out there on Sunday past and it is amazing the number of cars that are travelling over the highway from Frenchman's Cove, - Of course they have to come down naturally from Corner Brook, but the number of cars that are travelling over the paved road from Frenchman's Cove to Lark Harbour. Maybe I should thank the hon. Premier here for -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: - seeing that that road was paved last year, It was then a part of his district. Now once again you give credit where credit is due.

Mr. Woodrow:

Now in the community of York Harbour again the people are asking for water and sewerage. And in Lark Harbour, strange enough, the story is different, I have studied, you see, all the various places in my district and the peoples needs there are different altogether, they do not want water and sewerage there because like Halfway Point they have a good natural water system. So in that community they are not asking me to get a water and sewerage system for them.

Now I am going to move over to the North Shore of the Bay of Islands, come along with me to the North Shore of the Bay of Islands.

SOME HON. MEMBER: All aboard!

MR. WOODROW: All aboard! And that beautiful village Irishtown is expanding rapidly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Very good. And it expanded last year towards Corner Brook -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: Now let me explain what happened.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Hughes Brook?

MR. WOODROW: Hughes Brook is not in my district, I am leaving that to the hon. Minister of Education. I have enough to do to look after my own district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: In any case a couple of years ago Bowaters, in their kindness, put a lot of land on the market along this part of the North Shore of the Bay of Islands, and a lot of people bought this land. I suppose the community of Irishtown extended about a mile in the direction of Corner Brook, and of course now they are asking for water and sewerage in this new part as well as in the old part, we would call it, of Irishtown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Now I would like again to pay a compliment, I would like to, in fact, give credit where credit is due, and this time I am

Mr. Woodrow:

going to speak about the Irishtown Council -

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: - under the able and capable leadership of one.

Mrs. Agnes Penny. A terrific worker, sincere, feet on the ground -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: In fact, Irishtown is also able to expand, and I believe that in the not too distant future you will see an exodus from the city of Corner Brook over to the North Shore; in fact, this has been happening especially over the past five years -

MR. ROBERTS: Is that a good thing?

MR. WOODROW: Well it is -

AN HON. MEMBER: It gives you more constituents.

MR. WOODROW: - hard to say. It is hard to say. I do not know.

MR. ROBERTS: Well it is either good or bad?

MR. WOODROW: Well there is a point about it I would like to mention. It could be good, it could be bad. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs knows what I mean. However, in fact I hope it is going to be good for the community but in any case it is nice to have a responsible council to work with.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear! Hear!

MR. WOODROW: And I think I have said here before I like to work with the council, I think the council is the governing body in any community and when any Tom, Dick or Harry calls me about some problem - of course, if it is a personal problem that is different - but about water and sewerage I always say, "Did you contact the governing body in the community, which is the council." And I want to in fact pay a special tribute to the work, to the good work of the community council in the Community of Irishtown.

Now moving on down, we will get there after a while -

MR. PECKFORD: Summerside.

MR. WOODROW: Summerside, right you are. The minister knows his stuff. He has been around Newfoundland. There is a need in this community for a complete water and sewerage system and I received a letter from the Minister, no later than last week, outlining to me that a survey has been done in this direction and I hope that in time, I hope that this will also be tended to. And the same thing applies to the Community of Meadows and I also received a letter from the minister where he spoke of the survey that has been done in the Community of Meadows as well.

Now Gillams, McIvers and Coxes Cove; \$100,000 has been allocated for a water and sewerage system in the Community of Gillams and incidentally this is already on the way. They have a very energetic council in Gillams and they come to me with their

MR. WOODROW: problems and I in turn communicate with the minister in question.

McIves, the same; they have also received \$100,000 to start a water system in that community as well and I understand now it is well underway.

Of course the outstanding thing about the North Shore of the Bay of Islands is the fact that the Community of Coxes Cove has grown so much. I remember earlier talking with the hon. the former Premier, the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), about Coxes Cove, when Coxes Cove in fact was not a very advance community and I think we talked about it and we wondered if it would ever come to anything, and it certainly did; in fact it has grown tremendously. They have \$341,000 allocated for the start of a water and sewerage system and I understand are looking for more this year. They also have a very fine arena over there which is called, incidentally, I was over at the opening of the arena, I represented the Premier at the opening and the arena is called the Marshall-Moores Arena.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear! Hear! Hear! Hear!

MR. WOODROW: It is a credit to any community and I am sure that they appreciate what the government has done for them in this -

MR. ROBERTS: Why is it not the Moores-Marshall Arena?

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is the economic underpinnings at Coxes Cove now? There are ~~loppers~~ and a teeny, weeny little bit of fishing; what else is there now?

MR. DOODY: The member.

MR. WOODROW: They have a small fish plant over there. The small fish plant is open at the present time. It is open on a temporary basis and the hon. Minister of Fisheries is working in the direction of getting somebody to take it over on a permanent basis.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The first thing is to get someone to go fishing. How many many boats are fishing out there?

MR. WOODROW: Coxes Cove, let me see?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Three? Four?

MR. WOODROW: No. No. In fact I would say around forty, between forty and fifty. But this question did come up all right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman is kidding.

MR. MORGAN: A lot of herring fishing there is there not?

MR. WOODROW: No indeed not, around forty or fifty boats.

MR. MORGAN: Are they herring fishing?

MR. WOODROW: Herring fishery, lobster fishery, and the like and cod fishery.

MR. DOODY: Small boats.

MR. WOODROW: It has in fact, I am not kidding the hon. member, in fact I am saying in fact what I think at least is reasonably true, but in any case here again I think the hon. Premier knows that we have a very energetic council in Coxes Cove.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, there is no point in -

MR. WOODROW: And not only him but I would say almost every member of the administration knows that they have a very energetic council over there. Probably get an average of two or three calls a day I suppose.

AN HON. MEMBER: Alec Pack.

MR. WOODROW: Eric Gillingham is the Mayor, a very fine man also.

Oh yes, the hon. member from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is not here but I said earlier that I agreed with him and I disagreed. I told how I agreed with him and I would like to tell him how I disagreed with the hon. member and I want to quote what he said one day last week. In fact, it must have been on March 14th., he said, "Perhaps the number of seats in the Province should be reduced from fifty-one to between thirty-six and forty."

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the hon. gentleman?

MR. WOODROW: Well, I certainly, Mr. Speaker, have to disagree with that. But by the same token I appreciate the member getting up and expressing the views. He is no doubt sincere in saying this. But really I think -

MR. NEARY: Can you hold your fire for a minute, the member is on his way in now?

MR. ROBERTS: Do not let him rattle you, 'Luke'.

MR. WOODROW: Good enough. Fine. I will probably have to come back to it again.

MR. NEARY: Skip over it and come back to it.

MR. WOODROW: Yes.

In any case, I think I said earlier this afternoon that this government, this administration, I think that is the right word for it, at least the hon. the former Premier says, are big enough to accept criticism.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. WOODROW: And I think that is a good thing when a group of men can accept criticism. I think that is really a wonderful thing. Time is flying on.

I also wanted to mention how important in the district of Bay of Islands the fisheries are. There are six herring plants at the present time in operation in the Bay of Islands, five on the South Shore and one on the North Shore.

Mr. Woodrow.

There are two of those plants, two of them, have operated on their own. They have not received any government assistance whatsoever. In fact, the two plants that I refer to are, Barry Fisheries in Curling, and Allan Fisheries in Bennoits. Allan Fisheries did receive, I think, a small amount, but not too much. So these -

MR. NEARY: How much?

MR. WOODROW: I do not know what it is. I do not know off hand.

But I was going to say that these two plants, the owners of these two plants are really Newfoundlanders, really working hard, working hard for the Province. I also before - and in fact the time is flying very fast -

MR. J. CARTER: By leave.

MR. ROBERTS: I wish we would get back.

MR. J. CARTER: By leave.

MR. WOODROW: Oh my, oh my! Oh my, oh my, oh! How unkind.

MR. NEARY: Nasty?

MR. WOODROW: Nasty, terrible. However, you know, we are big enough to take it. We are big enough to take it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: I would like at this time, as I did not do it before, I would like to thank the Minister of Transportation and Communications for coming to my district earlier in the year and looking over the needs of the district with me. And I also have to praise the administration for their intention. They are going to pave the detour West of Grand Falls. I think this is really good. And I hope that soon the road sign will be put up which says, "Drive right except to pass." When I was driving over to Corner Brook last Friday, it is amazing how many people are still driving, you know, -

MR. DOODY: That is the slogan of our thirty-three years.

MR. WOODROW: - in the middle lane, and even passing on the right.

MR. MORGAN: There is a lot of that.

MR. WOODROW: Absolutely, right you are.

MR. SIMMONS: The member for St. John's East is here now.

MR. WOODROW: Well, in fact, I just told them I disagreed over the number of seats—thirty-six and forty-six. But yet I admire him for having the courage of his convictions.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, my time is almost up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: By leave.

MR. NEARY: Carry on.

MR. J. CARTER: By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. WOODROW: Well, I was going to speak about the — it is amazing, you know, it is hard to drive things home to people — question of speed limits on our highways. And a point I want to bring out is how difficult it is — I do not know whether hon. Minister of Justice would be able to enlighten me on this or not. We have made representation — or I should say the communities, the heads of communities — have made representation on many occasions to have the speed limit reduced on certain parts of the — not the highways — roads through the district. And it really takes a long, long time to get an answer back.

MR. HICKMAN: That is because you did not direct your question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications — the first portion.

MR. WOODROW: Right, you are.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's forty-five minutes have now transpired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member may continue by leave.

MR. WOODROW: A few more minutes, okay, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very, Mr. Speaker.

In any case I remember away back about — what? — twenty years ago, Albert Martin, who was then the mill manager of Corner Brook, and who was a great friend of mine, and we talked about the roads, especially then on the South Shore of the Bay of Islands, and he said, "You know, as long as you have bad roads, you will not have too many accidents." Of course,

Mr. Woodrow.

you know, now that the roads are good, we are going to have more accidents. I think, you know, the better the roads the more the accidents. And, of course, then the more precautions one has to take. So I feel, for example, on the road - I already mentioned the excessive amount of traffic that is going to be on the road this year from Corner Brook to Lark Harbour. I venture to say that a lot of the people in this House here tonight, a lot of the hon. members may even be over around this area, because it is a very attractive area. And I feel that in many places - and after all we are thinking of lives, which is important - the speed limit on that highway from, especially, Cook's Brook to Lark Harbour should be reduced in many case to not more than twenty miles an hour. Now perhaps, you know, this could apply to other places as well. Maybe there are a lot of members who have the same problem in their own districts.

MR. DOODY: Yes. Twenty miles an hour is a bit excessive, really.

MR. WOODROW: And also, Mr. Speaker, this applies to certain parts of the North Shore as well. So I hope that the Minister of Transportation and Communications will take this into consideration and I am sure he will when the time comes for him to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on a long time, but I am just going to mention now - I am going to mention one more item, one more topic, and that is the question of tourism. I think really that tourism in the future of this Province is going to play a big role, and I do not think we can underestimate the importance of it. It is going to play a big role, and it certainly is going to play a big role in the district of the Bay of Islands. It will play a bigger role in the district of the Bay of Islands this year than it did last year, because especially I am thinking again of the beautiful park out in the Bay of Islands. There is a road or a path leading up to the mountains, like going up Mount Calvary in fact, and you can see all out over the Bay of Islands. It is really a very beautiful spot.

MR. DOODY: The top of the hill.

MR. WOODROW: The top of the hill is right.

MR. ROBERTS: Is Mount Calvary in Bay of Islands or is Bay of Islands in Mount Calvary?

MR. WOODROW: Now that is a good question, is it not? That is quite a good question. I really would not know how to answer that. Is Mount Calvary in the Bay of Islands or is the Bay of Islands in Mount Calvary?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Whv dignify it?

MR. DOODY: I would not apply myself to it.

MR. WOODROW: Right, quite right. I will not reply.

But in any case I do not think, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that we can underestimate the importance of tourism in the district of the Bay of Islands, and for that matter in any other district as well.

Now I want to summarize all I have said. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to be able to talk on behalf of the people of the Province of Newfoundland and on behalf of, in fact, the people of the Bay of Islands district. And before I end up, Mr. Speaker, I want again to say - the member has gone - but I want to say about the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary)-

MR. J. CARTER: He is right behind you.

MR. WOODROW: Right behind me, absolutely.

- I want to say that he certainly has made the new members, in fact, who come to this House, he has certainly made us all welcome. And, you know, I cannot forget the words ringing in my ear. He said, "This is the people's House." And it is the people's House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: And the people have sent us here. And I feel that we should try to work to the best of our ability for the people of the Province and especially the people of our districts. And once again I want to say that even though perhaps if the administration spent on the district of the Bay of Islands only in water and sewerage they would probably spend maybe anywhere from \$10 million to \$15 million.

Mr. Woodrow.

I would be a very selfish member if I should put the gun to the administration and say, "Give this to me." I will not do that. In fact I will try to be reasonable as long as I am a member of this hon. House and I hope to be a member for some more years to come. I will try to be

Mr. Woodrow:

reasonable with the Administration and by the same token work on behalf of the Province and work in particular on behalf of the district of the Bay of Islands. And I hope all other members will do the same thing for the Province and for their district as well. +

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. E. M. ROBERTS: Thank you.

Well before the Minister of Finance speaks to close the debate there are one or two points that I would like to make, and I guess this is the only opportunity because we have now gone through the sub-amendment and we have gone through the amendment and we are on the budget itself. I would just like to make two or three points and I will try to be fairly brief, Mr. Speaker, because I for one, and this is a suggestion the House Leader on the government side might wish to consider, if we conclude this debate, if the minister speaks and anybody else who wants to speak speaks we might get out in time to hear portions of the budget speech from Ottawa which are to be televised I believe at 10:00 o'clock, and I am as interested I think as most hon. gentlemen would be in what is in that document.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ten thirty here.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: Ten thirty here.

MR. ROBERTS: Ten thirty here. You know, "The world will end at noon, 12:30 Newfoundland time," as the old story goes, and we might get out that few minutes early because I suspect the budget speech in Ottawa will have some bearing on us, whether it is good or bad, and I for one would like the opportunity to hear it and to see what is said.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk in this debate, including some by some people who should know a great deal better, and I would have thought did know a great deal better, about the debt. And I wanted to say a word or two about the debt of this Province because I think that anybody in public life must be concerned with the debt, with the

Mr. Roberts:

amount of the Province's debt and with the rate at which that debt is increasing.

