



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

---

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 4

---

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1975

SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

100

100

100

100

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

The hon. the Premier.

HON. F.D. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to move that this hon. House record sincere congratulations on the occasion of the installation of Archbishop Robert Loder Seaborn as Metropolitan of the Ecclesiastical Province of Canada.

I think Bishop Seaborn since he came to Newfoundland and as we came to know him, has distinguished himself not only in his own faith but also as a distinguished Canadian and a person who any who have met him I think respect to a degree that is a bit unusual. Archbishop Seaborn is a man whom I have come to know personally. His record is one as a family man and one of education through his own formal education and through honorary degrees at two universities, practicing in his faith in Quebec, Ontario and in this Province, a Chaplain in the Canadian Army who was, as I understand it, the first Chaplain to land on the beaches of Normandy with the Canadian Army during D-Day, a man who is respected, not just in his capacity as a churchman but certainly in his position as Chaplain with the army people who served with him. And I happen to know when Father Farrell was here last year and we had an opportunity to get together just how high that respect was held for Archbishop Seaborn.

He was awarded the Croix de Guerre. As I say, he preached and practiced his profession in many provinces in Canada. He was made Bishop of Newfoundland in 1965. He is still a member of the Legion and in October of this year at a meeting of the Provincial House of Bishops held at Halifax, Archbishop Seaborn was elected to the position of Metropolitan. On November 16, 1975, he was installed as Metropolitan in which capacity he will give leadership and support and will serve in the pastoral role for priests. He will be responsible for the consecration of bishops in the region and will preside over the Provincial Synod and General Council. His position in the church is second only to the Primate, Archbishop Scott of Toronto.

Throughout his distinguished career Metropolitan, Archbishop

Seaborn has shown himself to be a man of exemplary character and integrity, a man who has devoted his life to the service of his people and, I suppose, our people, his church and his country and a man who stands out as a leader among leaders and a man among men. We in Newfoundland are very proud that Archbishop Seaborn is located here in St. John's in our Province at this time of great honour to his career and honour to us as a Province.

As Premier of the Province I offer my congratulations to the Archbishop and know all members of the House join me in an expression of tribute to him as an outstanding man and an outstanding citizen.

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

HON. E. M. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I might say a word or two in support of the resolution moved by the Premier, and in seconding it, may I first of all say the Premier used a happy phrase; he referred to Archbishop Seaborn as being a family man. May I on behalf of us all congratulate the Premier on the addition to his family and on behalf of, I know every member of the House wish him and Mrs. Moores, and as yet I understand unnamed son, much joy and happiness on it. I am very happy. And I have been asked to say as well that we hope that the restraint programme that so significantly affected the receptions which Your Honour tendered and which the Minister of Finance did not tender does not reflect in a second class of cigar for the members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many notable events in the long history of the Anglican Diocese of Newfoundland, a long history which is shortly to come to a close. For 136 years, Sir, I am told it has been the focal point of the religious life, the spiritual life and the social life of a very large segment of our population. That Diocese, Sir, has been led by some outstanding men. The first of them, Sir, was the Right Reverend Aubery Spencer after whom, of course, Bishop Spencer College was named. In 1843 Bishop Spencer retired as bishop of Newfoundland and retired to Jamaica, and in giving, I suppose, his final charge he gave some of the qualities which he deemed necessary in his successor, and I think they are of interest to it. Bishop Spencer wrote that the bishop of Newfoundland - he later became the Lord Bishop, Bishop Spencer was merely the bishop of Newfoundland - that "the bishop of Newfoundland must have the strength of constitution to support him under a climate as rigorous as that of Iceland, a stomach insensible to the attacks of seasickness, pedestrian powers beyond those of an Irish gossoon, and an ability to rest occasionally on the bed of a fisherman or the hard boards of a workman's tilt." Seven bishops have followed Bishop Spencer in the See and the Chair. Not the least among them is the man that the House honours today, the Most Reverend Robert Loder Seaborn, the eighth Bishop

of the Diocese of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, Archbishop Seaborn, as the Premier has said, had a distinguished career even before he came to Newfoundland. Since then, Sir, he has attained even greater heights that reflect much credit not only on him and the church in this Province but on all of the people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I was particularly pleased that the Premier mentioned that Archbishop Seaborn was among the first of the Canadian troops or the first of the Canadians to land in Normandy on D-Day in 1944. There is a picture of the Bishop, looking remarkably unchanged considering that thirty years have passed, in a book called Six War Years, a picture of Bishop Seaborn performing his chaplain's function taken at D-Day, taken on the beach in France.

Sir, Bishop Seaborn is the first Archbishop of Newfoundland, the first Anglican churchman in this Province to take that rank. He is also, as the Premier has said, the second highest ranking Anglican in the entire nation subject only in the ecclesiastical disciplines to the Primate of Canada, Primate Scott. This is a significant time, Sir, in the history of the Anglican community in this Province, because in addition to the historic event of the Archbishop being elevated, the Diocese, of course, is about to be divided into three parts, each presided over by its own bishop. I understand that shortly, although nothing has been put on the Order Paper yet, legislation will be brought into the House to ask our approval for the restructuring in a legal sense of the three dioceses, They will be Eastern Newfoundland and Labrador, Central Newfoundland and Western Newfoundland. I have no doubt that it will receive unanimous support. I think it is particularly appropriate, Sir, the Premier moves this motion today, because on Saturday coming, the 29th., a special synod of the Central Newfoundland Diocese will take place in Gander for the purpose of electing the third bishop, the new bishop for the Central Newfoundland Diocese.

Sir, Archbishop Seaborn will be Archbishop of Newfoundland, or Lord Archbishop of Newfoundland for only a few brief weeks, He will then become the Archbishop of Eastern Newfoundland and Labrador. But, Sir,

every person in this Province will retain intense pride, the Anglican community in particular, of course, but I think every Newfoundlander no matter what his religious affiliation will feel pride and honour that Archbishop Seaborn has been selected and consecrated to carry on the duties of this high office. Sir, it is

with great pleasure that we, on this side, support the motion moved by the Premier.

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

MP. J. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I join with my two hon. friends in expressing a word of satisfaction and pleasure over the elevation of Bishop Seaborn. He will be the first Lord Archbishop of Newfoundland and the first Archbishop in the Anglican Church in this Province of Newfoundland, in this Country of Newfoundland. The first Archbishop in Newfoundland was the great Howley. He was the first native-born Newfoundlander to be a Bishop and he was the first Newfoundlander to be an Archbishop.

We have had three men from Newfoundland to become Archbishops with jurisdiction outside Newfoundland, Archbishop Phelps of South Africa, Archbishop Pinkham of Western Canada and now Archbishop Seaborn with jurisdiction over a large part of the Nation of Canada. We have, of course, had a fairly considerable number of Newfoundlanders, either native-born or by adoption, who became bishops in different parts of the world. At this moment we have four to five Newfoundlanders who are bishops in different parts of the world, as far away as Australia.

We have another Newfoundlander who has risen as high as it is possible for any man to rise within the limits of his religious faith, namely the general of the Salvation Army, General Clarence D. Wiseman who is the commanding general. There is only one general at a time in the Salvation Army.

I am delighted to remember that here in Newfoundland today we have two Archbishops, Archbishop Skinner and now Archbishop Seaborn, and to note the remarkable similarity in the two men. They are both of them very plain men, unostentatious and unpretentious, both of them friendly men, both of them deeply religious and both of them, Mr. Speaker, moved by a profound ecumenical spirit. I do not think that Newfoundland could have been as good as it is today, that Newfoundlanders of all faiths and of all confessions could have been so much together as they are today if we had not had those two



men in our midst, active and powerful, influential. Skinner, Seaborn - these two names will go down properly and rightfully in our history as men who made a very great contribution to the people of Newfoundland.

I know that all Newfoundlanders, not Anglicans alone, are proud over the fact that a Newfoundlander is now the second ranking - and who is to say that the word 'second' will not be replaced in the course of time - but already the second ranking Anglican in this nation of 24 million people. We can be proud of that, we Newfoundlanders. Everyone of us can feel half an inch taller. I would like therefore to join with all hon. members in this House in offering my sincere congratulations, not only to His Grace himself and not only to all Anglican people in the Province, but to the whole population of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved, seconded and agreed that an appropriate resolution regarding the elevation of His Grace Archbishop Seaborn be recorded.

PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition on behalf of the Local Improvement District of Port au Port West. The prayer of the petition is that we, the undersigned, residents of the Local Improvement District of Port au Port West, Aguathuna and Felix Cove, reject having our property taxed.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition, I must point out that the 292 signers of the petition are protesting a recommendation of the Whalen Commission on Municipal Government. The Commission, as you know, recommends that every municipality, with a water and sewer system or a water system, certainly a majority of its citizens should be required to adopt the real property tax as the primary source of revenue. While the recommendation has not been adopted by government, the Department of Municipal Affairs does encourage local improvement districts to levy a property tax. The citizens in this area are against the property tax, Mr. Speaker, and this is an early attempt to nip it in the bud, so to speak.

The Local Improvement District of Port au Port West, which is made up of Port au Port West, Felix Cove and Aguathuna, is not a wealthy area of the Province. However, the council collects 100 per cent, or nearly 100 per cent, of their service fees, which is \$20. They have recently put in ten miles of water line at a cost of \$300,000. The engineers<sup>d</sup> had estimated that the water line would cost \$750,000. In this area the majority of homes would be assessed below \$10,000, Mr. Speaker. Very few homes in the district or in the area would go above \$15,000. If they were assessed a property tax of three mills on a \$15,000 home, this would only bring in \$45, and, as I say, few homes go above that.

Mr. Speaker, Newfoundlanders have always resisted property tax, and in this area the service fee paid by the residents can cope with the expense of projects which have been undertaken. I believe that the citizens are right. They do not need a property tax. The Local Improvement District of Port au Port West can pay its own way, and there is no need for a real property tax in the area. The only real service they have, Mr. Speaker, is a water system, and they cannot afford to pay more than they do at present. I think it as well, Mr. Speaker, that the Whalen Commission is wrong when they suggest that rural areas should have a property tax. They are taxed enough for what they have now.

I hope the Minister of Municipal Affairs will be able to support this petition. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be placed upon the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further petitions?

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. P. CANNING: Would the Premier inform the House if there are negotiations going on at present in regard to the sale of the Atlantic Fish Processing plant at Marystown?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of the question, but I have heard probably the same comments that the hon. member has. I think there are probably discussions going on. Not to my knowledge has government been involved to any degree. I will certainly take notice and find out and advise the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: In the absence of the Minister of Finance, Sir, could the hon. Premier clarify a matter that was raised in the budget on Monday? Does the extra two cents on the social security tax apply to those people who are using electricity to heat their homes and for purposes of cooking?

PREMIER MOORES: To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is yes.

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

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. the Premier. Yesterday I asked the hon. the Premier a question regarding investigations into industrial health hazards in Baie Verte and I appreciate his answer. I wonder today could the Premier tell the House who is actually carrying out these investigations and what the present state of those investigations are at this time?

PREMIER MOORES: As I said yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I said as soon as that information became available it would be brought before the House. The specific detail the hon. member asked me right now I cannot answer offhand but I most certainly will undertake to supply the answer within the next day or two.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Premier. Has the Premier received a telegram then from the President of the union in Baie Verte saying that he is not aware of any such investigations ongoing at this present time?

PREMIER MOORES: The answer to that is no, Mr. Speaker, I have not.

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

MR. I. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Fisheries. Would the minister tell the House who owns the fish plant at Fox Harbour and what is the situation concerning its possible sale?

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Fisheries.

HON. W. CARTER: That question I will answer later.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. S. MULROONEY (Exploits): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my questions to the hon. Premier. In the absence of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs I ask the Premier the status of the \$820,000 designated to the town of Botwood for water and sewerage development?

PREMIER MOORES: Could the hon. member repeat the question. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MULROONEY: I asked the hon. Premier the status of the \$820,000 designated to the Botwood municipal council for water and sewerage development.

PREMIER MOORES: I will have to take notice of that question, Mr. Speaker. When the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing comes back, which will be tomorrow, he will be advised in the morning and hopefully give the answer at that time.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Would the minister assure the House, Sir, that the paving of the roads in Trinity - Bay de Verde such as the Northern Point road and the road around the pond to Cavendish which were (Cavendish, around the pond in Cavendish) which were slated for paving this year for which tenders were let but the roads were terminated because of the weather condition, the paving of the roads were terminated because of the weather conditions, will the minister assure the House that this programme, these roads will be paved at the earliest possible time in the Spring or Summer of 1976?