I think the first point I would make is one which draws upon the budget speech made by the then Minister of Finance, the present Minister of Mines and Energy, was in May 31, 1972 which was the first budget speech of the present Administration. The election, as I recall it, was late in March; the House met about mid April, as quickly as it could lawfully and properly be summoned together under the terms of the Election Act; and very quickly thereafter the government brought in their budget for the 1972-1973 fiscal year. And on page five and page six of that budget speech as delivered in this House by the Minister of Finance of the day there was an analysis of our debt, and I do not need to read it all, I am sure that members are familiar with it, but perhaps I can just read the summation, and the summation of that is as follows, that - let me find the exact reference I want - the minister spoke of the increase in the debt and the rate of increase in the debt. Now I had it marked, Mr. Speaker, and in the enthusiasm of listening to the hon. gentleman from the Bay of Islands I fear I have lost it, and that, Sir, is a terrible thing to do indeed.

The Minister of Finance in his speech said that if the rate of borrowing continued at the rate that had been incurred, and the reference is on page five, incurred during the six years preceding his budget speech, that the total debt would double to more than \$2 billion in approximately three and one half years. The exact paragraph is as follows, 'In the six year period from 1965-1966 to 1971-1972 it appears that the former Liberal Administration completely discarded any semblance of financial sanity. The total debt of this Province, direct and guaranteed less sinking funds, rose from what was already a national high of \$674 per person to the present - and this was in 1972, of course - to the present figure of \$1,955 per person. The total debt outstanding of this Province direct and indirect has increased from \$332,153,000 to the staggering total of \$1,035,930,000,

Mr. Roberts:

an increase of \$703,777,000 or 212 per cent.

"This incredible growth in direct borrowings and in guarantees during this six year period represents an annual growth rate of over 21 per cent. If this growth rate were to continue, which it most certainly will not, our total debt would double to more than \$2 billion in approximately three and one half years."

Further down below the minister concludes that section of his speech by saying quite starkly and quite boldly and quite simply and I have no doubt quite sincerely, "Surely it is obvious that this growth rate in borrowing direct or indirect cannot continue. It will not continue."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is what the government said speaking through their Minister of Finance in 1972. We have before us now the budget for this year and we are debating it on the estimates, and included with the documents which the Minister of Finance tabled with his budget speech, it is found on page 26 of the bound volume, is an estimate of the total Provincial debt, and comparing apples and apples, direct and indirect, guarantees, gross debt, the total shown on page 26 is \$2,111,900,000, call it \$2.1 billion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not bring out those two statements with any intention of castigating the Administration on it, I leave that to the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) who has made this his theme and I shall say a word or two about that in a moment or so, but I do not bring it out to castigate the Administration. But I think it is worth pointing out that a position which the Minister of Finance speaking as he was for the government, the then minister, I am sorry, the gentleman from St. John's West (Mr. J. Crosbie), which he took in 1972 in his budget speech, in which he said that we simply could not carry on borrowing, that if we did we would be up to \$2 billion in approximately three and one half years, and to that, to use his words simply, cannot continue, and he said, it will not continue, and despite that, Sir, it has continued. And I do not know how much of that

Mr. Roberts:

includes, I suppose that includes the Churchill Falls debt, I have not broken it down. I suppose it includes the \$160 millions we spent on the shares of the CFLCO, the Churchill Falls Corporation. But the fact remains that our total debt as of the end of this year is predicted to be about \$2.1 billion which is not much money if you say it quickly but it is a lot of dollars, a lot of money if you say it is \$2,100 million.

MR. DOODY: It is gross.

MR. ROBERTS: I agree. The Minister of Finance says it is gross. It is gross. It is gross and it is the gross debt. It is both. And I am comparing apples and apples because the figure used by his colleague in the 1972 budget was equally gross, it was \$1.35 billion, \$1,000 million and \$35 million on top of that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I have this broken out on a per capita rate, but I do not particularly need that information to make the point I am because it is a staggering, you know, it is a staggering total no matter how we slice it or no matter how we regard it.

MR. ROBERTS: Obviously anybody who is concerned with the financial condition of this Province or with the financial prospects of this Province has to be concerned with that figure. Anybody the least bit interested in financial affairs in this Province, with our ability to pay our way and our ability to develop our resources and our ability to provide our people with the services that they wish, that they expect and that they deserve and that they need, must be concerned with the fact that a total debt which three and a half years ago the Minister of Finance of the day said was unattainable, or certainly was undesirable and should be unattained in fact has been reached. I could give the House an even more staggering set of figures, Mr. Speaker; using Consolidated Fund Services, the expenditure thereon, as a percentage of the gross current account revenue and in 1950-51, which I think effectively for these purposes was the first year that the Province as a Province functioned, we became a Province at the beginning of the 1949-50 fiscal year, but in 1950-51, 1.8 per cent of our total gross expenditure on current account went towards Consolidated Funds Services. In 1955-56, and I have taken five year intervals because it would be much too long to read all twenty-five or twenty-seven years worth, in 1955-56, five years later, it had risen from 1.9 per cent to 5.7 per cent. Five years after that in the 1960-61 fiscal year it had been raised further to 7.2 per cent. In 1965-66 it had gone up to 10.9 per cent. In 1970-71 it had gone up to 14.2 per cent. In 1975-76 it had gone up to 14.8 per cent and in the current year, the figure which I have been given, is 15.9 per cent of the total gross current account revenue of the Province, gross current account revenue will be spent towards the Consolidated Fund Servicing.

Mr. Speaker, the significant thing is not so much the dollars, I have not bothered with the dollar figures for this analysis because in each case we are talking percentage of the same total sum, the gross current account revenue and the dollar totals are in a sense misleading because of course the total

MR. ROBERTS: expenditure of the Province has raised dramatically.

We all remember I am sure vividly, the late Mr. E. C. Spencer, who was then Minister of Finance, reading a speech in this House, the Budget Speech, in which he proudly predicted that the Province's expenditure in the year of which he spoke would be \$100 million. And he said with genuine and sincere feeling that he did not know where the Province could go on sustaining this incredible rate of expenditure. And of course we are now at the stage, Mr. Speaker, where the Province's expenditure is over \$1 billion and the question is being raised with equal sincerity, can we go on sustaining that?

But we must be worried, not by the increase from the 1.8 per cent because that was an artificially low figure. We had no debt of any substance or any amount. At the time of Confederation we had indeed a healthy surplus. But that was only in the bank. We had a great debt or a great deficit in public services and in the needs of our people and of course -

MR. DOODY: A debt to our people.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the Minister of Finance has used the phrase, a debt to our people, I think that is a good one. That the policy under which that surplus was piled up was really one that it is hard to believe that civilized men could with conscious adhere to. And yet they had. They had done that throughout the Commission period, or at least the war and post-war era because as I recall it during the early part of the Commission period, even though they brought in the most stringent economies and even though they certainly, the Commission, introduced no services of any substance and did little to expand what few public services we had, the Commission still ran a deficit during the first few years of their operation. But then came the war and war brought many bad things but it also brought with it a great measure of prosperity. I have not got an analysis here before me, Mr. Speaker, but I am quite sure that that forty-odd million dollar surplus that we had

Mr. ROBERTS: when we became a Province in 1949 had been amassed almost entirely in the two or three or four years that had passed since the end of the Second World War.

But in any event, be that as it may, why we had the surplus is irrelevant. We had it. The government of the day did the proper thing to spend it and they did the proper thing to spend it to provide public services.

But now, Sir, we are at the point where sixteen per cent of our greatly increased revenue goes to service our debt. Now, Mr. Speaker, worrisome figures, very worrisome if you take the two points which I have made. The first is that we have now reached a total debt which surpassed that which the Minister of Finance three and a half or four years passed, well it is four years now, four years this month, said we should not attain. And equally we have reached the point where sixteen per cent of our total current account revenues now goes merely to service our debt, to roll over and I am not talking of refinancing. I am talking of paying the sinking funds and paying the interest-re-financing, rolling over does not increase our debt unless it involves a higher interest rate, in which case it certainly increases our obligations, even if it may not increase our direct debt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had a great deal of talk in this session of the House and the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) about the debt. He holds very strong views, very strong views indeed on this subject and he has made them crystal clear on a number of occasions. I think I heard him this afternoon say that this is the tenth time he had made this particular point in the House and that may well be so, Sir. The hon. gentleman at times speaks in hyperbole, exaggeration, but I do not think he is being very hyperbolic at this stage. I do not think there is very much exaggeration at all in what he has to say.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, we must be worried about it. Of course we must be. Any man or woman who sits in this House, any man or woman who is the least bit concerned with the financial condition of this Province must be concerned with the debt situation. We are borrowing very heavily. There is a bill on the Order Paper now, Sir, to authorize the government to borrow the \$197 million that is set forth in this year's estimates, the capital account expenditure. And of course that does not include some of the other expenditures of the government, not all Hydro are in there because it does not all show, it is not all necessary to be authorized. Some of it was authorized a year or so past.

So, Mr. Speaker, where do we go? What do we do? Well let us look at the options. The hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) has somehow had the fear of eternity put in him on this question. I have heard him speak many times in this House and outside this House, publicly, in many private conversations, express a very deep faith in the future of this Province and a very real willingness to borrow money to provide our people with the services that they need today and the resource development which they need to achieve that faith. The hon. gentleman may still have the faith, but he comes in now and he says that we should cut that budget. Indeed if I am not mistaken I heard him this afternoon appealing to the Finance Minister to bring in a second budget come Fall. Maybe we will have a general election this Summer and history will repeat itself and we will have a second budget in the Fall.

Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt the genuineness and the sincerity of the hon. gentleman's views. I have no doubt he holds them sincerely. I have no doubt they represent the product of a great deal of study by him and a great deal of thought and he has

MR. ROBERTS: put a great deal of concern into them. What I do not understand, Sir, is where we are going to cut \$250 million, which I think is the figure the hon. gentleman has suggested, from the estimates. It is all very well to stand and say, "Cut" and I certainly have my arguments with the Minister of Finance and his colleagues on their priorities. I certainly have my arguments with some of their programmes and I certainly object to some of their taxation programmes. I have voted in this House to that effect. The hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) has voted at least once in this House, in this session, to increase taxes. I have not seen him vote to reduce expenditures. Indeed, Sir, I have not seen him at any point bring into this House any programme to cut expenditures. All I want to know, I realize that the Minister of Finance and I for once are on the same wicket, to use the phrase, because I think the Minister of Finance said much the same thing earlier, maybe not on this debate but, yes, on the amendment, or on the sub-amendment or one of the early parts of this debate. All I want

Mr. Roberts.

to know is where we are going to cut a quarter of a billion dollars, because I think it is dishonest of anybody to say that we can cut it without saying where. I do not mean to the dollar or to the cent. But where do we cut it? You go through the budget, Mr. Speaker - you do not have to go through it line by line or word by word, just take the tables - take the \$820 million that is estimated for major current account expenditure items. Now if we are to take \$250 million from that, Mr. Speaker, we are taking about thirty per cent, in round numbers, about thirty per cent.

Hospital operating costs are budgeted at \$142 million. Now let us look at each of these items. Thirty per cent of \$140 million, Mr. Speaker, in round numbers, for the purpose of debate, is \$52 million. Did anybody in this House suggest we cut \$52 million off our hospitals?

Teachers' salaries, \$125 million, contractual. I suppose the government would be open to an action for breach of contract if they were not to pay a teacher, with a given qualification, the agreed rate of pay. A breach of contract action would lie doubtless. But in any event, thirty per cent off the teachers' salaries item is \$37.5 million. Now that is what we got to do, Sir, to get a quarter of a billion off the current account. And I will come in a minute to capital account.

General salaries, civil service as such - I suppose that is the General Service Agreement, \$120 million. Thirty-six million has to be lopped off that, Sir. Interest on outstanding debt, \$106 million, but we cannot cut that. Those are contractual obligations. So we will have to take up more later on.

Social assistance, \$50 million in round numbers. Half of that again in round numbers comes from Ottawa under the Canada Assistance Plan. So if we just cut thirty per cent of the gross we are only saving fifteen per cent. So we cut thirty per cent of social assistance, and it comes to \$15 million. That is what we can

Mr. Roberts.

by saying to every person on welfare today, be he an able-bodied man whose unemployment insurance has run out or be he or be she an elderly person who is not yet getting the federal old age pension, or be it a widow with a family, and we say to them, for every dollar you are getting, you are getting seventy cents now.

Maintenance of highways, \$44 million. Can we cut thirty per cent of that? I do not think there is a member in this House who feels that we are spending enough on maintaining our highways. I know speaking for my own district, the Strait of Belle Isle, what few highways we have are not properly maintained. I am sure the gentleman from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) does not think we are spending enough on maintaining our highways.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And I would go throughout this House, Sir. Maybe the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) thinks that enough money is being spent on highways in Twillingate. But I know a number of his constituents who differ.

Memorial University grant, \$37.5 million. Should we cut thirty per cent there? We will save ourselves \$10 million or \$11 million. All we will have to do is to tell a thousand or two thousand Newfoundlanders they cannot go to university. That is all we have to do. We can save the money.

MR. DOODY : Hire a new president.

MR. ROBERTS: Beginning with a new president, and a new faculty.

Grants to school boards, \$32 million. We could save \$6.6 million if we cut that by thirty per cent. And all we would have to do then is say to our children, that you no longer will go to schools that are as clean as they are today or as well heated or as well lit. They will be thirty per cent less heated or thirty per cent less lit or thirty per cent less cleaned. Oh, we could do it, sure. We could also commit suicide.

Mr. Roberts.

Maintenance of public buildings, \$14.8 million. Maybe we could save thirty per cent there. All we would have to do is maybe only turn on half as many lights and have them cleaned half as often, and that would give us \$4 million or \$5 million.

Transportation of school children, \$11.3 million. Thirty per cent off that saves \$3.3 million. And all we would have to do is tell the children, say, in Cook's Harbour in my district, you can only come to school every three times a week, Monday, Wednesday and Friday.

MR. DOODY: We could move it from one mile to two miles.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the hon. Minister of Finance says, yes, we could move it from one mile to two miles. And all the children who now live within that zone of more than one mile from the school and less than two miles would have to find their own transportation. That would be, not only very popular, but it just be a means of shifting the cost from the government, who raise it through taxation, back to the individual parents, many of whom who cannot afford to pay, you know, in that way. That is a great Liberal principle, is it not? Shifting it off the backs of the government, who draw from all of the people of this Province, according to their ability to pay, or according to their expenditures in the case of sales tax and gasoline tax and liquor tax and cigarette tax or tobacco tax, putting them on the backs then of individual consumers. Sure we could do that in hospitals, too. We could say that from now on the amount you pay to hospitals is not related to how much money you earn each year or how much money you spend on buying your car or on purchasing anything else, say, like the sales tax; from now on how much you spend in a hospital is dependent on how sick you are. And if you have got money to pay for it, well and good, and if you have not, well that is your tough luck, buddy, pay up or get out. So much for that great Liberal principle. I happen to believe in that Liberal principle.

Mr. Roberts.

Grants to councils, Newfoundland Medicare, Rural Electricity Authority, pensions - let us cut the pensions, Sure we could save thirty per cent of \$9 million. We could save \$2.7 million - call it \$3 million saved right there, and all the people who are getting pensions from the government will just be told that for every \$100 they get now, they are getting \$70.

Mr. Sneaker, I do not want to wear the argument, thin, but I want to make the point, because I have sat here, and I have listened to the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) who believes what he says. I do not doubt that for a moment, Sir. The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, he says, "The hon. gentleman from Twillingate is not sincere." No, I think he is sincere. I think that is the tragedy of it. Because, Sir, it is an unrealistic, a completely unrealistic suggestion. Now if the hon. gentleman would come out and tell us where we are going to cut it, should we tell 1,000 or 2,000 students they cannot go to university? Should we say that from now on a person going into hospital shall pay thirty per cent of the cost of his room, and if a hospital bed is now costing - what? - \$100 a day on the average -

MR. COLLINS: The average cost is \$112.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Health says, \$112 average. Well from now on you pay \$30 or \$35 a day towards the cost of your hospital. Some places call it co-insurance, you know, rich and poor alike. What is the saying? "The rich and poor alike have an equal right not to sleep under the bridges of Paris," or however that saying went. You know, what a policy to follow or to advocate. It is not a policy which in my view this Province should advocate. I might also say that it is not a Liberal policy, and this coming from one who has held himself out time and time again as being the only voice of Liberalism left. Lloyd George, Sir, is rotting under that stone that holds him down in the valley of the river Dyfor, and Gladstone who I believe was interred in Westminster Abbey will rise again, Sir, and stalk the forests at Hawarden if he were to hear these principles being advocated.

Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Speaker, equally on capital account. Where do we cut there? We are trying to save a quarter of a billion dollars, we are told, a quarter of a billion dollars. I will find the table here showing the major capital account expenditure items. Let us see where we cut there.

Transportation development, a fancy name for highways, \$31 million this year, and highway improvement another \$20 million. So add them together, \$51 million. Well if we cut thirty per cent off that, we are cutting \$15 million. And we could do it. Sure, we could just cut that arbitrarily. The cabinet could say that they will only spend \$35 million. The Minister of Highways would probably resign in protest, and so he should, because even \$51 million is not what is needed. And the Minister of Transportation and Communications would be the first to agree to that today.

Labrador Linerboard Limited, \$25 million needed this year. If we cut thirty per cent off that we are saving \$7.5 million. What does that mean? It means the mill closes. And that is a policy of defeatism and despair that no public man in my view could advocate.

Industrial Development Corporation, \$10 million. What is that for this year?

MR. CROSBIE: That is to pay the Burgeo fish plant.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the Burgeo fish plant. Well should we close that up? You know we could save ourselves \$10 million by not going ahead with that. All we do is close up the town of Burgeo then, and the Minister of Industrial Development would agree with that.

MR. CROSBIE: The Burgeo Burp would fight it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the Burgeo Burp got defeated in the election. The Burgeo Burp, Sir, I believe, is now on the payroll of the Department of Fisheries - is he not? - serving his country.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: No, no!

MR. ROBERTS: Is he not?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: No!

MR. ROBERTS: Whose payroll is he on?

MR. W. CARTER: That was just a rumour.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, he is not on anybody's payroll. Oh, well, I see.

At least he is not on the House of Assembly payroll.

MR. CROSBIE: He should be in the Senate?

MR. ROBERTS: He should be in the Senate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, the hon. former member from Burgeo has about as much chance in my view getting in the senate as the hon. gentleman from St. John's West has of being on the Supreme Court of Canada, and I would not care to bet for either, or even in the House of Commons should he try it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker,

MR. ROBE: The hon. the Minister of Justice being a judge.

MR. DOODY: He should go there.

MR. ROBERTS: He should go somewhere, I agree. He certainly should go somewhere but I am not sure it is parliamentary. Mr. Speaker, to say where I think the former member for Burgeo-LaPoile should go.

Newfoundland and Labrador Housing

Corporation: We cut 30 per cent there. My God! That money brings in five dollars to every dollar we spend. And it is money that turns over, and what few jobs are going to be in this Province this summer will come in the housing sector. It is one of the bright spots, one of the few bright spots in the government's programme.

Fishery Development \$10 million: It is a gross figure and includes Ottawa. Anybody advocate we cut \$3 million off that?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. ROBERTS: What else? What else? How about some forest access roads? They are budgeted for \$5.50 million. We can cut 30 per cent off that and save ourselves \$1.75 million.

MR. SIMMONS: Save the federal government.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. Well, I have not come to these share-cost programmes. That is ninety-ten money, most of that. And we would have to cut to save ten dollars, we have to cut \$100 in expenditures. But we cannot even cut that.

Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel that I want to go into with the member from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). What he does he does for the whole world to observe, and the whole world can observe and judge as they see fit. And the hon. gentleman will answer to his conscience and his constituents for what he does or does not do. But I do have a quarrel. Sir, with the view that somehow this Province can cut expenditures in that scale, I think

MR. ROBERTS: that anybody who advocates that should come before this House and put up a programme. I heard the same hon. gentleman say, "Let us cut by a quarter of a billion" and then said, "Oh now let us go ahead and we will start the new hospitals in Clareville and in Burin and the big expansion in Grand Falls," which I suppose together will total fifty or sixty or seventy millions of dollars on capital account, and then to run those hospitals will cost an extra fifteen or twenty or twenty-five or thirty millions each year, every year, on current account.

MR. DOODY: They repeat themselves every two-and-a-half years.

MR. DOODY: Well it used to be every three years. The Minister of Finance tells me it is every two-and-a-half years now.

MR. DOODY: It is just down below two-and-a-half.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, that is a dishonourable and dishonest policy, in my view. It is one that should not be put before the House unchallenged. The member can advocate it if he wishes, and I have no doubt he believes it. I say it is not a Liberal policy, Sir. I say it is not a policy advocated by anybody who believes in the Liberal doctrine, the Liberal doctrine so well enunciated, among others, by Lloyd George in the people's budget, "Man is his brother's keeper." And here what we have is a Shylock policy, a policy of heartless and unrealistic cuts.

I do not believe this Province is bankrupt.

I do not think for one moment this Province is bankrupt. I do not think for one moment this Province's credit is irreparably damaged. I think that our credit is well stretched, and it is well it is stretched. Because who for one would suggest any substantial areas where money has been spent these last few years, these last twenty-five years, where it should not have been spent? Oh, we can quarrel over the Linerboard mill if we wish, we can quarrel over the \$40

MR. ROBERTS: million spent in the Come By Chance refinery which may or may not be recovered. We are in there with our second mortgage and if things work out the money will come back and if not we will have to take our losses like gentlemen and maybe the Japanese will lend us the ritual hari-kari ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, you know, these glib words come from the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) and they should not be allowed to stand unchallenged because - I am sorry?

MR. CROSBIE: He would not have used them before 1972.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy says that he -

MR. NEARY: Are you becoming paranoid or what?

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. The hon. gentleman from LaPoile said something?

MR. NEARY: Are you getting paranoid?

MR. ROBERTS: No, I am not getting paranoid, Sir, anymore than I am not concerned with the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) saying that he would never be in my cabinet. Sir, he is rejecting an invitation he will never be offered. That is simple.

MR. NEARY: And you will never be Premier of this country.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, that remains to be seen.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. putative Premier has made a good point.

MR. ROBERTS: Putative Premier, yes.

Mr. Speaker, I would rather be in that position than the position of the gentleman from St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) who is an exputative Premier or a putative ex-Premier as the case may be.

MR. CROSBIE: I am a mere nothing, I only serve.

MR. ROBERTS: "They also serve who only stand and wait."

And when the hon. gentleman thunders into St. John's West with cannon

MR. ROBERTS: to the left and cannon to the right,
"Onward rode the brave six hundred."

Mr. Speaker, the fact remains, Sir, the fact remains that this view, this policy that has been so glibly and so persistently advocated, whatever merit it has, has no merit for this Province at this time. And whatever merit it has in support of it at any time, it is not the expression of a Liberal, it is the expression of, not just a Conservative, a deep-dyed reactionary Tory, the sort of philosophy that Winston Churchill espoused in 1924 when he put England back on the gold standard and unwittingly took a very great step toward precipitating the financial collapse which came in England in 1930 and 1931, when - I am sorry?

MR. DOODY: Then he crossed the House.

MR. ROBERTS: No, by that time he was backing Mr. Baldwin's administration as a Tory. Sir Winston Churchill was a great man in many fields, but he was probably the worst Chancellor of the Exchequer that England ever had, and she has had some dandies. He was Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir, from 1924, I believe till 1929 in the administration of Baldwin, Stanley Baldwin. As a matter of fact, John Maynard Keynes wrote a book that is very hard to come by and the title of it was a parody or a repeat of his great bestseller, The Economic Consequences Of The Peace, and that was the book that made Keynes his name, and his other book which is very hard to come by now because I am told all copies were bought up by some mysterious forces, was the Economic Consequences of Mr. Churchill. Mr. Churchill's economic policy, his fiscal policy as Chancellor of the Exchequer was an unmitigated disaster for England. Unmitigated disaster!

Sir Winston Churchill deserves well of history. A great man. Could anybody have been greater than Churchill during the Second War? But his period between the Wars, Sir, was not marked by unalloyed success.

MR. ROBERTS: In any event, Mr. Speaker, the policy which the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) has been advocating in this House, Sir, has some merit. Of course it does! But it is not the merit of a Liberal, it is not the merit of anybody who espouses the Liberal philosophy, it is the merit of the reactionaries of the right, right, right, right, right wing of the old Tory Party.

MR. CROSBIE: Even they could not carry it out.

MR. ROBERTS: No. I agree. The gentleman from St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) says that even they, by which I take it he means the British Government of the day, could not carry it out, and I agree. When Ramsay MacDonald formed the national government, the last coalition there was in England, that poor, sick old man Ramsay MacDonald as he was by that time, a great figure, the first socialist Premier England ever had, a figure of an orator, a great figure of a man, but in his old age Ramsay MacDonald got in the hands of the Duchesses and Ramsay MacDonald was the figurehead on the coalition -

MR. MOODY: He wanted that coalition.

MR. ROBERTS: He did. The coalition was a Tory coalition. I suppose out of every hundred men and women who supported him in the House ninety-six or ninety-eight were Tories, Conservative, call them what you want. Tories they call them in England; it is a proud title. And Ramsay MacDonald was up there as the figurehead, and they had the national coalition. They had an election and they won a couple of overwhelming victories, the doctor's mandate. But as the gentleman from St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) reminds us, they could not carry out the swingeing cuts. And they were only talking, Sir, of a 10 per cent cut in the dole and here we are talking of 30 per cent. It is a poppycock policy, Sir, and I have sat here and listened for weeks now and the government and I - I suppose I should not be agreeing with the government but for once we think the same way on a policy approaching this Province. We may differ on a lot of aspects of financial policy, but do not -

MR. WOODROW: After hearing my speech you have changed.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, how can you get angry with a man like the gentleman from St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie)? I am sorry, from Bay of Islands' (Mr. Woodrow)?

MR. FLIGHT: It is easy to confuse them.

MR. ROBERTS: It is easy to confuse them, Sir, I agree. The gentleman from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), Sir, has many of the good features of the gentleman from St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), and the gentleman from St. John's West has many of the good features of the gentleman from Bay of Islands. They are soulmates, brethren, political allies, heart to heart -

MR. DOODY: Knee to knee.

MR. ROBERTS: I did not say that, no. The Minister of Finance said that.

MR. ROWE: Knee to knee.

MR. ROBERTS: Knee to knee, toe to toe, foot to foot, heart to hear and cheek to cheek and we will leave it at that, Mr. Speaker. But obviously, Sir, birds of a feather do flock together, in the case of the gentleman from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) and the gentleman from St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). I think each of them, Sir, should take that as being high praise. Because like the gentleman from the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), Sir, I am in a mood for flinging - what does he call them? Bouquets? What do you call them 'Luke'?

MR. ROWE: Bouquets.

MR. ROBERTS: I know what they are, but what does he call them?

MR. ROWE: Bouquet. Almost like sniffing wine.

MR. WOODROW: Bouquets.

MR. ROBERTS: Bouquet. A bouquet which is almost like sniffing wine or even a headier substance. Anyway the gentleman from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) made an excellent speech and members on both sides, Sir, listened to it with interest, enjoyment and followed his points. I think he made his points well, and I know that his constituents, Sir, the people who live alone every

MR. ROBERTS: inch which we walk today, every inch between Lark Harbour and the Curling Brook, and every inch between -- is it Irishtown the first community going out the North side? -- out as far as Cox's Cove and McIvers. We must have walked metaphorically, Sir, every inch of that with the member today, the whole House, Sir, inch by inch upward and onward.

MR. ROWE: We have blisters on the brain.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the fact remains, Sir, that the policy which has been advocated is completely unacceptable and unworkable and the burden is on those who advocate it to say how it would work. It is not enough just to say lop \$250,000,000 as if somehow it was like cutting off a toenail. Sir, I have shown that the retrenchments that would be necessary are absolutely savage, unrealistically so. It could not be made to work even by a coalition, this coalition, this fatuous foolish talk of a coalition.

MR. MORGAN: What?

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Transportation and Communications thinks it is - the hon. gentleman says he may not have heard of it but I understand, Sir, he has had words from his leader which indicate that other people have heard about it.