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

HON. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, all contracts that were let prior to the announcement by the Premier of the austerity programme in this Province, whether they be for reconstruction of roads or paving of roads, these contracts are ongoing contracts and if the work has not been completed this Fall by the contractors concerned, it will be carried on in early Spring.

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

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate whether or not a contract exists for the paving of the Custer's Head Road in Hant's Harbour in the district of Trinity-Bay de Verde?

AN HON. MEMBER: How urgent is it?

MR. ROWE: It is very urgent.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: I will let you know in a minute why, if you want to pursue it.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of that question and give you the answer tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Exploits.

MR. MULROONEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the hon. Premier. Could the hon. Premier clarify the present status of a promise made to the west end residents of Bishop Falls this past summer concerning a promised sewer programme for that area?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the details but I can assure you that I never make a promise that I do not fulfill even in elections, unlike what the hon. member believes.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: A question to the hon. Minister of Fisheries. Would the minister inform the House if there is in fact an agreement between the provincial government and the federal government to close down some small fish plants in Newfoundland, and would the minister care to identify these plants that are scheduled to be closed down?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any such agreement but certainly I will look into it and be able to inform the hon. member later in the House.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Sir: Is the minister aware that his predecessor made a public statement that there was in existence such an agreement and that some plants would be closed? Is the minister aware of that?

MR. CARTER: I am aware of the statement, Mr. Speaker, that was made by my predecessor, the Minister of Fisheries concerning the future licensing of small feeder plants. I am certainly not aware of any agreement whereby smaller plants would be closed down, but again I will look into it.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. Could the minister inform the House as to whether or not the promised half million dollar extension to the M.J. Boylen Hospital in Baie Verte will go ahead this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot give any more information than what has already been given with regard to hospital extensions and construction in general than was given yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

MR. MOORES: With permission I would like to answer that. As far as hospital construction in the province is concerned, it has been announced very clearly that any project that is not underway at the present time planning will go ahead on this year. There will be no construction until such time as the economic times of this Province are such to allow us to go ahead and that will be as soon as possible, but in the meantime there are no definite plans to do new building in this year and that should be made very clear now.

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Will the minister tell the House what is occurring with the proposed and promised airstrip at Cartwright, Labrador?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, tenders were called and tenders are closed, but to date no decision has been made whether or not a contract will be awarded this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, but in his absence perhaps the Premier or the Minister of Industrial Development might be able to answer it. Would the minister or the Premier inform the House whether it is the government's intention to appoint an industrial enquiry into the newsprint industry in Newfoundland as requested by the Joint Mill Unions in Grand Falls?

MR. MOORES: Not at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker? Could the Premier tell us



whether or not any attempts are being made at the present time to bring labour and management together in respect to the strikes at the three paper mills in Newfoundland?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the strikes at the paper mills in Newfoundland are the same as the strikes in the paper mills across Canada. This is not a Grand Falls, Corner Brook, Stephenville paper mill strike. It is the position taken by the national unions, who are one union in this case, against the pulp and paper industry in Canada and I think also probably to a lesser degree a test case before the anti-inflationary board. I think it would be very wrong for us to get involved on the local scene until such time as the anti-inflation board has ruled on the Mersey Pulp and Paper dispute, the K.C. Irving settlement, as I understand it, reached this morning in New Brunswick, and to do anything until the national picture has cleared up I think would be totally irresponsible.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker? Would the Premier inform the House whether or not he is aware of any attempt to have the paper unions and the paper mills in Newfoundland excluded from provincial labour legislation and to come under federal labour legislation as suggested by Bill Rompkey, the M.P. for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador.

MR. MOORES: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I would never be responsible for anything Mr. Rompkey suggested in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Would the minister inform the House whether or not a decision has yet been taken in connection with the tunnel underneath the Straits of Belle Isle joining Newfoundland to the mainland part of the Province to make it not only a tunnel to carry the transmission cable but to carry traffic and passengers? Has that decision yet been taken?

MR. HICKEY: It was announced.

MR. NEARY: It was not announced.

MR. MORGAN: Sir, that question should be on the Order Paper, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Tourism, in view of the fact that the minister has been quoted publicly as saying that he knew that the masts that were installed in the Norma and Gladys were the wrong masts, would the minister inform the House what action he took, if any, to stop these wrong masts from being put in the Norma and Gladys and the right masts will be put in?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I never suggest we put that question on the Order Paper, it is confusing enough right now. I never did say that I knew in advance of the masts going in. You cannot always believe, Mr. Speaker, what you read, and sometimes you cannot even believe what you hear or even see. I did say that I was aware before the vessel sailed, I did not say that I was aware before the masts were stepped in at the shipyards. Obviously if I had known that they would not have gone in.

matter is under investigation and it has been referred to the Justice Department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Federal-provincial.

MR. NEARY: I was just going to put the question to the minister. Who in fact paid the cost of replacing these masts in New York? Was it the provincial government or the Government of Canada or was it shared by both governments.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

HON. T.V. HICKEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously this expense has to be picked up by the Province initially. Whether or not it will be cost-shared, whether that item essentially will be cost-shared is a matter that I cannot answer at this point in time. But, as I said, the matter was investigated and it was also referred to the Department of Justice and negotiations or discussions are going on now between the shipyards, my department and the Newfoundland Hardwoods, who supplied the masts.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo (Capt. E. Winsor).

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The cost of the whole project, how was it shared?

MR. HICKEY: It is on a cost-sharing formula, Mr. Speaker, between the federal government and the Province. The departments, or the agencies involved, are the Department of External Affairs and the Secretary of State through the National Museums Programme.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo (Capt. E. Winsor).

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, along the same lines, can the minister inform the House if the Norma and Gladys is now off dry-dock in Panama? Has the vessel been cleared seaworthy? Is she on her way? What is the situation with her at this time?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, there was never any doubt about the seaworthiness of the vessel or we would have never allowed her to leave port at St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to try to convince the

hon. members. I am just stating a matter of fact. I am tired really of restating it but one has to.

CAPT. WINSOR: Has she left Baboia yet?

MR. HICKEY: I will have to check, Mr. Speaker. I have to be very careful what I say on this project. The vessel is off dry-dock, nothing very serious. Work is completed and I am told that the captain is quite pleased with the work and quite pleased with the performance of the vessel to date.

MR. NEARY: What work was involved?

MR. HICKEY: Scraping near the hull and bottom. Some inspection of caulking and a little recaulking I understand and the applying of the -

MR. NEARY: Water-logged.

MR. HICKEY: Some minor leaks, nothing to be -

MR. NEARY: Minor leaks?

MR. HICKEY: Oh, a few minor leaks. That is not - Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable that my hon. friend who used to be the member for Bell Island and of course who, I am sure, still goes back and forth to Bell Island, crosses the water and has crossed the water so often is alarmed or surprised to find that a wooden vessel would take a little water.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan).

MR. I. STPACHAN: In the absence of the Minister of Mines and Energy, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Premier. Would the Premier tell the House whether it is planned to provide the community of Williams Harbour with electricity as promised and if so, when?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The phraseology a number of times has gone on and if it happened one time, then I think one would not necessarily intervene but it is quite clear that in putting oral questions, they are not to be argumentative or to state any opinion which it is not necessary to state. I am therefore informing the hon. gentleman that the epithet, "as promised" used, certainly now used on a continuing basis is improper.

The hon. the Premier:

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to yourself, Sir, the question got lost in the explanation of the interpretation. The fact is, I do not know the answer to that. I will look it up and find out.

MR. ROBERTS: Winston Churchill White, I take it?

MP. MOORES: A very reliable source.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MP. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer a question to the hon. Minister of Justice. Will the minister inform the House if it is the intention of his department and the government to renegotiate two municipal contracts—or one municipal contract, I think it is, in Newfoundland with the RCMP or is the minister looking at the possibility of establishing a branch of the Newfoundland Constabulary in Western Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

HON. T. A. HICKMAN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the contract between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada, covering the services of the RCMP in Newfoundland, both under the provincial contract and two municipal contracts, one for Labrador City and the other for the City of Corner Brook, will expire on March 31 of next year. The Solicitor General of Canada, who is the minister responsible for the RCMP, submitted new proposals to the eight provinces who use the services of the RCMP on a contractual basis many months ago, and he was advised by this Province, through me, in May of last year that the proposals then presented were not satisfactory. Then the Solicitor General of Canada referred the matter back to his colleagues, and following the time-honoured tradition of the Government of Canada, without notice, conveyed on November 11, Armistice Day, even though that day we had asked to have it on another day, the final proposal insofar as the financing of the RCMP is concerned in the eight Canadian Provinces who use their services. There was a very considerable reduction by the Government of Canada from the amount that they had asked and said that they were insisting on being paid in April of this year, and we are down now to give or take approximately fifty-two per cent as opposed to fifty per cent which is the amount we pay now for certain services performed in the Province.

There are other items in the proposed contract which, in my opinion, must be the subject matter of renegotiation. It is my belief that if we are going to successfully renegotiate that contract it is desirable first to see whether we can get a consensus amongst the four Atlantic Provinces. Today in Fredericton the deputy ministers of Justice are meeting with other advisors to review the proposals, and the hope is that later this month, or early in December, there will be a meeting in St. John's, Newfoundland of the four Atlantic Provinces' A.G.'s so that we can proceed with a united front on these other items which we consider to be still negotiable.

Insofar as the second part of the question is concerned, there has been no consideration on the part of government to restrict in any way the areas covered by the RCMP at the present time.

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

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. If it is a supplementary, I will give way to the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: Is this in the same -

MR. ROBERTS: No, I have a different subject. A supplementary -

MR. NEARY: Go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition has ceded to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) for a supplementary question.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice, but it is on a different subject entirely. Could the minister indicate to the House, Mr. Speaker, whether he has asked the Minister of Justice for Canada to proceed immediately with the appointment of the third appellate judge, the third judge in the Appeal Division of our Supreme Court?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, I know the answer.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. Leader of the Opposition unfortunately does not know the answer. He might resign if I told him -

MR. ROBERTS: You will not resign over it Alec.

MR. HICKMAN: - as leader of the Liberal Party. He should be - Mr. Speaker, the situation is this, and I think for the benefit of all Newfoundlanders they should be made very aware of what the situation is with respect to the Superior Court of this Province at this time. Last year this House enacted the first major piece of legislation resulting in a restructuring of our Superior Courts in more than 125 years. The responsibility of the Province is to provide adequate facilities for the courts. We have no responsibility for appointment or paying the salaries of Superior or District Court judges. We proceeded to provide facilities, and they were in place, oh, it must be at least six months ago for the Appellate Court.

We also provided, again to be sure that there would be no delays on the part of the Province, five new posts for the Appellate Court. After the legislation was passed in Ottawa providing for the appointment of the new judges, and appointments were made, it was brought to the attention of the Province that these new facilities might be better suited for the District Courts in the St. John's area and the facilities at that time occupied by the District Courts made available to the Appellate Court. Consequently, without delay, within a matter of days of the request being made, the District Court judges moved to the building on Duckworth Street formerly the Daily News building where they are now functioning.

The Appellate Court renovations are proceeding with absolute speed and my colleague the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services informs me that his men advise him that the renovations will be completed on or about December 31 of this year.

In the meantime we have a rather difficult situation. We now have two judges of the Trial Division without any offices, Mr. Justice Mahoney and Mr. Justice Goodridge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HICKMAN: There is simply no room -

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. HICKMAN: Sorry!

MR. SPEAKER: I want to call the attention of the hon. minister to Beauchesne chapter 181 subsection 1, as I called to the attention of one of his colleagues yesterday. I will read the brief section. "Questions must be answered briefly and distinctly," it goes on, "and be limited to the necessary explanations though a certain latitude is permitted to Ministers of the Crown whenever they find it necessary to extend their remarks with the view of clearly explaining the matter in question."

Obviously that citation is open to misuse and abuse. I would point out that I think the essential part of it is obviously the first statement it makes and I call it to the attention of the hon. member because the explanations or additional data must be necessary explanation so that the answer will be intelligible.



MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I thank Your Honour for the wisdom and compassion on which that ruling was based. In view of the fact the minister did not answer my question as to whether or not he had asked the Minister of Justice in Ottawa to proceed immediately with the appointment of the missing Supreme Court judge, the Appellate judge, I am dissatisfied with his answer and let us give him, Sir, the opportunity to debate it tomorrow and then we will talk about who will not be resigning from this House to accept the appointment.

MR. SPEAKER: So noted.