MR. MORGAN: Keep that statement in mind.

MR. FLIGHT: Who is his leader?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know who is the leader of the hon. member for Bonavista South. I know that he personally makes a visit, and that is what counts.

MR. NEARY: The would-be Premier we are hearing from, in living colour.

MR. MORGAN: Personalities!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we have listened to the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) with interest, and even learned something from time to time. And I propose to go on listening to him in the hope of learning even more.

MR. NEARY: No, you will never learn. You never listen to anybody. That is your problem.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I listened to the gentleman from LaPoile for four years until he met his faith at the hands of a nominating meeting in the Town of Port aux Basques one night.

AN HON. MEMBER: He found nobody wanted him.

MR. ROBERTS: No. No. My friend from Burgeo -

MR. NEARY: You have only been the hatchet man around this building for the last twelve years.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir reminds me I would listen to the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), but I would not heed him.

MR. NEARY: The hatchet man.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, that may be the reason that today the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has conceived his great admiration for me, his burning passion that I would listen to him but would not heed him.

MR. NEARY: The hatchet man.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) on occasion. I do not think I have interrupted him. I would remind him that the rules of this House say that the member speaking has the right to make his speech without interruption -

MR. NEARY: Tell them what you can.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - and I would say, Sir, the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that I would request him- he can speak when he wishes, he does ad nauseam in this House-let him follow the rules, Sir, at least when I am speaking and I shall do my level best to follow the rules when he is speaking.

MR. BOUT: You did not listen to him when he wanted the nomination rigged.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I did not listen to him when he wanted the nomination rigged. No, of course not.

Mr. Speaker, it will all come out one of these days about a number of secret meetings that were not held in the basement of

MR. NEARY: Anyone who would make that remark has got all the characteristics of a rat.

MR. ROBERTS: - were not held in the basement -

MR. NEARY: You have all the characteristics of a rat.

MR. ROBERTS: - were not held in the basement of -

MR. NEARY: How are you rigger?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, there but for trick of fate would have been the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), but as I say, Sir, that was a meeting which was not held in the basement of my friend from Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) and so it is hardly relevant for debate here.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other point I wanted to make in this debate.

MR. NEARY: Well, well, well.

MR. SIMMONS: - you did not know that before?

MR. ROBERTS: There are a number of people who could testify to that one.

MR. NEARY: The characteristics of a rat.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make now, Sir, deals with certain remarks made by the member from Kilbride, not in his capacity as House Leader but speaking as a member of the House and particularly as a member of the Government. The minister when he spoke now I did not hear his speech but The Evening Telegram which generally reports these matters with a degree of accuracy said that the minister, I quote from the 14th. of May, The Evening Telegram, a story headed, "Twenty-three thousand new jobs created during five year period." The Minister Without Portfolio, Bob Wells, P.C., Kilbride, said in the Legislature Thursday that statistics show that there were 23,000 new jobs created in the Province in the five year period between 1970 and 1975." And I think that is an accurate statement. I do not quarrel with that. But I think there are some facts which should be borne in mind when looking at that statement. Because like so many things, Sir, we must look at the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth and, Sir, we have

MR. ROBERTS: only had part of the truth on this question of job creations.

Mr. Speaker, let me put forward some of those facts. First of all, although the hon. gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) did not say so specifically, in effect he is trying to take credit for him and for his colleagues for all of the jobs created in Newfoundland in these last four or five years. To do so, Sir, would be to assume that no jobs have been created by the private sector of the economy, no jobs have been created at all by the private sector, and that simply is not so. Much of the employment in this Province, Sir, is created by the private sector and much of the employment in the private sector in turn is created without any reference at all to government programmes.

The minister neglected to mention, Sir, that while the number of people working was far higher, the number of people looking for work was very much higher in 1975 than it was in 1970. In fact, Sir, on an average over the twelve month period it was 250 per cent higher in 1975 than it was in 1970. So for every ten people looking for work in 1970 in this Province, twenty-five people were looking for work in 1975. And that should be borne in mind, Sir, because while there have been a large number of new jobs created in this Province, some of them presumably a result of action by the government, there are also, Sir, an even larger number of people who are unemployed in this Province, not just larger in numbers but far larger as a percentage of the work force.

The unemployment rate for 1975, Mr. Speaker, was almost exactly double the rate for 1970 in this Province. Obviously even though there has been some growth in the employment levels, the growth has been insufficient to meet the demands of a

MR. ROBERTS: growing labour force.

During the first four months of 1976, Sir, the year we are now in, there has been a deterioration in the unemployment situation. The unemployment rate for this April is at the highest level it has been at for all but one other month since January 1970. The unemployment rate in April was 16.3 per cent. In January 1975 it reached 16.7 per cent, marginally higher. The number of unemployment in April 1976 in this Province, Sir, was the highest ever, 28,000 men and women, the highest level we have ever had in this Province since statistics have been kept.

I want to point out, Sir, in the effect to put all the facts down, that that level was equalled in June, 1974 and in January, 1975. But in each of those months, Sir, there is a reason, a unique and special reason which does not apply now. In June of 1974 we had the ice hit along the Northeast Coast and there was no fishing activity at all in the area north of, say, Baccalieu, Split Point, right down to Cape Bald and around; and in January, 1975 of course, the height of the trawlermen's strike and the deep sea fishing industry was closed because the trawlermen were on strike, a great victory which they finally won, and of course the plants along the Southwest Coast, the Burin Peninsula and the Western Shore and here in St. John's were closed.

The participation rates, Sir, the hon. gentleman from Miramichi (Mr. Wells), made great reference to the participation rate having gone up. We said it had gone from 43.4 per cent in 1970 to 49.2 per cent in 1975. It should be noted, Sir, that that rate is below the peak levels we reached in 1973, the participation rate is lower, is lower now than it was at the peak. We have nothing to boast of there.

MR. PORTIS: During the period 1970-75 the largest increase in the level of unemployment from March to April, any two months was 2,000 and that came in 1973. In March, 1973 there were 18,000 unemployed out of a work force of 163,000 for an unadjusted unemployment rate of 11.0 per cent. Compare that to the 16.3 per cent we have in April, the last month completed, the last month for which we have figures.

In April, 1973 the unemployment in total jumped from 18,000 to 20,000, a jump of 2,000. What is the record this winter, Sir?

MR. ROBERTS:

In 1976 the level unemployed in Newfoundland - and in each case the figures are the same; in each case we are using the new Statistics Canada figures, the new method of calculation related back as the hon. Minister of Finance knows, the figures have been recalculated back to 1970 on the new statistical method. Between January, February, March, those three months this year, our unemployment level, our total, held at 25,000. Then it jumped by 3,000 in April month. Heaven alone knows what it will be in this month of May. It should go way down.

MR. NEARY: These figures are not accurate. There are about 35,000 or 40,000 Newfoundlanders.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who knows so much about everything says these figures are not accurate. I am not saying they are accurate. I am merely reading the figures produced by Statistics Canada which I believe are as accurate, Sir, as any statement made by the gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). If he has other figures, Sir, let him bring them out. What I am talking about, Sir, are the figures produced by Statistics Canada. They are by the new technique right back to 1970. I am comparing apples and apples and oranges and oranges.

MR. NEARY: Just the ones who do not report for work every year.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sure there are. And there are a dozen not taken into account under employment either.

MR. NEARY: That is right. There are about 35,000 or 40,000 -

MR. ROBERTS: It does not take into account all sort of things. But what it does take into account is a comparable basis. The point that I am making is that while 23,000 new jobs have been created, the average level of employment of the twelve months of 1970 was 129,000 people working. For the year 1975, 152,000 people working on an average over the twelve months. But the number unemployed has gone up from 10,000 unemployed per month each month during 1970 to 25,000 unemployed per month each month on an average over 1975.

MR. NEARY: Much greater.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the hon. gentleman says it is much greater. Maybe it is but that does not take away from the validity of the point. If the hon. gentleman has some information that is more relevant or more up to date then I will gladly listen to him use it. And I do not quarrel. I think these figures are inaccurate and that they are estimates and they do not reflect under-employment, they do not reflect people who dropped out of the work force. What they do reflect, Sir, is an accurate comparison of month to month and year to year. By that standard, Sir, the record of this government has been abysmally bad. It has been shoddy in the extreme. They have not produced new jobs. No argument of that. You can challenge it but you cannot argue with it successfully.

The hon. gentleman for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) made such a point of his remarks that I thought it was only fair that the record should be made complete. That is why I want to read these other figures into the record and make them public. They are quite available but often, Sir, hon. members are busy with other things and do not take the time to look them up. It is time, Sir, that we all realized that we have nothing at all to be satisfied with. Indeed, Sir, if we should be looking at anything in this Province in the light of fiscal policy it should be to try to expand expenditure so that we can expand demand. That is what the federal government should be doing too. They should be bringing in a policy of regional fiscal and monetary support and they should be supportive of an increasing demand in this Province.

MR. DOODY Want to bet on it.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not going to make any bets on it. But I am saying what they should be doing in my view, and what the government of the Province should be doing in my view. They should be looking at expenditures, Sir, in the productive side of the economy because, Sir, that is our problem. It is not that we are spending too much. We may be spending all we can afford. We may be spending more than

MR. ROBERTS:

we should if we are going to take a miserly, a Scrooge-like, a sit-in-the-chimney-corner attitude. But we are not spending enough to do the job in this Province, Sir. Do not let anybody be the least bit under any apprehensions about that.

Mr. Speaker, let me also point out another fact about these figures which of course apply to the whole of this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. These figures really do not reveal the worst aspect of the economic situation. It is one which I have most recently seen brought out in a report which DREE submitted to the Standing Committee of the House of Commons on regional development. It has been published. It is a little book reviewing the economic prospects of the four Atlantic Provinces. As far as I know it has not been challenged. It is not like APEC. I was quite surprised when I read that the Minister of Industrial Development today felt that APEC was - what? - childish, I think, was the word he used or juvenile, some word to that effect. I hope he will produce the evidence which I am sure he has to substantiate those statements because they are very - here comes the minister now to his seat.

I was referring to a story in today's issue of the Telegram where the minister said that APEC - well I will read an extract or two. As far as I know they are right over an excellent story about some change in the rules of the House which I commend to the members. Yes the minister said he was amazed like a body like APEC which has such a high profile in the Atlantic Region "Publishes information that is so juvenile in it's analysis." I assume that is an accurate quotation. I mean I do not know what the minister said to the Telegram. I only know what the Telegram reported.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What are they talking about in that comment?

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know if he knows what he is talking about. I will tell him what the Telegram says he was talking about. What he was talking about was the APEC newsletter which came out within the last few days, the monthly newsletter. It was the one that "Forecwar

MR. ROBERTS:

a poor economic outlook for Newfoundland."

MR. LUNDRIKAN: On a point of order. We used to have this little rule of clarification. I was referring to and it stated in the article, I would presume, a January economic outlook article on all of the Atlantic Provinces in which there was an article on the Province of Newfoundland filled with errors, factual data, inaccuracies and we did have an analysis done by Mr. Dave Vardy. I think that might be part of their planning priorities secretariate. We did an analysis. It was a very, very poor article and we are writing the APEC people involved to express our concern that they do not have this quite clear in the record.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Of course there was no point of order there. What I would suggest when an hon. member would wish to make a clarification if he would ask the hon. member speaking if he would yield for a moment, and if the hon. member yields then he can make his explanation. If he does not of course, he would have to wait for another opportunity.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. I was not about to take a slap at the hon. gentleman.

MR. LUNDRIKAN: I wanted to make an explanation.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I am glad he did, but the Telegram does not mention January. It says, "He (the minister) said one of their newsletters earlier this year," It could have been January, February, March, April. I mean, I know not. It did not mention Mr. Vardy. He talked about the Planning and Priorities Secretary. That may have been Mr. Vardy at the time.

We should, Mr. Speaker, along those lines think of something. I mean, if the minister wanted to make a clarification, I would have yielded and let him say what he wished of course. But there ought to be something. The minister is a bit of an expert on raising points of order that as we get along through them turn out to be anything but

MR. ROBERTS:

procedural points of order.

MR. LUNDRIGAN I have not got the background of the hon. member in this House.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the hon. gentleman may not have whatever background

I am alleged to have. He certainly has not got the foreground that a

lot of people allege he has either. But the fact remains that there

ought to be some procedure, Sir. In hockey do they not fine people

when they do things wrong. Maybe the hon. gentleman should have a

fine, lose two minute penalty off his time, Sir, every time he raises

a point of order. By that stage—

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You cannot take it.

MR. ROWE: Rules are rules.

MR. ROBERTS: By that stage, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman would

now be about up to 1981, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Stop commencing.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman opposite —

MR. ROWE: Now look. You see what kind of —

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman opposite — I started

out now and he has led me astray again, Sir. I started out to make

a reference to him that was complimentary. I started out to make —

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You started out to — (inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh! Listen to him.

Listen to him.

MR. ROWE: What kind of garbage and scum is that?

MR. ROBERTS: The poor little boy listen to him. Of all the

childish, juvenile, foolishness that the hon. gentleman gets off with

that, Sir, is the most —

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You arrogant scum!

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman know that an arrogant

scum is unparliamentary.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has obviously dined

too well. Either that or he has lost control of himself. Mr. Speaker,

I have never yet run into anybody who parades the poor mouth quite as

MR. ROBERTS:

ludicrously or as mealy-mouthedly as does the gentleman, the minister of Industrial Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Never in my life have I seen anything like that. The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, came into this debate, Sir, unaware of what was happening, broke in on a spurious and specious point of order. And he is the man who keeps lecturing us in this House and outside about regard for the House, and now insists on interrupting. Then he gets up with his mealy-mouthed backwardness, Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUNDRIGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: - with his mealy-mouthed backwardness wearing his sackcloth and ashes, Sir, wrapping himself in a seamless garment.

As for the gentleman for Bay Of Islands he never once during his -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman for Bay Of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) never once during his remarks this afternoon and this evening never once asked members on either side to desist in any way. Indeed he seemed to feel and rightly so that members were enjoying his speech which is more than we can say for any speech the gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) can make, Sir.

Mr. Roberts:

The hon. gentleman from the Bay of Island (Mr. Woodrow) could take it, the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) could not, cannot and will not. And then he gets up and the only word I can find to use it is at all parliamentary, and yet accurate is mealey mouthed, mealey mouthed.

MR. ROWE: Parliamentary reasoning.

MR. ROBERTS: He somehow resents the fact that my father happened to be a doctor, happens, he is still licensed to practice medicine, in this Province, a doctor here in St. John's, if somehow that had something to do with me.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Not your father, you.

MR. ROBERTS: And I went to a school called St. Andrew's College and so did the Premier and so did the gentleman from St. John's West. And so what! I went there on a scholarship, Sir, and that is what paid most of my fees.

MR. DOODY: My knees were not pretty enough for a kilt.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the hon. Minister of Finance says, his knees were not pretty enough for a kilt. He may not, Sir, have been pretty enough for a scarlet tunic with brass buttons on it.

MR. DOODY: That is also true.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from Harbour Main-Bell Island is proof of the fact that all the girls love a soldier in his scarlet tunic. Mr. Speaker, he should be very careful of the Cadet Corp. The Premier, if I am not mistaken, before my time was Commanding Officer or whatever they call it, a Commander of the Cadet Corp.

PREMIER MOORES: A very august position.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

PREMIER MOORES: A very august position.

MR. ROBERTS: It was, and is a very august position, and one of considerable responsibility and the Premier discharged it well. Unlike the gentleman from Grand Falls, (Mr. Lundrigan), Sir, who has not even risen at this stage to be a lance Corporal.

Mr. Roberts:

Mr. Speaker, let me go on, before the hon. gentleman came back into the debate and interrupted and produced this quite irrelevant -

MR. SIMMONS: Opened his mouth to change feet.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the fact I was making is that the report which DREF, the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion submitted to the Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Rural Development -

MR. SIMMONS: Regional Development.

MR. ROBERTS: Regional Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is his advisor there on protocol.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would rather have the hon. gentleman from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) advising me on protocol or anything else than I would have the gentleman from Grand Falls advising me on substance or protocol based on the content of his office to date.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that, and I commend this report -

MR. NEARY: You are not contributing much to this debate.

MR. ROBERTS: I commend this report to the minister if he has not seen it. And if he has not seen it I will send it to him that DREF submitted a report, it is a fairly small one, to the Commons Standing Committee on Regional Development, several weeks ago. And it made the point, Sir, quite strongly and with evidence to support it that the per capita income on the Avalon Peninsula is now substantially higher than it is in the rest of the Province. And the gap, Sir, which I am told is 50 per cent on the average, is much higher now than it was in 1971. In other words, we have within this Province regional disparity, the Avalon Peninsula, and particularly within the St. John's area, is far better off economically than is the rest of this Province. And, you know, that is staggering, I have never before seen it drawn out, I think most of us instinctively might have felt that way.

MR. NEARY: That is where the high concentration of mucky mucks are, in St. John's.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Justice says, he questions it.

MR. HICKMAN: I would question that the per capita income on the Avalon Peninsula is higher than the per capita income in Labrador West.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh it might be, Labrador West is, as the gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) would tell us, an unusual district in that there is, as far as I know nobody unemployed in Labrador West and the people who are employed - although I was speaking the other day to the gentleman from Menihek who made the point, when I made this point to him about the fact that per capita incomes in Labrador West are high, he said, "Yes, if you work for the Iron Ore Companies."

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: But everybody else - and the one-third, and this is why we need housing.

MR. PECKFORD: The service industries.

MR. ROBERTS: Right.

MR. PECKFORD: - employs as many if not more as it is today than does the two mining companies.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Municipal Affairs makes the point, and that is why we need housing down there. Because I said to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the gentleman from Menihek, I said, "Look why do you need low rental housing and geared income?" And he said, "We have people whose incomes are below that what they would need to afford economic housing, economic rental housing." And I said, "But you have got the highest per capita income." And he said, "We do, and then he made this point about the service industries.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that the evidence has been laid before the Standing Committee at Ottawa, and in the absence of a challenge based on evidence I accept it. Because it is worse than that. Not only is the gap widening, not only are the average incomes here on the Avalon Peninsula, and more so in St. John's, going up higher than are average incomes elsewhere, but the unemployment rate in this Province is far higher once you go West of the Isthmus of

Mr. Roberts:

Avalon, The unemployment rate on the Avalon Peninsula was 14.4 per cent in 1975, on an average. High, but 14.4 per cent. And the rate for the rest of this Province was 21.8 per cent. You cannot get it broken down beyond that because - but I will deal with the point which I think -

MR. HICKMAN: DPEF does not want it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I say to the Minister of Justice that maybe - I do not know what DREE want or do not want, but the minister has access to the Central Statistical Services here who work in the Executive Council Department and, you know, let him ask them to prepare the information. I am sure whatever information is available - I have a lot of respect for these fellows down here, you know, in the Central Statistical Services and the Planning Priorities Group and all that sort of thing, and let the minister - you know, they will not listen to me, why should they? but they will listen to the minister.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: In Grand Falls-Rotwood area they must have a low.

MR. ROBERTS: Well let me deal with that, because that just underlines the point of what I am saying, Mr. Speaker. It just underlines the point of what I am saying.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Okay you are right.

MR. ROBERTS: Very much so. Because it is 21.8 per cent in the Province outside the Avalon Peninsula. Okay? Call it 22 per cent. It is 14.5 per cent on the Avalon Peninsula. The St. John's Metropolitan area itself is performing at a rate not far off the Canadian average. It is not far off in St. John's. We have a lot of unemployment, but, you know, it is not far off the Canadian average as a whole, it is too much, you know, but it is not as bad as elsewhere. Rural Newfoundland and Labrador is obviously falling further and further behind because the figures of 21.8 per cent include Labrador City, Wabush, the Stephenville area, Port aux Basques, Churchill Falls, Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Gander, Lewisporte, all of them, communities that are reasonably prosperous, all of them communities that you cannot, as far as I know, and I say this to the Minister of Justice,

Mr. Roberts:

you cannot get unemployment figures by community, I have never seen them.

MR. HICKMAN No because Port au Port, Churchill Falls have full employment. Labrador City -

MR. ROBERTS: Full employment is usually to find is 3 per cent or 4 per cent unemployment because any given time you have a number of the workers moving jobs.

MR. HICKMAN Burin Peninsula, pretty well full employment.

MR. ROBERTS: Right.

MR. HODDER: Port au Port is 50 per cent.

MR. ROBERTS: But how much worse does that make it? Because the Minister of Justice says the Burin Peninsula full employment, and I agree, and Labrador West full employment and I agree, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs says the area between Botwood and Grand Falls up through Bishop's and Windsor, you know, high employment, low unemployment. Well how much worse does that make it, Sir, elsewhere in this Province? And that is the point I am making; that we have very, very serious regional disparities in this Province and they are getting worse, and this is where the Minister for Rural Development should be listening carefully because this is the measure of the problem that he must tackle. The unemployment, Mr. Speaker, is infinitely worse now, and those of us and many of us on this side, Sir, represent rural districts. Maybe, Sir, that is why -

MR. LUNDRIEAN: I will be announcing -

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe, Mr. Speaker, that is why people in the rural areas turn to the Liberal Party and reject the Tory Party.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: But my friend from Port au Port district tells me the unemployment out there is 50 per cent, there is one out of every two people in that district is unemployed. My friend from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) other than in Baie Verte itself in the mining areas, my own district the Straits of Belle Isle and elsewhere.

MR. SIMMONS: Bay d'Espoir.

MR. ROBERTS: Bay d'Espoir, and you can go on and on, the rural areas of this Province, and, Mr. Speaker, that is a fact that should be hammered home to the Minister of Rural Development. And he talked, I thought I heard him say, doom and gloom. The gloom and doomsday in this House is either the elderly gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) or the gentleman from St. John's West, either of whom is competing.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And the hon. Leader of the Opposition objected to me clarifying a point. He did not want to hear about it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I object to the Minister of Rural Development for many, many, many reasons not the least of them being his propensity of playing the cheapest sort of politics which is the reason why, Sir, the constituents who sent him originally to the House of Commons rejected him, and he would not go back to them the third time, Sir, he went instead to a neighbouring district and they saw through him.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: He was afraid, in the last election, to meet the challenge.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: He would not run in my riding.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. ROWE: What is wrong, my son?

MR. ROBERTS: What challenge? I ran in the same riding I have been in all along except it was gerrymandered despite the recommendations of the royal commission, despite the assurance of the Minister of Justice that never again would we see a gerrymandering in this Province -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Go to Grand Falls the next time.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I will go to Grand Falls to run if the hon. gentleman will go to the Straits of Belle Isle to run. Let him carry the Tory colours down there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Let him carry the Tory colours down there. And the hon. gentleman, Sir, might not be too glib about Grand Falls if he had seen the surveys that I have seen the last two or three weeks.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right. That is right.

Mr. Roberts.

We will see, yes, we will see, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman went to the smallest riding, but one or two in this whole Province, a little pocket burrow carved out. Why did he not go to Fogo? Because he went down to Fogo district, and the Tory Party spent all the money doing the survey, and they came back and they said, "Premier our advice is that you not send any man you want to get elected; namely, Mr. Jonathon Esq. to Fogo district because he will get his socks stripped." And that is when the hon. gentleman began his political love affair with the district of Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Grand Falls the next time.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, Sir, has dined either too well or not at all. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has made a political career of running away, hippity-skoppiting from district to district. He is the last one in this world, Sir, who should be heard to raise that certain of question in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as a final comment regarding the level of job creation in this Province, I think it is very interesting to note where the growth in jobs has come these last three or four years. The data is really available only for the years 1970-1974. The number of employees in public administration increased from 8,600 to 10,700, an increase of twenty-four per cent, twenty-four point four per cent. The growth in the number of employees during the same period in other industries as follows; community business and personal services up twelve point five per cent; finance, insurance and real estate thirty-seven point five per cent, mortgage brokers; trade, wholesale and retail up twenty-eight per cent; utilities, transportation and communications twenty-three per cent; construction minus twenty per cent; manufacturing up twenty-one per cent.- although the preliminary figures for 1975 show a decline in this.- mining holds even, 5,900 employees either way; forestry up five per cent;

Mr. Roberts.

fisheries, full-time, part-time and casual employees between seventy and seventy-three are up twenty-five per cent, from 1,621 to 2,078.

MR. DOODY: As I said there was a very low percentage of people in that department before. It is a very small department.

MR. ROBERTS: It is? No, I am talking not of people in departments. I am talking of employment in the whole industrial sector. But, of course, the offshore fishery what employment it gives is mainly ashore, you know, in the fish plants. The inshore fishery has dropped eighteen per cent, from 16,000 to 13,200.

You know what comes out of the figures, Mr. Speaker, is that what major growth in employment we have seen in this Province since 1970 has taken place in the public sector, in the service sector, in retail wholesale trade and in transportation and communications and utilities. And in total, Sir, about 15,000 jobs were created there from 1970 to 1974. We only had 23,000 in five years and 15,000 in four years were in those sectors. Very few jobs if any were created during the period in the resource or manufacturing industries where the government claims to be having so much success. I should add, Mr. Speaker, if anybody wants to compare these back with the unemployment figures they do not necessarily tally because the unemployment figures are fairly complete. The unemployment figures tend to regard upon sampling techniques which ignore and have to ignore some of the smaller firms.

The employment in the Provincial Civil Service Sir, is worth-while. In 1970 the budget speech mentioned that the number of people employed by the Treasury of the Province was 20,415. The Fall budget for 1975, last November, gave the figure as 28,550, 8,300 increase in those five years.

MR. DOODY: Teachers are not the public service.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, yes. That is the public service. It includes

Mr. Roberts.

teachers, hospital workers, the civil service as it used to be called here in the building, Hydro, Housing Corporation, everybody paid out of the chest, everybody paid out of the billion dollars that the Minister of Finance will spend or the spending of which he will supervise this year. So, you know what is happening is that more and more of our work force is being employed in the - what did I say? - non-productive -

I do not mean that these people do not earn their keep, but in the side of the work force that does not increase significantly the Gross Provincial Product or the real Gross Provincial Product of this Province. And the Gross Provincial Product - the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) tends to use it as if it were some sort of magic talisman - is a very bad indicator, because it includes, for example, the iron ore mines in Labrador West, which contribute hundreds of millions of dollars to the Gross Provincial Product, but very little reasonably, very little really to the employment or to the treasury or to anybody else in the Province. You know, the value of the iron ore mines I do not suppose we keep five per cent of it here in this Province. The rest of it goes out of the Province.

MR. ROUSSEAU: What percentage?

MR. ROBERTS: I picked that out of the air - the gentleman from Menihok (Mr. Rousseau). It may be five or ten in salaries, in purchases and in the tax revenues that come in. It is not a very large amount. It may be ten per cent. Oh, it is a lot of dollars. But I make the point only for the benefit of the member for Menihok (Mr. Rousseau) in saying that the Gross Provincial Product is not a very useful industry in this Province. The fisheries, which are a very small part of our Gross Provincial Product - I do not know what the percentage is, and I do not have it here - but they might be, say, ten per cent of our Gross Provincial Product. But the value of fish landed in Newfoundland last year was \$42 million. Is of that order as the Minister of Fisheries, I think,

Mr. Roberts.

would concur. I do not know. It may be \$40 million or \$45 million but \$42 million sticks in my mind, and yet that employees thousands of workers whereas the iron ore mines may have contributed \$300 million or \$400 million to the Gross Provincial Product, and they employ far fewer workers than do the fisheries. I do not say that is anything against iron ore. I do say it as a caution against accepting the Gross Provincial Product as being a very useful measure of anything. There are better industries that we can use and develop.

Mr. Speaker, I made a number of points that I think are relevant and relative to the budget. I could go on at much length about many of the points, but I think my colleagues have covered most of the points which we wish to make. I am very proud of the way in which the gentlemen and members on this side have spoken in this debate, I think, particularly of the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) and the gentleman from Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) and the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning) and a very excellent speech by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) today and a number of others of my colleagues who spoke in the budget.