The hon. the Member from LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to put a question to the Minister of Social Services, Sir. Would the minister inform the House if the fifty dollar allowance to needy blind persons in this Province has been sent out to all the people who qualify, all the blind people?

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

MR. BRETT: I will have to take note of the question, Mr. Speaker, I do not have the information with me at the moment.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Premier. I wonder would the Premier indicate to the House what action the government has taken concerning additional office space for the public service, and in particular whether a contract has been awarded as a result of tenders that were called last Spring for rental space.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

MR. MOORES: The answer to the second part of the question is no award has been made to anybody. Regarding space, Mr. Speaker, I think the Leader of the Opposition and other members of this hon. House realize just how critical it is becoming. It is not as critical as that we will not find offices for M.H.A's, but it means that someone else will have to do without, but the space situation from the public service point of view is very unsatisfactory. It is a situation where there are some seventeen locations around the town, around the city now where various departments or sections of departments are located. It makes for very great inefficiency and I think that something will have to be done soon.

Unfortunately it is the type of thing that is made a political

football and sometimes a very partisan one, which is most unfortunate. But the need for space at this time is very severe. It is something that I hope we can come to an agreement on, you know, for the good of all concerned rather than having it used for the wrong purposes. But certainly it is something that we are going to have to do something about very quickly or very soon.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the question now, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. the Premier inform the House if the Workmen's Compensation Board has been given approval by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to put up their own building and rent office space to the government?

MR. MOORES: I do not know. I will take notice of the question and certainly advise him. But I legitimately do not know.

MR. NEARY: You mean you are in the Cabinet and -

MR. MOORES: To the best of my knowledge it is not so, no.

MR. NEARY: It is not so.

MR. MOORES: Not as far as I know, no.

MR. MURPHY: Could we have that information in the Cabinet, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would not the hon. the Premier agree that for the next couple of years civil servants and other Crown agency employees and everybody in Newfoundland drawing his or her pay from the Treasury should be expected to share with the general public in the sacrifice that has got to be made. I am arguing, but let me put it very succinctly; can we not do with what we have got for the next couple of years and save that much expenditure?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I think we have, too, and certainly if it came to public tendering the government would have great difficulty finding the money. But on a lease back policy which was the procedure of the past we may be able to arrange it if it is absolutely necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South. He had indicated but he has changed his mind. The hon. member for La Poile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, since nobody else has a question to ask I have one for the Minister of Education. Would the minister inform the House if the government are going to proceed with plans announced in this hon. House in the Throne Speech two years ago to extend the teaching day at the vocational schools and at the College of Trades and Technology and the Fishery College in order to facilitate the number of students that now have to be turned away from these training facilities?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the question but I am not able to answer it at this time. I will take notice of that question.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder could I direct this question to the hon. the Premier. What is the current situation regarding space and the plans that were made some years ago to extend the Confederation Building? Is that dormant, forgotten or where does it lie at the moment?

MR. MOORES: It is very difficult to answer. There has been plans for leasing space at Atlantic Place, at new buildings. We asked for proposals where we had various designs and various concepts, some in the old building out here, some on the new extension on the west end. The whole thing has become much more complicated than ever it should have. Probably a decision should have been made earlier, and probably that is government's fault, but the fact is that it is serious and I agree with what the hon. the member from Twillingate said, that austerity measures mean an austerity treatment to a lot of people. But the one thing you cannot have is austerity at the total cost of efficiency either. I think it is may be the subject of an all-party committee to sit down and take a look at. I am not opposed to that because it is the type of a thing I think that is going to have to be dealt with in the not very distant future.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Exploits.

MR. MULROONEY: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the minister, would the hon. the Premier state whether the balance of a \$21,000 grant to the Recreation Commission at Point of Bay of which \$5,250 has been awarded, will the agreed financing of the balance over the next three years be guaranteed to enable the -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! In my opinion that will be the type of question of detailed answer- mathematical, statistical kind of answer- which would be better placed on the Order Paper.

MR. MULROONEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter). Has the Minister of Fisheries made a decision as to what will be done to replace the Fishermen's Co-op which recently went into receivership on the Port au Port Peninsula?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CARTER: A decision has not been made yet. I visited Port au Port on the weekend, as the hon. member knows. We had meetings with the development corporation out there. At one point the co-op people requested a sixty day option to enable them to investigate the possibility of re-establishing the Co-op. But on Sunday at the meeting I was told by one of the people concerned that the option had been dropped and they were not now interested in re-establishing one. But certainly a decision will be made very shortly on it.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter). Some time ago he announced that he was travelling throughout the province visiting various areas and so on, is he still doing this and does he have some kind of an itinerary or schedule in mind? I ask the question, Mr. Speaker, because I have had some enquiries in my own district on this matter and this is why I ask it at this time.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker,

MR. CARTER: I have been travelling around. I visited parts of Bonavista North and Fogo district.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: parts of Rose Blanche and Port aux Basques, also Port au Port. This week I will be travelling to parts of my own riding and also the Port au Choix area - but it is an on-going programme which I am -

MR. ROBERTS: Will the minister be coming back?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CARTER: You are awfully funny, you know.

MR. SPEAKER: The thirty minutes for oral question period has transpired.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the regular order of business today be suspended to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, to give a name to the eight pound seven ounce baby boy the Premier has, and I have my suggestion here for Your Honour.

MR. ROBERTS: Are you sure that is a matter for a select committee?

MR. SPEAKER: I would be afraid to ask whether the hon. gentleman has leave. We might end up -

MR. NOLAN: I wonder if I could ask a question along the same lines. Since the income of the hon. the Premier has increased by something over \$22.00 per month in the last twenty-four hours, is it within the ten per cent guidelines?

MR. MOORES: It depends on which family we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, but on the whole, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: On Orders of the Day this being Private Member's Day we proceed to Motion 4. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would warn the Premier in case he does not know that the \$22.00 is taxable. The trouble is the cheque is not made out to him it is made payable to his wife, so he loses it coming and gets it going or vice versa.

Mr. Speaker, the motion which is before the Chair now, I think speaks for itself. It is quite a lengthy motion as motions go. There are a number of preamble clauses which, Your Honour, was kind enough to let - not only to let through, which we appreciate, but to let through without giving us a ruling thereon, which we also appreciate, but the pith and essence of it is in the first resolved clause which reads quite simply, "that a select Committee be appointed to enquire into and to report upon the prospects for Newfoundland and Labrador, including the prospects for economic growth and development and in particular a consideration of those types of development which are best suited to foster and to encourage the way of life most desired by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador."

Now, Sir, in a sense, I suppose, it could be said the motion needs no debate, because I am sure that every hon. gentleman will support it. But I do think it is worth some discussion. I hope there will be debate, because to me, Sir, the subject of this motion is the very heart and soul of what this House of Assembly should be talking about and should be doing. The intent and the purpose of this motion, Mr. Speaker, is nothing more or less than to permit and to set up the mechanism whereby we can chart a course for the future of this Province.

Now it could be said, Sir, that this is the job of the government of the Province. It could be said this is what they have been doing in the last 150 years that we have had governments in this Province, or elected governments, whether they be responsible or representative. But, Sir, the fact that this motion is put forward, I think, is evidenced that the government are not meeting this need. I do not make the motion, Mr. Speaker, in any partisan sense. If we wish we could have a gorgeous debate here in the next eight or nine or twelve or fifteen Private Member's Days on exactly what went on or what did not go on during any given period of any given administration of this Province's history. That would be interesting but very non-productive and essentially in the long run a complete waste of the time of this House. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that is why any of us were sent here.

I am prepared to say and I believe that every government and every minister over the years has tried as best they could to achieve what they could for the people of this Province. There have been some successes, and there have been some failures. We might not agree on what the successes are and what the failures are, but we can all agree that there have been successes and there have been failures,



MR. ROBERTS:

But I think it is sterile and futile to go over the past. It was George Santayana, I believe, who said that those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it. It is all very well to remember it, Sir, but if the debate on this motion takes the course of going over what has or has not been done over the years I submit it will be a waste of the House's time and a waste of the time of the people of this Province. I think we should accept the fact that all of the members of this House now and in the past are basically men of good will and go on from that point. The motion is very straightforward. It is an effort, as I said, Mr. Speaker, to set up a mechanism. The request is that the committee when appointed be given quite broad powers. It is specifically given the power to sit from place to place throughout the Province. I think that is of the utmost importance because if this committee is to do their job properly they must sit not only in St. John's, which is where normally a Select Committee can sit, or only in St. John's can a Select Committee sit normally unless it is given other powers, I believe they should be prepared to sit at place to place throughout this Province, certainly not in every community but in every region, to give every citizen of the Province the opportunity to come, to see them, to hear them, to state what they wish with respect to the commission's terms of reference.

The commission is also given the power to send for papers and documents and the other words in there would give the commission power to examine witnesses under oath, to commit for contempt and all of the powers which normally are visited upon a royal commission, nothing unusual, nothing exceptional. We are not going to get an inquisition. The powers are no greater than every royal commission ever issued in this Province has had conferred upon it.

That is just the mechanics, Sir. The important point of it is that a commission be set up and the committee be set up to look into certain things and those certain things, Mr. Speaker, are not just the

MR. ROBERTS:

economic prospects for this Province but the prospects - period - for the future of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, Sir, I suppose the first question which I must try to answer and try to convince the honourable gentlemen - the honourable lady is not with us this day as she is benefiting from provisions of the Medicare programme and suffering from a bad case of what we hope is the flu - but what I must try to convince honourable gentlemen is why should we have such an enquiry now? Why, 1975, why at this point in our history should we have such an enquiry? Then, if we are to have such an enquiry, Mr. Speaker, why should it take the form of a Select Committee? Of all the mechanisms open to the public administration of this Province, why should we have a Select Committee as opposed to a royal commission, or as opposed to a minister of the Crown or a number of ministers going and receiving briefs, or as opposed to any of the possible mechanisms which could be developed.

So these are questions which must be answered and these are questions which I shall answer. But there is one, Sir, which I do not think I need to answer, and I do not propose to, and that is the question of why have such an enquiry at all. Surely there is nobody in this House, Mr. Speaker, nobody in this Province who would say that this is not a right and a proper subject for this House of Assembly to be about. It is a matter which concerns us, which should concern us and which affects the people of this Province more intimately than almost anything which we do in this House. In a sense, Sir, 95 per cent of what this House carries out in the course of a session or twelve months is housekeeping, and I do not say that as a pun. We deal with the estimates. We deal with the appropriation bills. We deal with minor amendments to replace commas and put semi-colons in and we put through legislation like it is going out of style and most of it goes on the statute books and there it rests of value only to lawyers who can charge high fees for interpreting it and for arguing as to what it means and civil servants who are paid reasonably good wages

to use the powers conferred under it. Much of what we do is house-keeping. It has to be done and the House is the proper place to do it. But a lot of it, Sir, if it were not to be done at all would not in any way lessen life in Newfoundland. It might improve it considerably.

I want to talk, Sir, on what this motion talks about. It is not the housekeeping of Newfoundland and Labrador but rather what kind of house we should have and what kind of Province we can build.

I want a

Mr. Roberts:

grand national inquest into this Province, I do not think there is anybody, Sir, I cannot conceive of anybody who could or would argue against this, and I cannot conceive of anybody who would argue, could or would argue that this inquest should not be carried out by this House. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. gentleman from Grand Falls ( Mr. Lundrigan) said something.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Inquest?

MR. ROBERTS: I said inquest, i-n-q-u-e-s-t. If the hon. gentleman is not familiar with a word of two syllables, Mr. Speaker, I should be very happy to ask the page to bring him a dictionary, and I will have somebody point it out to him.

Mr. Speaker, the original definition of parliament, one of the original definitions of parliament, is a grand inquest into the affairs of the nation, and that is what I think we should be about now. It is not a new quest, Mr. Speaker. It is not a new issue. In a sense it has come up in this House in every session of the thirty-seven General Assemblies that have sat here. It has been a constant preoccupation of Newfoundlanders. Anybody who reads anything of our history must be struck by that. I suppose the classic formulation was the Reverend Moses Harvey back in the 1880's who, as I recall reading it, once gave a speech which said, where now and whither tending. The puff boiler, the propaganda, the puff piece which Whitbourne, Admiral Whitbourne, Sir Richard Whitbourne published early in the seventeenth century to entice people to come to Newfoundland was a form of it. The most interesting little book, which my friend from Twillingate published in 1930, I believe it was, the "New Newfoundland" was given over to an intensive examination and a discourse upon what could and should be done with Newfoundland. We can go right on down through the piece, through columns and newspapers, and through public speeches and through speeches here in this House. But why now, Sir? Why should we have an inquiry now? Why this year of all the years? Well, Sir, I think first of all that there is great and growing public awareness and concern.

The hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) made a public statement recently in which he adverted to it, and I expect him to support this motion. I think it is the sort of motion which would lead

to the result that he had in mind, as I read and as I understood his public statements. But there is growing awareness around this Province. Any of us who moves around and talks with our people and listens to our people knows that there is a growing concern in this Province. Just where are we going and what are we in for? What can we expect? What are we getting? Are we making any progress, or are we falling behind?

We have a government that came into office, an administration that came into office four years ago in a sea change, a complete reversal of a political situation which had existed for twenty-three years, and they came into office planning and promising a new direction. They have obviously failed in that, Sir. Unemployment is up. After four years we are still getting the same rhetoric. We got it in the Throne Speech again. We had it in the Budget Speech. All we are getting is rhetoric, the change of parties, Sir, the change of political stripes of the administration. The hon. gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) on Sunday, on the television said essentially the same thing that the change and direction which he expected four years ago did not come. It did not happen. And many of us feel that way. The people of Newfoundland and Labrador feel that way. The change of the political complexion of the administration did not really change very much. Let me just read an article written by a man very knowledgeable and skilled in the development field, Mr. Frederick Evans, who I believe is now on the staff of the university. Do you know if he is? I think he is on the staff of the centre for the development of community initiatives.

MR. ROWE: Fred Evans.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Fred Evans. But this is an article which he has just written. He puts a prefatory note on it which is most interesting.

"The following article was produced as a form of performance evaluation and was intended to be released in that context. The calling of a provincial election, however, created the situation where the article could have been construed as partisan politics. The presentation for publication was, therefore, withheld until after the election, and is now presented with some modification" - as was the government after the election

Let us just read what Mr. Evans, an expert in the field of development and planning, said and I gladly, if anybody wants, read the entire eleven page piece, but let me just read the first two or three paragraphs because they set the pattern.

Mr. Evans says, "the present government has a lot of rhetoric to live up to. We all remember the way we nodded approval as we listened to the concept of "The team approach to good government". We all thrilled to the bright future held out to us by "the rational approach to the development of the Newfoundland economy" and, of course the central place that rural development occupied in the thinking of the new government (by which he meant the present administration). The new government held us all spellbound. All of these great things were to come to us by processes of planning.

"Three years later we see the results of the fatal step from the nice, warm bath of theory to the icy cold shower of practice. The team approach to good government has only resulted in the concentration of power in a small number of cabinet members and bureaucrats who head up groupings of cabinet portfolios and high salaried civil servants. Lesser cabinet ministers and backbenchers have little or no say in the running of the government. The rational approach to the development of the Newfoundland economy has resulted in a vast increase of borrowing with a corresponding increase in the public debt, the making of a good corporate citizen from a man condemned in the 1972 rhetoric, and increased support to the manure theory of development which holds that if you spread enough money around something is bound to grow."

What a devastating indictment of what this administration has or has not been doing in the last three years! Now, Mr. Speaker, that in itself is reason enough why we should have this enquiry now. Then add on to that, Sir, the concern with the environment, a new concern, new to Newfoundland but new across North America. Ten or fifteen or twenty years ago nobody gave a damn about the environment - if the price of industry was pollution then let us pay the price and glad to do it. But now, of course, Mr. Speaker, now of course we are more and more, and properly so, concerned with the environment.

Down in Baie Verte where my friend, the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has been told an investigation is under way, and nobody knows about the investigation including the Minister of

Health because there is no such investigation underway, down in Baie Verte they are becoming concerned about the environment, and out in Long Harbour the men who work there are becoming concerned about the environment, out in Stephenville where when the wind is the wrong way you know there is a pulp mill across the bay by the odors coming across, in Grand Falls, where the chip problem has caused a great deal of concern, and throughout the Province as a whole environmental matters are becoming of concern. Our younger people are becoming concerned with the quality of life. Many of the older people as well are becoming aware and concerned with questions of life styles.

I am not going to say we should have a book called The Greening of Newfoundland and Labrador, but these are issues which are more and more of concern to more and more people of this Province. There is more to life than the almighty buck. Development at any price is not worth it. You know, a job is not an end to it all. We must of course have economic development but if the price of economic development is the destruction of much of the way of life of this Province, that is too dear a price to pay. That is the sort of thinking that must be taken into account and must be given the opportunity to express itself.

There is a concern with the quality as well as the quantity of life in this Province. We had a royal commission on it in December, 1967 and the report came in, a lovely document, 500 pages, Mr. Speaker. I will wager that of the fifty-one men and women who sit in this House this day there are not five who have read that document. And I will wager there are not 500 people in the whole of this Province out of the 550,000 of us between Trepassay and Cape Chidley who have read that document. There is a lot in it that is useful.

The present Premier was a member of the commission. He may even have read the report, Sir. He will be one of the five members who has. But, Sir, that report said that it was only good for five to ten years and it was presented to the government eight years ago. It is outdated now. Then finally, Mr. Speaker, we have a new House.



MR. LUNDRIGAN: How many people have read it, have you suggested?

MR. ROBERTS: I suggest there might be five in the House.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What about in the Province?

MR. ROBERTS: I said there might be 500 in the Province, and I am being generous.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What about your enquiry, your inquest? How many are going to read your inquest?

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know how many are going to read the inquest.

It will be like the report on the political post-mortem on the hon. gentleman's career, brief but inglorious in Bonavista-Trinity-Conception, of no interest to anybody, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), Sir, is not a freshman in legislative matters, although he is a freshman in this House. If he wishes to go on in this way, I - certainly there have been better men than him try this, and he is willing to try and he will get as good as he gives. But, I would suggest

that that is not adding to the stature of debate. If he wants to play the little games that he won himself such a name for in Ottawa, but not in his constituency - his constituents expressed their views on it - then let him gang ahead. I am trying to make what I consider to be a very important matter. If the hon. gentleman does not feel that way let him either leave the Chamber or let him be quiet. And I am willing to bet, Sir, he has not read this report. He is not one of the five men who has any idea of what is in that report, although as the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development he might be well advised because, of course, he has one of the major responsibilities for trying to do something about it. As the hon. gentleman from Twillingate said on opening day, "The hon. gentleman from Grand Falls is going to find out there is a big difference between having one's mouth yapping in opposition, which had been his career up until now, and having to perform in ministerial office." I, for one -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman from Twillingate, the hon. gentleman from Twillingate on opening day was being suitably dignified as befitted all of us wearing our morning suits and so forth. But that was the import of the hon. gentleman's message and a good import it was. The hon. gentleman from Grand Falls, Sir, if he wants to earn some spurs and wants the leadership for which he has been seeking for so long of the Tory Party, let him perform in office. And I for one welcome it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying we had a royal commission report. We had it eight years ago and the royal commission -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. ROBERTS: No, I should not say that. No, I will not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The royal commission report was eight years ago. It is outdated now. There is much useful information in it and much of it is of value still. But their

economic forecasts were good they said in the most for ten years and the majority of them were good only for five years. So it no longer is a useful guide even to the economic state and prospects, and that was all that they looked at, that commission Mr. Gordon Pushie chaired nine or ten years ago, a commission which I think did excellent work.

Well now, Sir, assuming we should have such an enquiry, such an inquest, a grand inquest into the state of the nation, a grand inquest into the state of the nation - the hon. gentleman may have no plans for the development of this nation, Sir, but other people do - then why a select committee, why a select committee? Well, Sir, the royal commission I think have done valuable background work. Many of the men and the women who wrote the reports in this are still in the public service at one place or another. Ian McAllister is in Halifax. He is a professor of economics at Dalhousie University. Mr. David Mercer is now a vice-president, a senior vice-president of the Hydro Corporation. Mr. Ed Power is in private employ in Ottawa. Bert Templeman died very tragically - at the age of what, thirty-six? just a few months ago. One of the men who put this report together, Mr. David Vardy is head of the Priorities and Planning Secretariat, the administration. Miss Susan McCorquodale is of course on the staff of the political science department. These people are available still, most of them, to give a committee their views and their advice and their suggestions.

I think also, Sir, that we should have some public input. After all, what is wrong with asking the people of Newfoundland and Labrador what they think about the future of their Province. I think there is a good thing to be said for getting some M.H.A.s involved as well. After all, this is a political subject. There is nothing more political than the future of this Province and what the government of this Province should be doing to try to bring that future about.

Nothing should be more political. Nothing would be more appropriate. Nothing would be more fitting for Newfoundland and Labrador than to have our M.H.A.s involved in this sort of discussion as opposed to what usually goes on in this House. And I am not apportioning blame. That in itself that take us a long time and would, I suspect, not produce very much agreement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are the reasons I put forward for having an enquiry now and for having an enquiry in the form of a Select Committee, a committee which could go throughout the Province much like the Select Committee on the Inshore Fishery which travelled throughout the Province, heard briefs. My friend from Fortune-Hermitage, then a private citizen, presented a very excellent brief to the committee. The Select Committee on the fisheries moved a little too quickly. It was just an election gimmick essentially, or pre-election gimmick. It was recognized by the fishermen as being such.

MR. MORGAN: That is not so.

MR. ROBERTS: No, it is not so. That is why the Tory Party lost almost every fishing district in the Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the -

MR. MORGAN: They did not loose Bonavista South;

MR. ROBERTS: No, they did not lose Bonavista South. The people lost Bonavista South but the Tory Party won, Sir.

Now, Sir, as I was saying before the hon. gentleman from Bonavista South surfaced again.

MR. MORGAN: How undignified!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants to talk about dignity would do well to observe the first rule of the House which is that a member speaking has the right to speak in silence, and the hon. gentleman, Sir, the hon. gentleman from Bonavista South is one of the people who can open his mouth and say very little. I would suggest, Sir, that he keep his mouth closed and learn a lot.

Now what is the problem? Just what is the problem facing this province today? What would a committee do? Well I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it would ask questions. It would ask some of the hard questions that have not been asked and have not been answered in Newfoundland and Labrador, and it would get some answers. It would have a look at unemployment. ah! the great political stand-by! Every politician, I suppose since Dr. Carson and John Kent went at it talked about unemployment and what he was going to do and on and on and on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, the facts show that the unemployment situation in this province is going from bad to worse and worse still. I have here the official statistics issued by the government for the month of February in the years from 1963 to 1975, showing the labour force, showing the number employed, and the number unemployed, and the unemployment rate for each year in the month of February, the same month the same conditions would obviously apply. February is not a high point in the employment year. Seasonal industries are all shut down in February month.

In 1953, Mr. Speaker, there were employed in this province 101,000 people out of a labour force of 107,000, 5.6 per cent unemployment rate. In 1954, Sir, the unemployment rate dropped to 5.1; the next year

6.0; the year after, 1956, Sir, 6.5; in 1957 the unemployment rate went from 6.5 up to 8.8 per cent. In February 1957, out of a work force of 114,000 people in this province, 10,000 were unemployed, 8.8 per cent. Then, Sir, the work force doubled, I am sorry, the unemployed doubled, the work force did not. The hon. member for Twillingate will remember this because we had a change of administration in Ottawa, we had a Tory Government in Ottawa and look what happened in Newfoundland. In 1958 the unemployment rate was 16.7 per cent, the year after 21.5, 18.2, 18.9, 18.3 and in February 1963, Sir, 17.3, the end of the Tory years. Mr. Diefendbaker was dragged from office in April of 1963, Mr. Pierson became Prime Minister.

In February, 1964 the economy was being stimulated, a labour force of 121,000 people, Mr. Speaker, 108,000 employed, 13,000 unemployed an unemployment rate of 10.7 per cent compared to 17.3 per cent twelve months previously. The year after, 1965, 12.4 per cent and then 8.6, 7.7, 9.2, always Your Honour will note, in the same range. Then 10.9 per cent in 1969, 9.7 in 1970, 10.9 in February 1971 and when the present administration came into office here, Sir, 10.8 per cent. In February 1972, a fortnight after the hon. gentleman opposite first assumed office, there were 157,000 people in the work force in this province. 140,000 of them were employed in February, 17,000 were unemployed, 10.8 per cent unemployment rate.

But as usual, Sir, Tory times, it climbed to 11.8 per cent, it climbed to 15.5 per cent, it climbed to 17.6 per cent in 1975 and I am told it will go to 30 per cent in February 1976.