MR. ROWE: Pat Canning.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I mentioned Pat Canning. He made an excellent, excellent, excellent speech, the wisdom of years. It is easy to see why the gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning) has been elected to this House eight times, Sir, you know, in the same area. I do not think there is anybody in the history of this Province can ever equal that. The gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) who has gone home - we have driven him out - the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) has been elected eight times, but in about seven or six different constituencies, but the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning) has been elected eight times by essentially the same constituents. The same people

Mr. Roberts.

sent him back here time, after time, after time, but excellent speeches, Sir. I think the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) made some excellent points, Sir, that I would hope the government would take. He and I are seat mates in Labrador. We are seats adjoined. The most northerly portion of the Labrador part of my seat is the southern boundary of his seat, the most northerly community in my area is Red Bay and the most southerly community, the permanent community in his area is - I am not sure if it is Battle Harbour or Mary's Harbour, whichever is the more southerly of those two. But, Sir, all of us who are involved in Labrador and have ever have occasion to be in touch with the people of Labrador - I think the gentleman for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) would agree and the gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) tends to be a little wishy-washy, but made much the same points today. They are very deeply concerned about the separatist feeling.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Be nice now.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) does not like it, I suggest he leave. Mr. Speaker, when I say the gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) is being wishy-washy, I am being nice, Sir. If I would talk about the hon. gentleman's public record, what he says in Labrador, and what he says here - this was the same man the newspapers told us who shook hands, Sir, with an effigy of one of his colleagues, the gentleman from St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) who was being burned at a public ceremony. And all I say, Sir, is that what one is in this House one must be outside this House, and I say that the speech made today by the gentleman for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) in my view was wishy-washy.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Is that a fact?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am against almost everything the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) does. I very much welcome his decision -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER:

I must direct the hon. gentleman to my left to allow the hon. gentleman who is speaking to my right to do so without interruption.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I apologize for that, Your Honour.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, will he heed Your Honour's ruling?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for getting intralld in this kind of a shouting match, and I will heed Your Honour's direction.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I take his apology for what it is worth. Well, Mr. Speaker, I say I take it for what it is worth, and I have my own views as to what it is worth, and I find it very decent of him, Sir, to say that he will heed Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. Speaker, the point I was making is that all of us who represent Labrador constituencies, and mine in part, say, Labrador constituency, are very deeply concerned about this separatist movement, very deeply concerned about this feeling that exists in

MR. ROBERTS:

Labrador. And I do not want to repeat what the gentleman for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) said today but I would think it was very, very worth-while I think his words were words which should be heeded and considered because unless the policies he advocated are adopted one must fear for the unity of this Province. I was very glad he made the point - it was better coming from a Labradorian than it was from a resident of the Island - that the feeling is not one of joining Quebec. Far from it. The feeling is one of territory or as - I see the gentleman for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) is back in his seat. I am told he was recently wearing a placard saying - what was it 'Ian'? One Labrador Or What?

MR. STRACHAN: "One Province or what?"

MR. ROWE: Do not ask 'Ian'.

MR. ROBERTS: "One Province Or What", was the hon. gentleman's placard. And if I am done him a misservice - or carrying a sign - if I am done him a misservice I would be the first, Sir, to regret that and the first to apologize for it. But I am told by friends of mine in Labrador that the hon. gentleman was carrying a sign saying - if the hon. gentleman could remind me what it was. There was an incident.

DR. FARRELL: Carrying a sign.

MR. ROBERTS: What did it say? It was not the one that said "Burn John Crosbie". The hon. gentleman was not carrying that, no. What did the sign say then? Correct me.

One Province -

MR. ROBERTS: "One Province Or -

MR. DOODY: What."

MR. ROBERTS: "One Province Or What." Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the sentiment. It is a worthy one and it would be even worthier if there was no "Or What" on it. It would be even worthier if there was no indication that anybody in public life in this Province can accept anything except one Province and we will work hard to make it

MR. ROBERTS:

so. What the gentleman for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) was saying this afternoon, what I say tonight - I believe the gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Coudie) and the gentleman for Menihek (Mr. Pousseau) feel this way - is that the people of Labrador are not going to accept the present state of affairs. Unless the government and the people of this Province show that there is a change then, Sir, the 'Or What' may become 'Or Something Else'. What struck me about that sign or placard, whatever one wants to call it, was that it was an alternative, either-or, this or that.

Well I say there is no alternative. I say the duty of the public men of this Province, this House of Assembly and of all who wish to be in it and all who are in it is to preserve, to fight, to maintain and to develop. If we cannot develop then at least maintain as one Province, Sir. I thought the gentleman for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) today made an excellent speech, one which I hope will be taken to heart.

Hon. gentlemen opposite may not like what I say from time to time and that is their perfect privilege. They may even from time to time on rare occasions be right in not agreeing with what I say. But let them listen to the gentleman for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). He speaks with knowledge and with passion and with conviction and says here in St. John's what he says in Nain or in Goose Bay or anywhere in Labrador. That, Sir, is a man and a policy which I admire and which I applaud.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against the budget. When the division is called the minister will have an hour or more if he needs it, but at least an hour, before we adjourn this evening to respond to what members on both sides have said.

MR. DOODY: The federal budget is on at ten o'clock.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I said ten earlier and somebody said ten thirty.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We need a half hour to get home.

MR. ROBERTS: Well it may take the hon. gentleman a half hour to

MR. ROBERTS:

get home. I can take twenty minutes to get home without breaking the speed laws. I do not know where the hon. gentleman lives or how he gets from here to there. But, Mr. Speaker, you know the minister has at least an hour and if he needs longer of course he is welcome to it.

I have made some points which I think should be made by one speaking for the Liberal Party in this House. I wanted to reject what I think to be the disastrous policy advocated by the gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). I have given my reasons why I think it is disastrous, it is unworkable, it is unrealistic, it is unthinkable. I have also given my view that it is not a Liberal philosophy. The hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) entertained us at some length.

MR. NEARY: It is just as Liberal as the anti-labour theme.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) entertained us at some length with recitations, quotations from men who have been associated with the Liberal Party in Canada and in the United Kingdom in the past. All I will say, Sir, is that the policy which he advocates has nothing at all to do with the policy advocated by any of those men.

MR. NEARY: What about the unfair labour practices?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is referring to the fact that the Battery Motel, a company in which I have no interest at all -

MR. NEARY: You just have to be kidding.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is on the verge of saying something that is unparliamentary. I tell him I have no interest in it direct or indirect. The company is owned -

MR. NEARY: Can you prove it?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not need to prove it. Let the hon. gentleman disprove it.

MR. ROWE: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: I say, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: I can tell the hon. gentleman-

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman, Sir, let him disprove it. I have made - as a matter of fact I took a sworn oath to that effect on my conflict of interest statement, and it is true. If he feels somehow that a company with which I have no connection, except my father happens to be the majority shareholder - go down and look it up in the Peigstry of Companies in the member's infamous research.

MR. NEARY: I have already done that.

MR. ROBERTS: I have no direct or indirect interest unless the hon. gentleman wants to hold against me the fact that I bought \$1600 worth of bonds out of about 500,000 issued. That gives me a really major interest in the company.

MR. NEARY: A lot of my fellow Bell Islanders bought them too.

MR. ROBERTS: Fine. Good for them, Sir.

MR. NEARY: And they lost their shirts.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir, nobody has lost his shirt. The hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) may have lost his head.

MR. NEARY: No. They lost their shirts.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am not going -

MR. NEARY: If he does not soon sit down he may lose his head.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get into this sort of thing. We have already seen one example in this session of the House. The gentleman for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) was subjected to the friendly attentions of the gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and if he wants to turn his attention to me come ahead and if he has the courage to say anything outside the House and not hide behind the cloak of legislative anonymity, if he says anything that is untrue or libelous he will be invited, Sir, to his day in court and we will see then if he has got the courage to back up his words or whether he wants to hide, as he does, behind legislative anonymity, behind the shield of parliamentary immunity.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's record is one of consistent cowardice, pretending or masquerading as public interest. That speaks for itself. Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Very aristocratic! An aristocratic view. Tell us about all the money in the other things.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I shall have to direct -

MR. NEARY: Tell us about the Halfway House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I shall have to give the same direction to the hon. gentleman at my right as I gave a few minutes ago to another hon. member at my left, and that is that there should be no further interruptions.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And really the gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) and the gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to quote Kipling are sisters under the skin, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Halfway House, you were in, that too.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I had no interest in halfway House, none at all, direct or indirect.

MR. NEARY: What made you leave cabinet when we were discussing it?

MR. ROBERTS: I had no interest direct or indirect in it. I left the cabinet when the matter was discussed, Sir, because my father had an interest in it and I did not think it appropriate to stay there and by arrangement with the Premier of the time it was arranged - why did not the hon. gentleman resign from cabinet if he is so tender?

MR. NEARY: Well I almost did but the hon. member -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman almost did.

MR. NEARY: Almost did.

MR. ROBERTS: He almost did, Sir. He almost walked on the water on a number of occasions but all that happened is he fell in and got wet.

MR. NEARY You built it for \$425,000 and we paid \$1,250,000 for it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman paid -

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

I must now insist that the hon. gentleman refrain from any further interruptions.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman and the government paid nothing to me or to any company with which I was associated directly or indirectly and that is all need be said. If he wants to make an attack upon my father that is the hon. gentleman's pleasure, Sir. I would regard that in the same way that the gentleman for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) felt about the attack the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) made on the hon. gentleman for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) wife, his law partners and their wives.

MR. NEARY: No attack. That is a lie, a deliberate lie.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that please, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member will have to withdraw that statement.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have said what I wish to say and despite the gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and despite the gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) I think the points which have been made by members on this side are very relevant. I would hope the Minister of Finance in concluding this debate will deal with some of them.

I am particularly anxious, Sir, to hear him deal again with the insane policy of this \$250, million cut and with the persistently repeated views of the gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) that we are on the verge of bankruptcy or insolvency or some state in between. Mr. Speaker, as I have said I shall vote against the budget, my colleagues shall vote against the budget. It is too bad the gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) is - I do not know if he is gone home or not but he is not in his seat - I hope, Sir, he will take his stand on this because he has, as the record shows, consistently voted with the government and that, Sir, maybe the first harbinger of the coming coalition. Thank you, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

May 25, 1976

Tape 2928

IB-7

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

+ MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I will be extremely brief. But there are a few points that should be made before the Minister of Finance

MR. J. CARTER: concludes this debate I would like to take issue with the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) and to some extent with the Leader of the Opposition and to a much lesser extent with the government itself. Although I intend to support this budget and vote for it nevertheless there are a few minor points, perhaps not so minor, that I think should be made.

First of all I was very heartened to see that the Opposition voted to absolve the government from all possible blame. They voted almost - well to a man. Curiously enough the government on the other hand voted to accept all the blame. Well it is certainly true that the government should accept responsibility but I think this is probably carrying it a bit too far. We would not have ended up this way, Mr. Speaker, except that Your Honour ruled that my sub-amendment was part and parcel of a vote of non-confidence. It was not intended to be so but since it was ruled as such therefore procedurally, I had no choice but to vote against my own sub-amendment. However, be that as it may, I do find it curious, or a curious reversal that the government should take all responsibility whereas the Opposition should vote to absolve it. Anyway it will go down in history I suppose.

The member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) is wearing a very strange -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Why did not he write that in the first place?

MR. J. CARTER: He has not got that originality.

The member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) is wearing a very **strange cloak**. I have never heard a greater stream of hypocrisy in my life. The first twenty-three of Confederation were marred by the most frenzied period of financial **finagling** **it is possible to imagine and therefore, I think, that** is enough said.

When we talk about the enormous budget today we should always bear in mind the tremendous inflation that has

MR. J. CARTER: occurred even in the last five years. I think one is hardly exaggerating if you say that in the last five years some prices have doubled, the price of oil, the price of cars, wages -

MR. NEARY: Savoury.

MR. J. CARTER: Well that is a private matter. However, Mr. Speaker -

MR. YOUNG: It is still a bargain.

MR. J. CARTER: It is still a bargain, yes.

So therefore when we talk about a \$2 billion debt, if you talk in 1970 or 1971 terms it is much nearer \$1 billion. \$1 billion is a lot of money in any terms, but I do think that inflation is helping to shrink our debt. I would hope that we could avoid excessive borrowing in the future but I would like to come to that in a few moments.

I said earlier, at the outset, that I would be voting for the budget with the government. There may very well come a time when I would vote against the government and for instance that time would certainly come if a square inch of this Province were to be given to Quebec - and I think many members agree with me -

SOME NON-MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. J. CARTER: - on any pretext whatsoever. Yes.

The resources of Labrador and of this Island itself are very considerable and I am disappointed that it is not possible to purchase or lease on a long term or semi-permanent basis large tracts of woodland to harvest on a perpetual yield basis. This is a disappointment. I think it is an oversight and I think it could make a great deal of difference to our economy.

MR. NEARY: What does the hon. gentleman suggest?

MR. J. CARTER: No, I suggest that a private individual should be able to buy say 1,000 acres of woodland in Newfoundland or Labrador and harvest it responsibly, pay tax on it, pay a reasonable price for it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Buy it or lease it?

MR. J. CARTER: Buy it? Lease, preferably buy.

MR. ROUSSEAU: What do you mean and give it all up like you did the paper companies?

MR. J. CARTER: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest that it be given up. The government always has the right of eminent domain. It can always get it back but I am suggesting that it sell it or sell a lot of it or some of it for a reasonable, fair market price and make the owners subject to any reasonable restrictions as to the management and the disposal of the wood.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. J. CARTER: But I do suggest that this would be a great step forward. It is now possible, if I wanted to, I could buy several thousand acres of prime pine down in South Carolina and I could buy it as an investment and, of course, it would be a very worth-while investment.

MR. PECKFORD: How about the peanuts in Georgia?

MR. NEARY: It would be pretty costly to get it up here to Newfoundland.

MR. J. CARTER: You sell it down there.

However I will just mention this in passing. I do not want to take too much of the House's time. It is interesting that in the scheme of education the wheel has come full circle. I notice that the BC School Board is now favouring schools going from kindergarten to grade eleven. This is a development that I welcome and a development I predict will become more and more widespread among the various school boards. They are finding that one school for all grades, keeping its numbers fairly small, is a very economical proposition.

I would like to take issue with the Leader of the Opposition when he says that we cannot cut thirty per cent off the budget. I do not think anyone in their right mind would consider that we can cut thirty per cent off the budget, but that is not to suggest that we cannot cut something off. We can always do a little

MR. J. CARTER: bit better. You merely have to flick through here and see that a little bit could be trimmed here and a little bit there and although the sum might be an insignificant percentage of the total budget, still I suggest it would be a very considerable sum indeed.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the time is fast approaching when these decisions will no longer be ours. They will be forced upon us and I suggest that we make these budgetary decisions while they are ours to make. This year we have less flexibility than we had last year. We certainly have a great deal less flexibility than we had, say, in 1972. In 1972 we were able to have a discussion with Memorial University as to whether we would or would not build the engineering building. As it happened the engineering building was built. But now that kind of discussion could not take place this year. We just do not have the flexibility. We do not have the resources.