MR. MORGAN: 8 per cent national.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the national rate has obviously gone up and down. But the significant thing is the unemployment rate in Newfoundland has risen always under the Tory Party. I am not saying they have caused it. I am just saying they have presided over it.

Mr. Roberts:

17.6 per cent, Sir, last February, and it would be a brave man who would predict much under 30 per cent, Sir, in this year.

My friend from Port au Port district (Mr. Hodder) tells me that as many as one out of two of his constituents are unemployed, and that does not take into account the labour disputes and however many hundreds and thousands of our people are out of work, out of productive work at any point in time because of a labour-management dispute.

Mr. Speaker, the record is dismal. The work force between February 1972 and February 1975 has increased by 27,000 people. There were 157,000 Newfoundlanders employed - I am sorry, in the work force in February 1972 when the hon. gentleman opposite took office, 184,000 in the work force in February 1975 three years after the present government took office.

What happened, Mr. Speaker, what happened with the number employed? 27,000 people had come into the work force. The number employed, Mr. Speaker, rose from 140,000 in February 1972 all the way to 141,000 in February 1975, an increase of 1,000 people employed. The number unemployed, Sir, went up from 17,000 to 43,000 - 26,000 more of our fellow Newfoundlanders looking for work. Well, Sir, why is that? Does it have to be? Could we do better than that in Newfoundland and Labrador or are we condemned to live forever with unemployment rates rarely below 10 per cent in our history as a Province and these last few years climbing steadily 10.8, 11.8, 15.5, 17.6, and what is it this year? 25. It was 20 the most recent figures, 25, 30 per cent when we get into the depths of the Winter months. It is one of the questions, Mr. Speaker, that must be looked at, and I think a Select Committee is the way to do it.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have the growing demand for services, even though much has been done, even though the present administration have done much to improve services in this Province. They had too. They were spending money. They could not avoid improving services. They have paved

some roads, they built a few water and sewer systems, They have not opened a hospital bed in four years in office. But they have done some good things, of course they have, and more power to them. They built a Regional College in Corner Brook. The Liberal Party built a university, the Tory Party has built a Regional College and that is about as fair a summation of their approach to things. But they have improved services, of course they have. But, Sir, they have not met the need, and everywhere you go in this Province and everything you hear in this Province is that the need for improved services is not being met, and our people, Sir, our people - not only is the need for services not being met, but the growing expectations are not being met because our expectations are growing and so they should. A few years ago, Sir, many Newfoundlanders would have been quite content, particularly in the rural areas, the hon. gentleman from Grand Falls (John Lundrigan) would agree, with rather meager services because that was the most they could see, They thought if the day ever came when they got a bit of road to get in and out of their harbour, and maybe a bit of light so they would not have to use an old Delco - and there is only one community left in my constituency now, Mr. Speaker, that has to use a Delco. It is the only community that the Tories won in the whole district of the Straits of Belle Isle. There is a message in that for somebody, they won it twelve votes to eleven. Mr. Speaker, that was all that people aspired to, a few, you know, a few very basic services. But now, Mr. Speaker, now, Sir, people expect, and rightly so, water and sewer systems, and adequate housing, and not just a bit of road but a good all-weather road, a paved road, and access to all of the public services - medical, educational and every type of service. And the result of this, Mr. Speaker, is that there is today in this Province a growing frustration on the part of our people. There is a very strong feeling, I do not think as yet a realization, but the frustration is coming because of the gap between the expectations which our people hold and the reality which they perceive. I suppose that is a jargon way to say that much wants more, and I say that our people deserve more. The problem now, as the Premier has told us, and as the Minister of Finance has told us, and as other hon. gentlemen will



tell us, is that our economy cannot produce more, it cannot justify, it cannot pay for more services.

The labour disputes, Sir, the labour-management disputes that we have, they are really an example of this frustration. Every M.H.A. has encountered it. Every M.H.A. who moves about and listens at all to people, and thinks about what is on their minds and what their concerns are sees almost an anger, inchoate, inarticulate, but very real. The system just does not seem to be working. And for twenty-five or twenty-six or twenty-seven years now we have made spectacular progress in the first years of Confederation, the first twenty or so, Now she is slowing down. And so we

changed the administration. Obviously it was the dirty Liberals, but they could not do it. We could not do it, and I was proud to be a member of the Liberal administration. Obviously, the people said, "Boy, that is what caused it. The dirty Liberals could not do it. They did not know what to do. It was their fault things were slowing down." So now we have had the Progressive Conservatives, our Tory friends, for the last three or four years, and they are not doing it either. And I find, Sir, that more and more people in this Province are beginning to wonder. This is not unique to Newfoundland but I think it is more striking here, because we have come so far in so short a space. But not only have we come far, Sir, we want to come further, because our people, Sir, watch the same television as do people across Canada and travel widely and have the same expectations. And a young boy or young girl growing up in Flowers Cove or in Francois expects to have the same kind of life as any Canadian citizen, be he in Toronto or be he in Vancouver or be he anywhere, and so he should have. Sir, people are beginning to wonder in this Province whether government as an institution can do the job, and I am not talking about a government of one party or another party or any party. But I find, Sir, that there is a growing cynicism, a very real cynicism growing among our people about government, about the efficacy of government, about the role government can play. It is tied up with the belief - and I am not suggesting for a moment that people are not concerned with economic issues, of course they are - but with the belief that development at any price is not worth it, that a job in itself is not the only end in life, that it is no good giving work to 200 or 300 men in Baie Verte if we are poisoning them with a death sentence from asbestosis. That is not the way to develop Newfoundland.

Thirty or forty years ago men in St. Lawrence went to work in the mine there, and they could not have cared less, Mr. Speaker, if they were being poisoned or not they were that desperate for a job to feed their families. But now, Sir, my friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning), many of whose constituents are connected with that mine and

have families there now find out their feeling , and who is to blame them, Sir? Those of us in the House are not required to put our own health at hazard, maybe our reputations, but not our health at hazard to try to make a living.

Sir, I find, and I do not put this - it is not a matter of Liberal and Tory. I think the change of government, the change from the Liberal administration to a P. C. administration was a very good thing in that sense, because it showed people that whatever was causing this malaise in our Province today, whatever the cause of the fact the economy was not producing what it should produce, what it has to produce if we are to have what we want and what we feel we need and we feel we are entitled to, but whatever the cause of that it was not the fact that the group of men who sat around that table down on the eighth floor or sat to Your Honour's left here in the this House that it was not just that those group of men belonged to one political party or another. And I think the last four years, Mr. Speaker, have shown that conclusively beyond any shadow of any doubt.

Now, Sir, those are some of the questions that a committee could ask. Let us get some answers. Let them send for the officials in the government and say, "What do you think?" We have had a great galumphing expensive Priorities and Planning Secretariat down there on the seventh floor for the last four years, what have they done? What are they doing? Let us get in the resource experts. We all talk about our fisheries, a good thing for us to talk about in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, what is the potential of our fisheries? Your Honour is new to the House. But Your Honour has been interested in public affairs. Some hon. members have sat in this House for many years now. My friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning) and the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) have been here, with a gap of four years, have been here for twenty-two years now. Has there ever been an estimate made of just what can be done in the fisheries? How many jobs can we get? Oh! we all talk about development.

We are on to trout farming now, an idea which the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) was on what - five, six years ago. Merrill Menzies, Ralph Hedlin and his crowd in Toronto were commissioned to do a report on that, on fish farming. Maybe there are a few fish that can be farmed or a few farms that can be fished.

Now we are hearing now some more, that the Premier allegedly was overseas talking about joint ventures, joint ventures, putting the European people out off the 200 mile limit and then letting them land their fish here and process it ashore, a good idea.

MR. CARTER: That is not new idea.

MR. ROBERTS: No, of course, it is not new. It has been fought out

MR. ROBERTS:

in this House many times. Mr. Speaker, how many jobs are there in it? There must be some figures somewhere. Are we just going ahead like the blind fool staggering ahead, Sir, lurching from one hope to another, one thought to another, or do we have some idea where we are going in this Province? How many jobs can there be in our fisheries? The Minister of Fisheries is new to his post but he has a deep interest in the fisheries and I hope a deep knowledge of them. It will require an even deeper knowledge, but how many jobs can we create in our fisheries?

I know, Sir, that employment in the fisheries has not increased significantly despite the incredibly large capital investments that have been made. I venture, and we had a debate here in the House last year, the hon. gentleman's predecessor, the member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) and I had it back and forth on the figures. But as I recall them, Mr. Speaker, there are fewer people employed today in the fisheries than there were twenty years ago in this Province for all the advances, for all the developments. God knows where we would have been without the developments, probably nobody in the fisheries. But how many can we get?

What about our forestry? Where are we going in the forestry? Twenty years ago - no, it was not twenty, sixteen years, seventeen years ago there was a bloody, and I use that term in its literal sense, there was a bloody war fought in Central Newfoundland. The IWA, and the real issue in the IWA, the industrial issue as opposed to the issue of who controlled the Province, the elected government or a group within that society, but the industrial issue was simply would there be a full-time logging force or a part-time logging force. There were 20,000 loggers part-time in 1959, there are three or four thousand today full-time, highly paid skilled professional men. But there are 16,000 part-time jobs that are no longer there. What future in our forestry, Sir? How many more jobs can we get?

A Memorial University professor made a speech out in Gander, was it? - they are always going to Gander to make speeches. They must have a lien on the Hotel Gander by now - Mr. Speaker, was it he said that we can increase our forestry by 15 per cent by introducing new machinery? Or increase our utilization, I guess. I think he said the cut could be

MR. ROBERTS:

down but we could produce the same volume. But, Sir, how many more jobs could there be? Can the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture tell me, what is our potential? We know how many cords of wood we have roughly and we know the ones we can get at. Nothing new on that. The Kennedy Commission twenty years ago looked at it, and the Rousseau Commission - no pun on the honourable gentleman's name - looked at it ten years ago, but how many jobs can we create? Let us get some experts in before a House Committee and ask them; "Mr. Expert what do you think we can do in the forestry? If we have 20,000 people working now can we get 30,000 people there?" Or are we just bumbling ahead hoping frantically somebody gets an idea, some promoter wanders in with an idea, or somebody around the Cabinet table says; "Boys, why do we not try this?" Or some constituent says; "Sir, I want some money for that." Or some genius somewhere gets an idea and writes a book or a paper and somebody happens to read it and says; "Why do we not do that?"

What about our minerals? What job potential have we in our minerals? The only new mine we have had in the last few years is Daniel's Harbour and that is a twenty year old concession come to fruition. The cement plant out in Port au Port has been downed by the economic winds. But what can we do in our minerals? What is our potential in jobs, and what will it cost us in the qualitative factors?

Our energy resources: I do not propose to go into the Lower Churchill here, though obviously it is worth at least an hour and-a-half of any members time, but what is the situation with our energy resources? The real reason we are not going ahead with the Lower Churchill, obviously, is that we cannot sell the power. That is the reason and all else follows from there, just as the Upper Churchill power could not have been developed if Quebec had not bought it. It would still be flowing unchecked to the sea, and Sir Winston Churchill's design or desire of a great imperial scheme to put a bridle on those falls would not have come to fruition. Maybe it should or it should not, but the fact remains, unless there was a customer it would not and the only possible customer was Quebec Hydro, be it good, bad or indifferent.

MR. BRETT: At two and-a-half mils?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, at two and-a-half mills. One could have bought gasoline at three dollars. And the hon. gentleman is so wise in hindsight, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is so wise,-

MR. MORGAN: Fifty years.

MR. ROBERTS: let him - Mr. Speaker, his record of development so far, his administration's record of power development is nothing. Zero. And let us see what they come up with.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Crude oil then was a dollar and a quarter a barrel.

MR. ROBERTS: They are wise in hindsight. We will stack their record up, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: In sixty years.

MR. ROBERTS: We will stack their record up. Yes, I hope the hon. gentleman is around in sixty years. I hope so, Sir, for his sake if not for ours.

And what of the future of areas? What about the Burin Peninsula? It has been a very prosperous area but a deep concern down there now. What is the true situation on the shipyard? The minister has not come clean yet. There is more there that has not come out. What about the future of the fishing industry down there? And then what about those other great coasts? What about the Northeast Coast? What future is there? I believe there is one. But what is the future?

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) today in his daily appearance in the question period asked about a proposal possibly to cut out some fish plants. And, of course, there is no such proposal. Some of them may have to be financed socially as opposed to economically because they are social. The fish plant in Englee may or may not be an economic venture, but without the fish plant in Englee there is no Englee—to name an area with which both the hon. gentleman who presently represents St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Carter) and I are familiar. I mean, it may or may not be economic but the almighty buck does not rule. If it does, then we might as well all pack up and go to Toronto, or go further west to Vancouver somewhere.

But, what is the future? The government have not stated any plan. They have not given the people any information. Just what can be done? What is going to happen in our rural communities? More and more as one goes into the outharbours, Sir, one is confronted with the situation that there is nobody in the average, in many of our outharbours, not the average one, but many of our smaller communities have nobody older than fifteen, or between the ages of fifteen and say, fifty. Think. Hon. gentlemen represent outharbour



constituencies. I will bet down in St. Mary's-The Capes in many of the communities down there - and it is not an area I know very well - but when a young man or woman gets to be fifteen or sixteen or seventeen, he or she leaves to go elsewhere, has to to make a living. Is that the future of our rural areas? If so, is that what we want? Must it be? Or can we provide a base in a rural area? Not 3,000 jobs in four years and most of those temporary in sawmills that are going bankrupt as quickly as the leaves fall from the trees.

Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Labrador?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, and that is the next item. What about Labrador? What about the Coast of Labrador, that 800 miles that my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) - the seat should have been called the Coast of Labrador, that historic name - the gentleman who represents Eagle River and represents it very well, I will thank you, but what is the future of those communities, of Fox Harbour and Williams Harbour and all the way from Mary's Harbour north to Nain? What about the future of the part of Labrador that I represent, Red Bay down to L'Anse-au-Clair? What about the future of the St. Barbe Coast? You know, want to go right around the Province?

But, what is the future? The government have not provided any answers. Maybe they have none. Maybe a committee would find them, but I think, Sir, we should try that committee. They are old questions that have never been answered. In our history, Mr. Speaker, we have always looked panaceas. We have always figured that just over the hill there was the green and lush promised land. If you go right back through, Mr. Speaker - the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) can be much more eloquent than I can and particularly on these things - but the railway was the great answer when - was it Thorburn put the railway through or Whiteway? Sir William Whiteway put the railway through, his administration, and a mighty achievement it was. That was to be the answer to our problem, if you read the books of the day or the newspapers of the day.

If only the railway got through to St. George's, that was

the cry, we would open her up. So, we put the railway through.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We got Grand Falls.

MR. ROBERTS: And we got Grand Falls and that was the big panacea then.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And Buchans and Corner Brook.

MR. ROBERTS: Right. But still the unemployment still climbing and then Corner Brook came and the hum on the Humber was the next big step forward. And then the third mill in Stephenville and the Come By Chance. Then we had the alphabet soup. ADA, anybody here remember ADA, the Area Development Agency. It had a brief but inglorious life in Ottawa, gave out a few millions.

Then came FRED, the Fund for Rural, Economic Development. You could write theses on these and no doubt hon. gentlemen have. Then came ARDA which underwent a significant metamorphosis from being the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Administration to the Agricultural and Rural Development Administration. Then

we had DREE. And DREE was going to provide all of our answers. And now DREE have had a menopause, as it were, and have had an agonizing midlife change and are no longer in the infrastructure business. The hon. gentlemen can no longer look to DREE to provide the water and sewer systems and the schools. Whatever moves DREE, that mighty mind of DREE in Ottawa there on the Laurier Avenue and the Carlton Building is no longer infrastructure.

MR. MOORES: Menopause was your word, Sir.

MR. ROBERTS: Menopause was my word, and I think it is not a bad one at all. They have had sort of a change of life and they are no longer as fertile, at least when it comes to shovelling dollars out to the treasury of this Province. They have done a lot in Newfoundland, of course they have, and they have a lot more to do including the Northern Peninsula Highway, which I am delighted to know will continue next year, thanks to Uncle Ottawa.

All of those things, Sir, did some good. Some did more good than others, and some could have done more good than they did. They have come and they have gone. Each one was going to be the answer. And I have not gone back to the records of this House but I am sure if I did you could find over the Thirty-Seven General Assemblies that almost every session, or certainly every Assembly, had one great answer to our problems. And some times the answers were achieved and some times they were not, and men strove mightily. The railway now looks insignificant. Who goes by rail now? You get in your car and drive. The government that put it through, Sir, had courage and vision and foresight. At the time it was a mighty project, and a mighty risk and one as the hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) says, paid off, paid off. But to read of it at the time it was going to be Lord - the Opposition of the time said it was Lord Rothermere's private hunting estate. That is what they said at Grand Falls. There would be no town in Grand Falls. Essentially the same things were said about Mr. Shaheen during the debates on the oil refinery at Come By Chance. And now, of course, this administration is promising us a second oil refinery when conditions improve.

Mr. Speaker, now, of course, the great panacea, the one that the Premier and his colleagues have had handed up to them on what they thought was a silver platter until they grasped it and discovered that it was a very hot silver platter was the Lower Churchill. That was going to solve all of our problems. If only we had the Lower Churchill or when we had the Lower Churchill all our problems would be set straight. We would have the perfect land, the Elysian fields would be here on earth, and they would be bounded by the boundaries of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Well, Sir, we may or may not get the Lower Churchill. I hope we do, but that is another story. The fact remains, Sir, the problem still remains. Unemployment keeps going up, and unemployment is a pretty good measure of the economic performance, of the performance of the economy of this Province. People are becoming increasingly dissatisfied with the quality of life. And then on top of it the government now have to begin to tell us the full story of the economic position of the Province, the financial position of the Province. We had a singeing 25 per cent increase in the sales tax and more to come in the next two or three years.

So, Mr. Speaker, where do we turn? Do we turn to planning? It used to be the great answer. A few years ago hon. gentlemen opposite, whenever a problem came up said, planning was the answer.

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. the Leader of the Opposition permit a question.

MR. ROBERTS: No, when I am finished I would be delighted to try to answer any question the hon. member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) would care to address afterwards, Let me finish my carefully thought-out notes - if I can only read my writing.

Mr. Speaker, where do we turn? Planning? It was given as an answer. Oh, yes, yes, when we get into office we will plan and we will have priorities, and when we plan there will be money for everything. And, of course, we have now discovered after all of the planning there is not the least evidence that this Province is any better governed now than

it has even been in its history. It is no better governed now than when the fishing admirals governed. Taxes are up, unemployment is up. This is a result of planning? Few new jobs. The budget - the first time in history, I suppose, a budget has come in, not just on a deficit, put that aside, but admitting a \$30 million or \$40 million, \$50 million or \$60 million deficit - they only admit \$30 million, but it is larger than that, Your Honour. Little new development. I scratched my head briefly today, Mr. Speaker, to try to think of the new projects that this administration have got going in an industrial development sense. Perhaps the hon. Minister could help me, because I thought of the Daniel's Harbour zinc mine and I mark that up.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I will help you!

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I will help you!

MR. ROBERTS: All right, I agree. And certainly the hon. gentleman, Sir, his help is something I can do without. There is a light bulb factory, I believe it is going up on the Thorburn Road, thereby adding significantly to the traffic congestion in the western end, or that part of the western end of St. John's.

Now what else have they done?

They have been in for four years. We no longer had an Economic Development Department, we had an Industrial Development Department and they are busy as nailers down there. They are located just between the barber shop and the liquor store down on Philip Place. Now what have they done? You know, I am genuinely asking. The man who was the minister, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Doody), is not in the House. He is in Ottawa today doing some good, I have no doubt, for the cause. But what has happened? We certainly have not made any progress in unemployment. We are not even holding our own. We are falling further and further behind, 3,000 jobs they claim in Rural Development and I would like to see an auditor go through that. I think that would be worth the cash. It would be worth a lot more cash than the province is going to get back, because most of the money in Rural Development is gone now and there are no permanent jobs to show for it.

I am not talking, Sir, about unkept promises. I am not talking about Mr. Ted Sorenson's great industries. He came and he went fishing. I am not sure if he was fishing for fish or something else, but he promised, the summer of 1972 he "promised" a great number of new industries. I do not know what has happened but they have never come. Well I have The Evening Telegram clippings on the point if the Premier would like to refresh his memory.

We heard of an aluminum plant. That is no closer to fruition now than it ever was. We have gone all over the world flogging our wares, as it were, to about every aluminum industry in the world, but no aluminum industry. During the famous by-election in Hermitage we heard a great deal about hardwoods industries down in Bay d'Espoir. The Rallands Plant is not a hardwoods industry in the sense it was described then. There are any number of others.

So where do we turn, Mr. Speaker? Where do the people of Newfoundland and Labrador go? Do we just go on the way we are, staggering on every few years, chucking out that crowd and putting in this crowd, and then unemployment going up and everybody trying to scratch their minds to get some public relations devices to try to explain it away, and stagger

through and cook the books in an election year to get over the hump of an election and then put her on for another three or four years and have another great burst of energy and expenditure the year before the election. Is that the way our public life is to develop in this province? That is not why any of us is here. I do not think any member of this House or any of the 150 or 200 people who sought election on September 16 wanted to be in the House to take part in that sort of public life. Panaceas do not answer, Sir. Any project one can dream of will not in itself solve our problems and most of them will not even come close to it.

So where do we go? What do we do? Do we give up? We are not going to give up. If we give up we might as well fold her up now and send the keys to Ottawa and say, there you have got her now boys, and all go our separate ways and the devil take the hindmost. That is completely, I mean nobody, nobody would suggest that. Obviously we go back to our basics. We have got to look at our resources and our geographic position and our human abilities. But just what can be done? Nobody in the House knows, or nobody in the House has told us, I do not pretend to have all the answers, but I would like to be on that committee to be able to get, I would like to be able to get the Minister of Fisheries up as a witness. He would not have to be under oath. I would like him to tell us how many jobs his officials tell him can be created in the fishery, and he can send an expert from here and an expert from there - well most of them, I may add, have been in here over the years, at least once and some more than once. And I would like to get the Minister of Mines and Energy and let him tell us. The government have been holding the Lower Churchill to themselves like that, clutching it to their ample -

AN HON. MEMBER: Bosom?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that is not parliamentary. To their ample girth as if somehow it was a secret, and yet it is our money. There is \$55 million or \$60 million at risk now on the Lower Churchill project. It is our money. We, the people of this province, will have to pay for it and we may have to pay for it in no hospital in Grand Falls, or no

hospital in Salt Pond, Burin. That may be the price we have to pay for it. Or no decrease in the pupil-teacher ratio. That may be the price we have to pay.

What can we make of our resources, Mr. Speaker? There has never been a statement of what we can achieve in this province, never that I am aware. And while I do not even pretend to know the tenth of what has gone on or what is going on in this province I think I would have heard about it. Somebody would have come in and told me. I hear almost everything else these days. What can we build? How many jobs can we develop? And what kind of life can we provide our people?



What can we do? We are okay as M.H.A.'s. We are all getting our big fat salaries. And when we get flicked out, as all of us will in due course, in the fullness of time, when we get out we will all be teachers and doctors and lawyers and businessmen. We will do okay. One of the things about this House, Mr. Speaker, is nobody gets in it except people who by and large are well off. And not necessarily well off in dollars, but well off in the social and economic structure. Is that not what happens?

MR. ROWE: What am I doing here?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, my colleague from Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) is concerned about being well off economically. Actually it is not his concern, Sir, I can venture, it is his bank manager's concern. But, Sir, the people who get in this House tend to be the people who are going to do fairly well. It is the same with the House of Commons in Ottawa, you know. We all sit and talk about the ordinary people. The gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) told us yesterday, he represents 99.9 per cent of the people of this Province. I am not going to say anything about that except, you know, there is a lot of truth in the fact that whatever an ordinary citizen is, he does not get in this House. We are making out okay. We are the crowd who do okay in Newfoundland and Labrador. And if the whole thing goes under, we will be okay. The doctors will get their pound of flesh, because people will be sick and will have to be looked at. The undertakers will get us all in the end anyway. The lawyers will do okay, because even if you are going bankrupt you need a lawyer. The teachers will find a job somehow. There will always be some businessmen who can grub a few cents by buying a pair of socks for \$1 and selling them for \$1.50 in the name of economic development. We will do okay.