MR. DOODY: We had discussion on the library.

MR. J. CARTER: Yes but the decision was not to go ahead.

MR. DOODY: That is a big difference.

MR. J. CARTER: The other point, too, is that when we speak about bankruptcy, bankruptcy or financial difficulty for a government or a province is quite different from that of a corporation. The corporation being a corporate entity, once it becomes bankrupt it ceases to exist but no matter how hard pressed Newfoundland becomes for money we will still continue to exist. These buildings will still be here and Newfoundland will still be occupied. It is impossible for Newfoundland to go out of existence but it is not impossible for us to have grave financial difficulty and I suggest that this will be - we are heading that way unless we make it one of our ambitions to come to that situation where we will no longer have to borrow.

MR. J. CARTER: Now I do not suggest that we reach it this year, next year or even the year after, but I would like to see the Minister of Finance, when he gets up on his feet, say that this is a cherished ambition of ours, that we should arrive at the stage where we will borrow as little as possible, and hopefully none at all. Thank you.

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

The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, as I speak on the main motion that Your Honour do now leave the Chair, I do not want to suggest that you, much as you may wish to, make an immediate exit for more comfortable parts of the building.

I do want to open by offering a word of congratulations to various speakers who have participated in this debate. I would particularly like to mention those people from Labrador, because I think this is probably the first time really in the House; since I have been here certainly and from quotations that the hon. member from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) read from budgets which he had written and had other people read for him in times past, I note that he mentioned our Island domain and our Island home and so on from time to time, so I would suspect that the area of Labrador has really not been an item of great concern during the previous administration.

I do want to mention particularly the speech of the hon. member for Naskuapi (Mr. Goudie) who is referred to as being somewhat wishy-washy by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I feel, Sir, that this is not only unkind and unfair but completely inaccurate. I do not think that this Province has had a spokesman for the Labrador area as articulate and as respectable and as decent, as humane, and as honourable as the hon. member for Naskuapi (Mr. Goudie) is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. DOODY:

In passing that to him, Sir, I speak from the heart, because he has made a contribution in government toward the coastal area, toward Labrador really, because, of great respect to my hon. colleague, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) as has been suggested earlier that part of Labrador which he represents so well is really another world. It is a different area. It is an area of relatively great prosperity and of relatively new twentieth century and latter twentieth amenities. The hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) speaks from heritage and speaks well. He speaks with a knowledge and a love of the people in the area, which I do not think we have ever really had the opportunity to hear before in this House. And I welcome every opportunity that I get to listen to him, and I think we all do, and I think this House and this Province will benefit from it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: In saying these things, I say them in the full awareness that the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) speaks of the coast of Labrador. He speaks well, and he means well, and I fully appreciate the fact that his intentions are good, and his meaning is conveyed fully. And as I said earlier, I do not think this House has ever had representation from Labrador such as it has today. I think we have men here who are fully dedicated to the area more than they are dedicated to politics or to parties or to anything other than the advancement and the full recognition of Labrador as part of this Province. And I think that is becoming more and more realized even in this House itself as you hear various members debating and mentioning the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, and there is more and more an accepted part of the vernacular of the House's debate. I think that this is due mainly to the representation of these three men who I mentioned here this evening. There are other people who have made contributions to this debate, Sir, good contributions, men who can speak and speak well and who are a great deal more experienced

Mr. Doody.

than I or these other people whom I have mentioned. But rather than dwell on their particular speeches or on their contributions, I just want to get into some of the problems that a budget itself must present to the minister and to the government and to the Province, and through this House to the Province.

I know very well, Sir, and everybody else in this House knows very well that this budget that we brought down a few months ago is not the answer to all the financial and fiscal problems of this Province. I know full well that the restraint programmes that were outlined in the Budget Speech were not adequate to deal with the problems that are facing the Province. I know full well that the cuts that we have made, and the demands and the needs of the people of the Province, are not enough to bring us down to a realistic level of expenditure in terms of the realities of the finances of the Province. But I also realize full well, Sir, that the people of this Province deserve a certain level of existence, if you will, a certain standard of living, a certain level of co-existence as the rest of Canada, or else the whole Canadian message would be meaningless. If there is to be a Canada and if we are to be part of it, then surely it cannot be expected that the people who live on the coast of Labrador, or who live on the Northern Peninsula, or live in the Bonavista Bay area, or on Bell Island or in Harbour Main or other parts of this Province are to be any less Canadian than the people who live in Toronto, or the people who live in Vancouver, or the people who live in Montreal. And I do not mean by that, Sir, that they should all be living in cosmopolitan areas, and they should all be living in that mad race for existence that you see in these metropolitan areas. But what I do mean is that there is regional disparity, that there are parts of this Dominion, this country of ours, that are less prosperous, that are less well off, that have not been developed, that do have a potential,

Mr. Doody.

and are being ignored in the Canadian system. And if the price of being a Canadian means that we have to cut and slash and sacrifice then perhaps that is what we are going to have to do. But we are going to have to consciously consider that in the years or months to come and decide if that is the course that we want to go.

This Province of ours has managed to get itself into a position of being part of the Canadian Confederation. It did so in the full and certain knowledge that we had joined the Dominion of Canada, twenty-five, twenty-six years ago on the understanding that we were going to be equal partners in Confederation, and a great deal has been said since that time, Sir, on regional disparity and on equal rights for all Canadians, and on equal opportunities for all of us to realize our potential and that those people in Newfoundland would be no worse off in terms of opportunity than those people in the rest of Canada. But the Government of Canada has seen fit to establish a Department of Regional and Economic Development, and then to press merrily ahead and pretend that there is only one problem in Canada and it covers the entire Dominion from Victoria, as we so often see in the newspapers or hear on radio and television "From Vancouver to Halifax." And then there is a correction to say, "Excuse me, from Victoria to St. John's." And I am afraid, Sir, that this is a feeling that is prevailing or prevalent throughout a great deal of the Canadian hierarchy, and in this I mean the Ottawa syndrome. I mean those people who have been too long in Ottawa, not only the political people, when I mean the elected people, I also mean these people in high office and high civil service positions. I mean those people who have taken for granted that some of those Newfoundland jokes are not jokes, and that we down here are really just a nuisance, who bother them from time to time by telling them that we have huge resources here in terms of human ability, and that we have huge resources here in terms of hydro potential. We have huge resources here in terms of fishery potential. We have huge resources

Mr. Doody.

here in terms of mines and forests, that we are, per capita probably the richest potential in Canada, and they foisted off a Department of Regional and Economic Expansion on the one hand, and negated it by charging or setting up an exorbitant and ridiculous system of freight rates which more than offsets any artificial pump priming by this Department of Regional and Economic Expansion.

And so, Sir, our problem is not one of attempting to cope with the situation as we see it. Our problem is one of trying to jump in twenty-five years to that term of growth that the rest of Canada has been working on for over a hundred years.

Our economy here in this Province is probably one of the most sensitive ones in any part of the Western World. Quite apart from the very obvious seasonal nature of our basic structure, of our forest industries and our fishery and its absolute vulnerability in the world market, we have got ourselves in the position over the past years, during our huge leap forward, of having something in excess of forty per cent to forty-five per cent of our Gross Provincial Product dependent on our construction industry. Now, Sir, this is great when the dollars are flowing and the economy is good and the money is being pumped out and the buildings are going up; big salaries are paid, and the economy appears to be in very healthy condition, but when an inflationary process sets in in the heartland of Canada, in Central Canada, in Southern Ontario or Alberta or wherever, and the money tap gets turned off and government stops priming the pump, and that forty per cent to forty-five per cent of the Gross Provincial Product becomes very vulnerable, the \$200 million that this government is pumping into the economy this year in capital expenditure becomes very insignificant. We find ourselves with a huge unemployment problem. That added to our seasonal thing, seasonal nature of our basic industries, is a product of twenty-seven years of misdirection perhaps of the dollars that were available to us over that period of time.

MR. DOODY:

Now it is all very well now-and I can appreciate the concern,and I share that concern,I can see it.I am living with it daily- it is all very well to say that these monies should not be spent on - the monies that are available should not be spent on the service industries; they should be directed to the fisheries and to forestry and to agriculture, tourism, mines and energy and to rural and industrial developments, consumer affairs protection and rehabilitation and recreation. But, Sir, all of these things are steps that should have been taken,or thoughts that should have been considered,some years ago. It is very, very easy to take the last four budgets and compare them, and say that this has happened and that has happened and the other thing has happened over these four years,or the last budget was a political budget and this budget was a realistic budget. One could also say that things change over a period of four years or five years or ten or twenty or thirty years, that inflation steps in there, that spending slows down and the costs increase, And in terms of real dollars,who can compare this billion and a quarter budget,which is really less than \$1 billion in government expenditure when you have a net of eight hundred and some in terms of revenue, but it is still a frightening amount in terms of the population and size of this Province. Who can say what the real relationship to that is in relation to the needs of the people, the expectation of the people, the rights of the people, and the value of the dollars that are spend today?

One local journalist wrote that the 1976-1977 Newfoundland and Labrador budget is one which allowed limited choice, it is beyond the political manipulation, manipulation which was thought to be the unquestionable privilege of a government. It is a document of the times, Sir; one which requires the spending of more to obtain less. We have ourselves now locked into a situation where 75 per cent to 80 per cent perhaps of our income is spent before we receive it. We have \$350 million public service salary bill. Is there someone to suggest that we should not pay these salaries, that we should pay second class salaries, and hope to get first-class performers or

Mr. Doody:

performance? And tacked on to that \$350 million salary bill, Sir, we have the thought that for every 1 per cent or 1 percentage point of increase in the public service negotiated agreement, every 1 per cent drives us up a \$3.5 million current account extra expenditure. We are looking at something like a \$10 million current account contribution to capital account in this budget that we have before us. So you can see how vulnerable the situation really is and how dangerous the ground is on which we are walking.

We do not pretend to have all of the answers to our financial or fiscal problems in this budget. This is a budget of necessity not one of manipulation or one of convenience. It is the best possible deal that we could make at that time with what was available. We have got to spend \$264 million on education, \$194 million on health, and the consolidated fund service, which you have heard so much about, the servicing of the public debt of \$116 million or \$120 million, social services of a gross of something close to \$60 million. You add these figures together, deduct them from the total expenditure and you can see what is available to prime the pump in the resource industries and places where we have to get the money. So I find myself in a very strange position of agreeing with the Leader of the official Opposition that to speak of across-the-board cuts of a quarter of a billion dollars or \$200 million or \$100 million is just unrealistic. What we need are some specifics. What we need is someone who will suggest to us which areas they want cut, which hospital should be closed down, which school is no longer needed, which road should not be paved, which communities do not need water and sewerage facilities.

Day after day after day in this hon. House each of us in turn rises and brings forth a petition from his district that he represents, and he does it with a good heart, and he does it with a good sincerity, and he does it because it is his duty, and he does it because he knows the people in the community that he represents deserve that road or that school or that water and sewerage project, and he

Mr. Doody:

feels that that money should be made available. But he also has got to realize at the same time the capacity of this Province to spend, and that capacity can only be talked of in terms of the revenue that we can raise here in the Province, and I think that all of us will agree here that we are overtaxed now. I think our tax effort is the greatest in Canada with the possible exception of some of the smaller municipalities. It is an established fact that the tax effort of the Province of Newfoundland is the highest in Canada.

We cannot expect to get a great deal more money from our people in terms of taxes. We have taxed them as hard and as fiercely and cruelly and unreasonably as any public can be expected to accept. And we have done it not because it is a popular thing to do. It is all very well for members opposite to stand up and denounce us for being cruel enough to raise this tax and that tax and the other tax. I can appreciate that; that is the Opposition's right and indeed it is probably their duty. Once again the alternatives have not been suggested as to where the revenue is to come from. I know that there is a certain amount of waste in government. There has to be a certain amount of waste in any corporation or any area that spends \$1.25 billion. And I can assure you that we are doing everything that we possibly can to try and find ways of cutting any waste that there is or finding it or locating it and getting rid of it. These things are not simple.

The rest of the revenue that is needed to run the Province, a large proportion of it, has to come from Ottawa, not because we are beggars, as somebody suggested here, not because we are handout recipients, but because we are part of the Canadian nation, which brings us once again to this situation in which we find ourselves, in which the last Finance Ministers Conference underlined so dramatically of the ability of the Federal Government to institute programmes of great social advantage and great social significance and great assistance to the public of Canada and to the Provinces of Canada

Mr. Doody:

and I think in terms of the cost-shared programmes and I think in terms of the medicare, the health insurance, the post-secondary education, and bringing forth this great social programmes and great steps forward in the history of Canada, and then half-way or three-quarters of the way, or a quarter of the way down the road inform us that they can no longer afford to keep going at the rate that they had told us they would when they began, and changed the rules in the middle of the game and leave the Province with the bill. But, Sir, these things are even more terrifying than the conclusions that we have had to come to in the beginning of this budget; the fact that we had to postpone all new hospital construction, that we had to postpone the proposed polytechnical institute, and the Memorial University library, and the College of Trades and Technology, and the Labrador West Arts and Culture Centre, and the Constabulary building and so on are not really as frightening, because these things are items that we have not gotten ourselves involved in as yet, and so we are not immediately concerned with the cost of operating them.

But when the Government of Canada starts telling us that they are going to change the rules in medicare and change the rules in post-secondary education in terms, and they are going to change the rules in revenue guarantees, and that, Sir, is what really is a problem. And these are things that we must concern ourselves with.

There has been much talk during the debate, and it has been a sort of a sideways talk about bankruptcy, insolvency, the ability of the Province to borrow. It has been said by the hon. member from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), and I am sorry that he is not here, that this Province is not bankrupt and will not be bankrupt as long as we can service our debt. Well I mean this is a truism, I suppose, that could be expounded by a philosopher of a great deal lesser learning than the hon. member.