MR. SIMMONS: The insurance salesmen will do well.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the insurance salesmen will do well, because obviously if we are facing calamity, that is when we need insurance. But, you know, Mr. Speaker, what can we build in this Province? We

can all say we believe, and I think we all do believe, and I am prepared to say we all believe, but what can we achieve? What can we do? How many jobs can we create? Was Percival Copes right? I do not think he was. But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, Percival Copes' argument is a powerful one and it deserves rebuttal. Is that our fate? Are we condemned to live with 15 per cent and 20 per cent unemployment for the rest of our political lives or for the rest of our natural lives? How long are we going to go on just pretending things are okay? They are not okay. The government have now come crunch up against it. The man and woman who is unemployed is crunch up against it. The Province is coming crunch up against it. People are not going to get the water and sewer systems they have been led to expect, and I am not talking about political promises. I am talking about the fact that they know that in this day and age it is not unusual, there is nothing wrong, you are not aspiring to undreamed of heights to have a water and sewer system. It is not much to ask. Twenty years ago nobody except St. John's and Grand Falls and Corner Brook dreamed of such luxuries or Harbour Grace and Carbonear and sophisticated places. Most people in Newfoundland now it is not a luxury, it is a straight necessity. Out in Lewisporte district, they expect it, and why should they not. If they are going to live in Embree and Stanhope and Comfort Cove they have a right to have decent and adequate public services. Why should not the people on the Burin Peninsula not aspire to a hospital? You know, that is not much to ask for. But can we provide it? And what can we make of our opportunities when we know what they are?

Do we want to be a Rhur valley in Newfoundland? Do we? If the price of development is to have a couple of dozen Long Harbours and three or four Baie Vertes, do we want that? Maybe we do, maybe we do not. I think it is a fair choice to ask people to make. Do we want all to live in urban areas? The Province is becoming urbanized now. Do we want to live in smaller communities? And if so, do we have to pay a price in services? Do we have to do without certain things if we want to live in the rural areas? Good questions, real questions, questions that people deserve

to have answered. And above all what kind of way of life do we want in this Province? What kind can we build and what price must we pay to build it? We all talk. The Premier is very prone to do this. I certainly have been known to do it. Ah! The Premier need not lift his eyebrows, I am not going to take a crack at him, not on this occasion. We all talk about our way of life, and I think we all believe that our way of life is unique and worth preserving. We all rush out and buy the Books of Newfoundland, so we should, because they are part of our heritage, and they tell us a lot about ourselves.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no need to rush out.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, no, they rushed in to me. Nelson Oates rushed in today. When people rush in - my colleague, one of my former colleagues, who I will not name, claims to have the most valuable set of the Books of Newfoundland in existence. I would say the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) has the only set that have not been autographed to him.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about our way of life but what do we mean? Is it just empty platitudes and pretty phrases tripping off politicians lips when we look solemnly into the television cameras and do our bit. Sir, the questions which are raised by this motion - and I am really disappointed in the hon. gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) - I do not mind bickering back and forth. It is part of it, and he is good at it, and I will hope to learn from him, but I am disappointed that he has taken the approach he has, Sir, to what I put forward as

very serious motion. And the hon. gentleman, I would hope, I would hope was just carried away by the exuberance of the moment, the joy of being in the House, the celestial blessings of being in the ministry, and above all the ineffable grace, Sir, of being the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development. Sir, the questions which I raise on this motion I consider to be one of great import and great seriousness. The question is not whether we should have a select committee or not. That will be decided by the House in the appropriate way. The real question, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is just what are we doing here as M.H.A.s. Are we going to spend the next two or three or four or five or six or eight months, whatever it is, doing our little housekeeping and being as busy as nailers giving bills first reading and second reading and committee stage and third reading and then some of them a fourth reading and then looking at our estimates and asking our little questions and having our little one-upmanship games and all the things that are part of parliamentary life? Is that what we are going to do? When we draw our pay checks, are we going to be told by the people of this Province, "Well done thou good and faithful servant." Or are we going to try to accomplish something a little beyond that. We are starting a new House. This is the first substantive motion to come before the House. The budget debate, the motions have not yet come up, the substantive motions. What are we going to try to achieve as M.H.A.s the next one year, two years, three, four, however long this thirty-seventh general assembly lasts?

I think that if we set up this committee we can come to grips with some of the big questions, some of the great issues. We can try to set a course for the ship of state of this Province. And I say we should do that, Mr. Speaker. And that is why I bring in this motion, to give us all an opportunity to do so. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that every member will support this motion. Thank you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for the motion because it -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Both hon. gentlemen rose, to my judgment, at the same time. I was to recognize the hon. minister.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I never thought that I would ever be in a position to force Your Honour to make that kind of a judgment. And I say only because of the fact that I want to get my two cents worth in, I would certainly not have any reluctance at all to bow to the hon. gentleman from Twillingate who is a distinguished member of the House for quite some number of years and a person that I feel honoured to be able to be associated with in debate, if not in philosophy and ideology in terms of my political persuasions.

I feel very humble standing here today, Your Honour, for a number of reasons. Although I have been around the political ball park for a little while, this is a brand new experience for me and I look around me and I see a lot of my colleagues, especially the younger members who have not been in the House before and I would like to say to you hon. gentlemen through His Honour, the Speaker, that some of my inexperience in this Assembly will show through quite clearly as the months and the years progress and hopefully at some point in the future I will develop the kinds of skills and the kinds of sophistication in debate that the Leader of the Opposition has exemplified over the years. I hope that I can reach the stage where I can have the intellectual brilliance that he brags about today. And I hope that us outharbour boys from the bays reach the level of education and level of development that will enable us to participate in debate in our esteemed assembly as he indicated here today.

Your Honour, I would like to say through you, Sir, that I have got no great desire to become one of the great sophisticators and intellectual debaters in this Assembly. I have a desire to participate in a very humble way to represent the points of views of the people of Newfoundland to the best of my ability and to be honest and have the integrity and the determination and energy which can justify my election to the House. I say to Your Honour,

or through Your Honour to the Assembly that I have never in my years, in the few years I was in the House of Commons in Ottawa, I have never seen an example of the kinds of personal abuse and the personal interaction that this chamber has seen today and has continued to see over a number of years. Of all of the debates that I was involved in - and I say to the assistant leader of his party through you, Sir - of all of the debates, at no time did I see the debate in the chamber that I was a part of degenerate into the kinds of continuous little personal interactions that you see here. I hope that this chamber today - I have always seen a tremendous repartee, if that is the word, where you get the cut-and-thrust back and forth across the House and the questions raised, but you do not get the kind of - I have not seen that kind of small little personal attack.

I have seen members stand tall. The opposition leader that I was associated with, who was on television last evening, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Stanfield in Ottawa, always recognized that he was part of government, with a small 'g'. He was part of the government process. He had the desire and the need to be -

MR. F. ROWE: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman has risen on a point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: I bring to mind, Mr. Speaker, the rule of relevancy in this particular case. I do not believe the hon. member is being relevant whatsoever to the resolution on the floor of the House of Assembly, and I would ask Your Honour to rule accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER: The rule of relevancy is frequently a difficult one to observe, I would think, and equally difficult to enforce. But I would not be in a position now to rule the hon. minister out on grounds of breach of the rule of relevancy. In my opinion, he is to date in order.

MR. LUNDRIKAN: Now, I was making the point that I hope that the beginning of a legislative Assembly here today, that the real beginning of debate or the continuation of yesterday enables all of us to

respond to the challenge that we have in the Province today of recognizing that we are a province, a part of Canada with the usual abundance of problems in 1975. I hope that the quality of debate and the input from the Opposition recognizes that they have a contribution to make in trying to govern our Province. The Opposition, Mr. Speaker, will never be accepted in 1975 politics as just an adverse force, as a negative force, a destructive force, a critical force. They must have the responsibility of being able to analyse government proposals, government suggestions, government determinations, make their recommendations, have their input and help the people of the Province with good government.

That is the role and that is the kind of a reason why I was so disappointed today. I intended to stand here and compliment the Leader of the Opposition. I had anticipated that he was going to come up with a serious of recommendations and show us a new front, a new thrust and a new attitude. I am very disappointed today, and I say so through you, Sir, to see the lack of quality that was prevalent in the input that we saw here today.

A professor friend of mine a few years ago when I was trying to get an education, one of the outport types or as he said, the outharbour types, at the university was involved in presenting an essay to fulfill one of the requirements of his English 200 - which I had failed, by the way. I failed my English 200 at the University because of my spelling, and the hon. leader today reminds me of that inadequacy. I feel very badly about it. In any event, this hon. friend of mine from the university put forward his essay and on the bottom of it when he received it back he said, the professor, I believe Professor Neary, had penned in that it was a constipation of thought and a diarrhea of words. I would not like to suggest that that was the contents of what the hon. gentleman had to say here today, but it is a phrase that we all should remember.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be intimidated by the remarks across the way. I have got my points to make and I am going to proceed accordingly. Ever since I have been involved in politics and in the

Province I have consistently heard by politicians over the years about the need for governments to get involved in resolving the problems of Newfoundland: The government has to resolve the problems; the government must solve this problem; the government has to assume all the responsibility. That attitude typifies and is the essence of one of the reasons we have such an abundance of problems in our Province today. Politicians and the kind of attitude I saw here today, politicians themselves have never, Mr. Speaker, really had the confidence in their people. Nobody in Newfoundland is going to do as much to resolve the problems of our Province as the people themselves can do.

Anybody who suggests to the House or to the people of



Newfoundland that the government has the responsibility for, and the capability of resolving the problems in Newfoundland today are undermining and further undermining and further destroying the initiative of our people. The people collectively, all of the people - the universities, the professional groups, the educators, the fishermen - all of the various people around our province collectively and individually are the people that are going to resolve the problems of this province. The best that the government, Mr. Speaker, were ever able to do will be to present the kind of climate and present the kind of programmes, technical assistance, research assistance, financial assistance where necessary, to enable our people, themselves, responding to government initiative, if you want, to be able to resolve our problems.

I have never heard - and I have been associated with the Premier from way before politics - I have never heard this government or the members of this government ever mislead our people in thinking that they can, in thinking, Mr. Speaker, that we, the government, can solve the problems. I have never seen that. I have frequently stood before meetings and with the Premier in halls packed with people where he has been so blunt in telling our people that we cannot allow any politician or any group to give the impression that we are going to solve your problems, so blunt that I know that it has cost political support for our party in some of the presentations that he has had.

I will not go on and tell you personally perhaps the biggest reason why I was knocked out of the ball game in 1974, which also perhaps gave me the biggest maturing influence in my own life and something the hon. member from LaPoile - not LaPoile, I am very sorry, from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) might like to experience some day in his lifetime. One of the biggest reasons why I am sure that I got knocked out of the ball game was that I stood on stages and the hon. the former Premier was in the audience on one occasion in Bonavista

and I told our people that we have to give up believing politicians that indicate that we can solve all of their problems. That is the kind of attitude in 1975 that can destroy whatever is left of the fiber of Newfoundland people.

MR. SIMMONS: That is the only reason you say you lost. You blamed it on the Premier.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Premier knows and the people of Newfoundland know -

AN HON. MEMBER: Ignore him. Ignore him.

MR. SIMMONS: You were down at Holdiay Inn -

AN HON. MEMBER: Ignore him. Ignore him.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - and the people of Newfoundland know -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - that whatever I am as a politician that certainly I am able to take my own beating and stand on my own two feet and acknowledge my own limitations. I have not reached the state of divinity yet, like the hon. the gentleman. In any event, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to touch on a few things. We have been severely criticized today for some of the economic problems that exist in the world and that have had their impact on the people of this province. The one essential difference between the government of this province and the Leader of the official Opposition, if I can call it that, is the fact that we do have confidence and do believe in our people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, we do believe that the people of this province are aware, are aware more unfortunately than some of the elected politicians across the way, are aware that we are facing difficult periods, are aware that we have had certain economic thrusts over a period of years that have been unsuccessful. Nobody on this side of the House has ever indicated to the people of Newfoundland that all of our thrusts, all of our ventures have been totally successful. We have always indicated, Mr. Speaker, that some of the things we have tried to do are open to question, and I will just mention this very openly and very publicly.

MR. ROBERTS: Called the divine right.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: For the first time in our history, to my knowledge, the government have tried to do in a very brief period something which has not been totally successful, but I can point out a good bit of the measure of success here today. Mr. Speaker, the process of rural development, and when I say rural development I would like to suggest to Your Honour, Sir, that there is hardly a part of Newfoundland, if I could go as far as to say - not a part of Newfoundland that could not be classified by some definitions as rural.