MR. DOODY:

There is nobody in this building and nobody in this Province and probably nobody in the world naive enough to think that an institution loans money for any reason other than the fact that it knows and feels that its investment is secure, that it will receive a return on its investment at a rate that is guaranteed by a financially stable institution, and in this case it is the Province of Newfoundland. We have had absolutely no problem in moving our bonds, offering our submissions to the investing public. We have had our ratings done by Moody's by Standard and Poor's. Our investment counsellors, our fiscal managers, have gone over and over and over and are in constant communication with us on our fiscal position. The prospectus, each successive one, is examined and looked at because their reputations are at stake just as ours are. There would not be a bond sold if there was not a knowledge, a certainty in the investment community, that these bonds will be honoured and that the interest will be paid on them on the agreed dates.

Sir, that does not mean that we have unlimited access to the bond markets. It simply means that within a reasonable degree of borrowing, within a reasonable degree of responsibility, the loaning public of the financial community will loan us money to carry on certain reasonable programmes. But they want us to show them in return a fiscal restraint, the fact that we have the ability to manage our own affairs and the fact that we have the ability to pay them the interest and to retire the debt. This we have done. This they are satisfied with and we have no indication that there is any problem whatsoever in the fiscal community. There is no danger of this Province going bankrupt. There is no danger of our bonds being bounced on the capital markets. As a matter of fact, the contrary is the truth. That is something that has to be dispelled and it has to be dispelled quickly. We do not want the word to go forth from this House that there is great gloom and doom and this Province is finished and that we are not going to be able to borrow. That is not so. We can borrow as long as we do it with a degree of

MR. DOODY:

responsibility and a certain knowledge of the fiscal community that we can honour our obligations. This, Sir, is what we are doing.

Now we have heard the hon. member opposite, the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) forecasting a budget in the Fall. I do not know how much we can depend on his crystal ball in this particular area. I sincerely hope he is wrong. I have had the somewhat dubious distinction of bringing in two budgets during the very short tenure of my term of office. I can assure the hon. House, Sir, that I have absolutely no desire to bring in another budget. I think that this budget is adequate for the needs of the Province for the present year. I think that barring unforeseen acts of God or the Queen's enemies or whatever you have, that we should be able to carry on very nicely with the situation as it is right now.

I do not, as I say, feel that the answers are here in this. Our unemployment problem is a great one. We are pumping, as I say, over \$200 million into the capital account area of the Province. Unfortunately the public sector has not seen fit in the past to get itself involved in the expansion of the Province or of its resources. I think that that is something that has to be changed and something that has to be worked on and something that we have to sell. Our growth of expenditure has been cut dramatically in terms of percentage points although the size of our expenditure has grown.

I really think, Sir, that this is a reasonable budget. It is certainly not one that shows that this Province is in a great, buoyant fiscal era. I do not think it would be fair to pretend that it is. I think that the people of the Province of Newfoundland are realizing the fact that we have very serious problems in terms of financial reality and I think that they are prepared to join us in facing that reality. I think that working together, ourselves, the people of the Province, the business community, the trade labour movement, all the other people here who are concerned with the progress and with the recovery of this Province, can make it happen. I think

MR. DOODY:

that we can make this a bench mark here this year that we can move forward from. I think that we are going to do it. I do not think that we are going to do it by talking about gloom and doom, and I do not think that we are going to do it by being fiscally irresponsible. I think that we are going to do it by presenting to the marketplace and to our own people the fact that this is a responsible and reasonable administration that is faced with a major recession over which we have no control.

The Government of Canada itself which holds the purse strings says that it has very little control over the world's economy. We will see what stand or what positions they will take tonight in their budget in terms of boosting the economy of those areas of the Province which have the most desperate unemployment problems and which are most greatly affected by the economic recession. I rather suspect, Sir, that once again they will paint a broad brush and pretend that there are no problems other than just one and it is common to all of Canada. I hope that is not so.

So, Sir, I am not going to want to go on at any great detail. There are many items that I had hoped to raise. I will not raise them now. We will get into that probably in other debates as we get through the proceedings of the House as it moves. I think, Sir, right now I will simply ask you to put the motion and then we will get on with the business of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is moved and seconded that I do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means. Those in favour "Aye". Contrary, "Nay". In my opinion the "Ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

MR. ROBERTS: We are all here, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Fight. I will ask because this matter can be so important at other times where the rules say three minutes. Is there leave that three minutes be now deemed to have expired? I have to know if it is so agreed because that can be a very crucial question, obviously.

MR. POBERTS: Mr. Speaker, for our part all of our members who are in St. John's are here and prepared to vote, Sir.

MR. LUNDGREN: Well there are only about sixty second left why break the precedent that is already there?

MR. SPEAKER: Apparently the three minutes have elapsed. The bar is across the House and I can only presume that three minutes have elapsed.

DIVISION:

Those in favour of the motion please rise:

The hon. Premier, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications, the hon. Minister of Tourism, the hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, the hon. Minister of Health, the hon. Minister of Social Services, the hon. Minister of Justice, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, the hon. Mr. Wells, the hon. Minister of Finance, the hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development, the hon. Minister of Fisheries, the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services, the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the hon. Minister of Education, Mr. Young, Mr. Goudie, Mr. N. Windsor, Mr. Finn, Mr. Carter, Mr. Woodrow, Dr. Winsor, Mr. Marshall.

Those against the motion please rise:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hodder, Mrs. McIsaac, Mr. Strachan, Mr. Canning, Mr. Rowe, Mr. Simmons, Mr. White, Mr. Flight, Mr. Lush, Mr. Rideout, Mr. McNeil, Mr. Callan.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee of Ways and Means rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Young): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means reports that the Committee has considered the matters to them referred, have made progress, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: To the hon. Minister of Finance.

"I, the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums required for the public service of the Province for the year ending 31st. day of March, 1977 by way of further supply, and

Mr. Speaker.

In accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867, as amended, I recommend these estimates of the House of Assembly. Signed, Gordon A. Winter, Lieutenant-Governor'

MR. WELLS Mr. Speaker, I move that the Lieutenant Governor's message be referred to a Committee of Supply.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Is it the wish of the Committee that the total contained in the message carry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Carried.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report that they have adopted the amount of \$889,633,200 contained in the estimates of Supply, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER The Chairman of the Committee of Supply reports that the Committee has met, and considered the matters to them referred and have passed the expenditure of \$889,633,200 and ask leave to sit again.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the report of the Committee of Supply, with respect to the estimates of 1976-1977, together with a resolution and the bill attached thereto be referred to a Committee of Ways and Means.

On motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

RESOLUTION: "That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1977, the sum of seven hundred and fifty-five million one hundred and thirty-three thousand two hundred dollars (\$755,133,200) in addition to the initial sum of one hundred and thirty-four million five hundred thousand dollars (\$134,500,000) authorized for like purposes by the Supply Act, No 1, 1976.

On motion resolution carried.

On motion preamble carried.

On motion title carried.

On motion heads of expenditure I through to XX, carried.

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Seventy-Seven And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service."(Bill No. 31)

check & see if not # 56
HWS
26 Apr 77

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

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed a certain resolution and recommends that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee reports that the Committee has met and considered the matters to them referred and

Mr. Speaker.

passed a certain resolution and recommends that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion, a bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Seventy-Seven And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service," read a first second and third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 31)

T

~~13-6~~

HJB
26 Apr 77

MR. SPEAKER: Order I, the Address in Reply.

It was adjourned by an hon. member who is not present, as I recall.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we are addressing ourselves, Sir, to the sub-amendment that was proposed by the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), Sir, and in order, Mr. Speaker, to save time and indeed, Sir, the patience of the members on both sides of this House, which judged by my own experience, Sir, have been pretty tired of the diarrhea of words which have spilled onto the floor of this hon. House over the past several months, with your permission, Sir, rather than speak to the amendment I would just merely like to table a copy of my few remarks, Sir.-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: - and I have copies, Mr. Speaker, for the press and if any member of the House is interested in the views of a gentleman who is an independent member of this House, has no party affiliations and believes that the member represents the ordinary people of this Province, then, Sir, perhaps some of the members may wish to peruse through this document which has some very positive and constructive suggestions. So, Sir, it gives me great pleasure to table my few remarks on the sub-amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words about this amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sub-amendment.

MR. LUSH: I would like to know exactly, if someone could provide me with a copy of the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sub-amendment and you speak on the amendment.

MR. ROBERTS: I have forgotten what the sub-amendment is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, ah!

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. There seems to be some confusion as to where we are in relation to the Address in Reply. Can somebody advise us?

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is the sub-amendment.

MR. ROBERTS: How about reading it to us.

MR. SPEAKER: Right. The sub-amendment reads as follows, proposed by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), seconded by the - well I am not sure which hon. member seconded but one of them did - to add the following words to the amendment, "And deplores the failure of the parties represented in this House to set forth succinctly for this House's and the people's understanding their respective basic policies for the solving of the principle public problems of the Province."

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, we are ready for the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Those in favour of the sub-amendment "aye", contrary minded, "nay", I declare the motion lost.

MR. LUSH: I would like to move the adjournment, Mr. Speaker, on the understanding that I get an opportunity to speak to this on Thursday.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) has moved the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS: Before I move the adjournment of the House, Your Honour will recall that the question was raised earlier in the day, the procedure for the constitution of the two committees which were named by the hon. member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford). I understand now that I have to move, or give notice that I will move the constitution of these committees. It may be that leave may be given to dispense with notice, and we could deal with the matter now if leave is given.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, on our part we will certainly give leave. It is a debatable motion but I do not think it needs to be debated. I am anxious that the motion be put through because my understanding of it is that when it is put through the two committees, the Standing Committee on the public accounts, and the Standing Committee on the Standing Orders are then constituted, and I think it is important they get about their work as quickly as possible. So we will give leave, you know, if the minister gives notice we will give leave to put it through today. I think the House has adequate notice of the move.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPaille.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I grudgingly give the House leave but I want to again point out to the hon. Government House Leader that I was not consulted. I do have rights in this hon. House. I was not consulted in connection with these committees, neither do my name appear on any of the committees. I did not know who comprised the committees until they were read out in the hon. House, and this is about the tenth time, Sir, this session the Government House Leader apparently overlooks the independent member when it comes to raises in pay, expenses, other arrangements, and in this particular case I was overlooked again. But nevertheless, even at that, Sir, I grudgingly give leave to pass this resolution.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, there was a committee under the chairmanship of the hon. member from Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) and there were members from both sides of the House on the committee to strike these two committees. This was not struck by the Government House Leader, this committee.

So anyway, Mr. Speaker, if leave is given we would ask for the question and I would move that these committees be as recommended by the committee appointed for striking the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour "aye", contrary "nay", I declare the motion carried.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at three o'clock in the afternoon.

May 25, 1976

Tape No. 2934

NM - 4

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 P.M. Those in favour "aye", contrary "nay", carried. This House is now adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday at 3:00 P.M.

Contents

May 25, 1976	Page
Statements by Ministers	
Mr. W. Carter announced tenders had been called for construction of a community stage at Little Heart East, and for the upgrading and repair of a community stage at Merasheen Island, P.B.	8561
Commented on by:	
Mr. Smallwood	8562
Mr. Canning	8564
Mr. Carter responded to questions raised.	8566
Mr. Lundrigan tabled the results of the most recent meeting of the Rural Development Authority.	8567
Commented on by:	
Mr. Simmons	8575
Mr. Smallwood	8576
Oral Questions	
Query concerning the administration's position regarding reports of the fishing arrangement reached by Canada and Russia, especially how the agreement will affect redfish catches for plants along the Southwest Coast. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Carter.	8581
Fishing pressures on caplin stocks. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Carter.	8584
Notice to leave ICNAF. Mr. Roberts, Mr. W. Carter.	8585
Possibility of the Russian fleet taking cod as well as caplin in Newfoundland waters. Mr. Neary, Mr. W. Carter.	8586
Query as to whether Newfoundland will send a telegram of protest to Ottawa over the agreement with Russia; and whether the House will be asked to pass a resolution objecting to the agreement. Mr. Neary, Mr. W. Carter.	8587
Fuel situation at Nain. Mr. Strachan, Mr. Wells.	8588
The section of the Trans-Canada Highway West of Grand Falls. Mr. White, Mr. Morgan.	8588
Possibility that the magistrate's court will be transferred from St. George's. Mrs. MacIsaac, Mr. Hickman.	8589
Federal report on asbestosis and its availability in Newfoundland. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	8589
The equivalency program. Mr. Lush, Mr. House.	8591
Query as to whether CED exams will be Newfoundland normed. Mr. Lush, Mr. House.	8592
Equalization of electricity rates in Newfoundland. Mr. Strachan, Mr. Crosbie.	8592

Oral Questions (continued)

Query as to whether monies from the Native Fund could be used to subsidize electrical rates. Mr. Strachan, Mr. Crosbie.	8595
Query concerning a newspaper article on the Health Sciences Centre. Mr. Neary, Mr. Pousseau.	8595
Query as to whether the matter has been investigated. Mr. Neary, Mr. Pousseau.	8596
Ministerial concern over the article, since a civil servant took issue with government. Mr. Neary, Mr. Pousseau.	8596
The Ferryland stadium. Mr. Callan, Mr. Wells.	8598
*Mr. Callan expressed dissatisfaction with the answer and gave notice that he wished to debate it on the adjournment.	8598
Query as to why the family garden plot program has been discontinued in the Goulds. Mr. Lush, Mr. Rousseau.	8598

Orders of the Day

Committee of Ways and Means

Mr. Strachan (continued)	8599
Mr. Canning	8609
Mr. Goudie	8633
Mr. Smallwood	8643
Mr. Woodrow	8663
(Adjourned the debate)	8671

The House rose at 6:00 P.M. 8671

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M. 8672

Committee of Ways and Means (continued)

Mr. Woodrow (continued)	8672
Mr. Roberts	8685
Mr. J. Carter	8737
Mr. Doody	8742

 The motion was carried on division. 8755

Committee of Supply reported adoption of the amount of \$889,633,200 contained in the Estimates of Supply and asked leave to sit again. 8756

The Committee of Ways and Means reported passage of Bill No. 31. 8758

-0-

The Address in Reply

Mr. Neary	8759
Mr. Lush	8759

 The sub-amendment was defeated. 8760

 Mr. Lush adjourned the debate. 8760

By leave, the report of the Striking Committee was approved. 8761

Adjournment 8762