The City of St. John's, my hon. colleague who is a friend of mine for years in the House of Commons, always used to say to me that the City of St. John's is perhaps - and said with great affection - the biggest outport in the province, because there is hardly a person here who has not had some relationship or some background in the outports of Newfoundland. The people, of course - and my background is outport all the way from just across the bay here, and I have represented the rural parts of the province and of Grand Falls for a number of years - In any event, Your Honour

there has not been a government of any part of the world who ever tried a rural activation programme, or a rural development programme that had any substantial short-term results. The development process involved in trying to get people convinced that they have resources and have the capabilities to get involved in their own destiny in a rural economy is a slow process. I would like to suggest to you, Sir, that it might take many more years beyond the three years that the government have been involved in a very progressive way with rural development for some of the results to be felt. But I would like to suggest to the hon. House and to all members that I personally will not tolerate personal attacks on the departments involved in the rural development of our Province, personal attacks because of the fact that we cannot point to every area of success. So I would just like to say that so far in the department, which I am very honoured to have the opportunity to administer in some small way at the present moment, Sir, we have not had on thinking about it - well, actually there is not a lot of difference because much of the work that is going on in Industrial Development very, very much relates to the rural aspirations and the rural capabilities and the rural resources of Newfoundland.

I would just like to suggest that so far in a matter of just three years the department has been involved with the creation of what the leader of the Opposition frowns on and sneers at, the creation of 3,000 jobs, 3,000 jobs which average costing to the government of \$2,000 per job - and I am given rounded off figures - \$2,000 per job. At the present - and by the way there is ample, I could quote all kinds of data here to support the position that in Canada according to some economists the failure rate in small businesses is about 50 per cent in the first three years. And there is one professor at Memorial right now who is even claiming that it is higher than that and he uses statistics based on the Ontario economy as well. So, the

failure rate in small businesses is substantial.

Let me remind the members of the hon. House, Sir, that at the present moment there is \$600,000 being repaid per year to the Department of Rural Development based on a total allocation of funds of under \$5 millions - \$600,000 a year being repaid. The maximum that could be repaid is less than \$1 million. The failure rate is very low and we can point right now, Your Honour, to at least 60 per cent of the industries that have been started, 783 of those small industries that have been started are meeting with what we call abundant success, success and improvement and growth and development. All of those industries, there are 783, but we always get hon. gentlemen pointing to the fact that there is such and such an industry got a grant because - I could give examples of little controversial areas where monies have been allocated, and you are going to get them in the future. We are getting so far - I have had roughly forty applications coming before our board in the last two months or the last six weeks since I have been in the position to be able to receive these kinds of applications in the rural development authority alone, approximately forty applications.

We have got to judge them. We have got to make judgments. We have got to use my colleagues in the various departments of the resource areas that I would like to say right now who have always, usually and here today got the usual - whatever the word is I am thinking about - their verbal battering from the Leader of the Opposition. We would like to say to you, Sir, and the Department of Rural Development that the co-operation we are receiving in trying to expedite the applications that have a development potential is just tremendous. And I am not saying this as the minister. I am repeating the officials and the people in the departments responsible, in my departments, that have to go to the various departments, the co-operation is tremendous and we are very, very happy about it.

In any event, Your Honour, as I was saying we are always going

to make mistakes when we are talking about so many little industries, so many little industries right across the Province. We are going to have a lot of failure. And unless we want to just dry up all of our funds and say to the people of Newfoundland, we are not willing to venture a bit, then we are going to have a tremendous amount of failure. If we are going to just apply the banking mentality, and a banker's mentality to every decision, then we have got to expect certain decisions to be questionable on economic grounds and I admit this openly. But, Your Honour, the unfortunate part about it is that every member of the present legislature can understand what \$15,000 is. They can understand that.

Every Newfoundlander can understand it. And the minute you make a mistake with \$15,000 to some person who had an idea and it did not work out and it failed, everybody can relate the \$15,000. Everybody can understand it and consequently that kind of thing enables the members across the way and others to be able to point their fingers and say, Joe So-and-So from So-and-So cove made a mess of it, and you have got a headline.

I would like to ask hon. members, Sir, through you to be very reluctant to point fingers at the individuals who are involved in getting our loans because I do believe myself it has a deterring effect and it gives the impression that the Rural Development Authority and the Loans Programme is something that they should not interact with. This is certainly not helping the development potential of our Province.

We have had, Sir, the loans - for example there are sixty-seven loans that have gone into apiculture. These have to do with all kinds of farming projects of a variety of natures and many of them have been very successful. We have had in the sawmilling area - I mention this one because it is an area that has to be reassessed - over 400 loans have been made to small sawmills. Let me make an observation on that as I am going through, Your Honour. The minute I was responsible for the department, I asked the department to do an assessment of the success of the grants to small sawmills, and I specifically selected an area that I knew had a tremendous number of small sawmills, the Bonavista Peninsula. That goes from Port Blandford to Sunnyside, if you can imagine the geography I am going right on both sides of the Trinity and Bonavista Bays to Bonavista itself.

We had advanced sixty-nine loans to small sawmill operators in that particular area. We have increased the production of the lumber and we have had tremendous success. The people we have made loans to, the results have been very encouraging. We do feel ourselves though that to a certain extent we might have overdone it in making loans in certain parts of our Province for certain types of industry.

In trying to plan out our strategy, Your Honour, for the sawmilling operations in the Province we have had to sort of look at these areas and make an assessment as to what the needs are.

We are presently undergoing a survey of the area in the Botwood area. There are some seventeen small mills that have received assistance, and that one we are particularly interested in. Let me just say something, if I might be so down to earth about it, if it is not out of order to be down to earth, Your Honour, and suggest that this study was done by a young Newfoundland fellow by the name of Dave Martin. He is about twenty-five years old. He is from Brent's Cove, is a member of the department. He has done the study on the Benavista Peninsula in three weeks, three weeks salary that he was going to get paid anyway. And I am so proud that a young fellow, not a consultant firm, not an outside group, not a royal commission or an enquiry, but a young chap from the department could put together such a tremendous analysis on this in a three week period. He is doing it very sophisticated, very down to earth, very insightful and very commendable for a young Newfoundlander. I do not know what his education is. He is an outharbour man all the way.

But in any event, Your Honour, at the present moment he is completing a study for us in the area of the Botwood area. Now, we have got for the first time - I never heard it mentioned today - a central planning mill operation funded through, partly through the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, I believe, and I can quote the background on that in detail if it is required at some point in the future. and that central planning mill operation will to my knowledge - and I might be wrong on this - to my knowledge will be the first mill that is able to receive, and with assistance from government, receive the lumber and the raw material in a semi-processed fashion from the small operator.

The aim is that that central mill will be able to produce a finished product in total that it will be able to meet whatever demands in the construction industry in the Province no matter how sophisticated.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is it privately owned?



MR. LUNDRIGAN: It is privately owned, Your Honour.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How do they charge the owners of rough lumber to dress their lumber for them?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Well, I would just like to -

MR. SMALLWOOD: So much 1,000 or on the halves or something like that?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Well, that is a good question, Your Honour, because it does involve us in the business of the relationship between the central operation and the local people. Now I will get into this at a later date because I want to spend perhaps fifteen or twenty minutes, Your Honour, on that very point. I would like to say that we have got a lot of areas not answered because it is a brand new venture. It is really an effort to try to make possible for the independent Newfoundlander, the person who does not want to give up his right to get into the mill and saw his own logs. That is a tendency on the part of Newfoundland people that will never be overcome, Neither do we ever want it to.

So to reinforce that kind of a strength on the part of our people, to enable people to have their own operations, be their own bosses, we have got to in some way help them with a central kind of capability. Everybody cannot have

\$500,000 worth of planning equipment. At the same time we cannot say to the people in the small mills that you have got to go out of business. And this is our answer - not an answer, but our response to what we feel is a marketing problem on the one hand and on the other hand a way to reinforce the independence of Newfoundland people in their own community.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How far is it economic to bring the rough lumber to the mill, to the dressing mill?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Your Honour, this particular area, the geography is perhaps a little bit unique. You are only looking at twenty or twenty-five miles. Most of the mills in road distance - from the central operations it is twenty or twenty-five miles.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How many mills in that area?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I think there are seventeen, Your Honour. I believe there are seventeen mills. There are fourteen that I am aware of, and I think there are three or four others besides. Now on the Peninsula -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Have they not got planers themselves?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: One of them has a planer.

In any event, Your Honour, just getting back to the other business about the Bonavista Peninsula, there are, believe it or not, 371 mills in the area that I have just described, and I mentioned the study we have done. One of the things which was news to me, and I believe news to some of the people in the department, because we had not had a detailed assessment of the area, was that there are 40,000 cords of black spruce able to be harvested every year, but it is not harvestable for saw logs. There are 10,000 of the black spruce which are large enough - and I do not know, there are words they have - there are types of black spruce, and there are some that are less knotty and grow in areas which are less damp and so on which are partly good for saw logs. In any event our study indicated that of the 40,000 cords of black spruce, only 10,000 cords are being harvested at the present moment. And that 40,000 is a sustainable yield. We can continue in that area, in

that defined area I just described, to harvest 40,000 cords a year. And I can continue on beyond that. At the present moment, from our own assessment with the co-operation of my colleague in Forestry and Agriculture, we estimate that 85 per cent of all of the wood in that area is actually black spruce. Consequently, frequently we are building roads and access roads into the areas to try to avail of the saw logs, and here we have to by-pass one of the most essential and one of the best resources, this beautiful black spruce which is so valuable in the papermaking industry.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where is this?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It is on the Peninsula from - the Bonavista Peninsula - I described it as the Bonavista Peninsula.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I cannot describe where, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Bonavista Bay side or the Trinity Bay side?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I am familiar with - I would say maybe it is the Bonavista Bay side. I used to haul logs and lumber with my father -

MR. MORGAN: King's Cove.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Inside King's Cove.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - back years ago, and I cannot describe it. I believe it is on the Bonavista Bay side.

In any event, Sir, the implication is that we right now are very serious in looking at that resource to see how we can make sure that we can take the present effort in rural development where we have assisted a lot of sawmills to reinforce their existence and to also go beyond that and perhaps provide a way where we can get the small sawmill operator able to more economically use this present resource. I just mention these two examples of where we are assessing some of our directions, some of our programmes to see how we can more fully respond to the local needs of our people.

In any event, Your Honour, I was about to move on to a number of areas that we are going to be experimenting with, and developing pilot projects with for 1976 and the coming year. At the present moment I have had meetings with three of my colleagues that I consider in the resource area with - not a matter of meetings. We are talking

on a day-to-day basis, the Minister of Fisheries, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, my colleague the Minister of Tourism, to try and help define and broaden the announcements that were made today or a few days ago in the Throne Speech in terms of programmes. And today, Your Honour, the Leader of the Opposition sneered at some of the observations which were made, the fish farm concept, and we mentioned in our Throne Speech the business of reprocessing fish, the business of the joint venture with some of the European people. We talked about blueberries. We talked about the handicraft industry, the eel fishery, and I mention these things because I do believe myself that even in this present Chamber there are people, and I watch the Leader of the Opposition in his present debate with his colleague there -

MR. MORGAN: A caucus meeting.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - I would like to suggest that there are people right now that I am looking across the way at that do not believe that these are the directions we should move in. And I would like at some point

to challenge the Leader of the Opposition to tell us and tell the House and tell the people whether he feels that some of the things that we have planned for and are planning to implement in the coming year, whether he feels they are feasible, whether he thinks they are right directions.

MR. ROBERTS: Is a question permitted?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Do not wait until we get down the road and we get involved in them and we get money expended and we get it off the ground and then make his observations. We feel in this coming year -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question? He has asked me a question, will he permit a question in turn?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind permitting a question.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the hon. gentleman. I would be happy to give him my opinion but would he agree to let me have access to the feasibility studies and other documents so that my opinion might be founded on the information which is available, and I would be then very happy, Sir, to give him my opinion publicly or privately, in writing or orally as he prefers.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not see why we should not make some of our - despite the fact that he has got a great -

MR. HICKMAN: So he can criticize it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - research term now and he has been well funded and he has been taken care of by the government to a considerable extent. I am surprised that he is going to require the assistance from my department and my people to enlighten him on some of these positions. But only a week or two ago we made available to one reporter who raised a question about some of the research that we have had done and we have got no reluctance to co-operate and assist him and try to educate him and try to convince him that there is a future in rural Newfoundland, there is a future in our resources. I would be very pleased. I could give him a list of research effort and available information to our people that would certainly give him some indication

that the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation has not been a total flop, as is indicated and as some of his colleagues have.

I would just like to mention that seeing the question is raised that this present year, to date, and that includes only up until March 31, 1975 period, \$6.5 million expended, creating 1,767 jobs for eighty-one projects in the Province of Newfoundland in the area that is being funded by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development. And besides that, which has not been touched on here, and I have not raised it yet, is the fact that there has been a considerable amount of work done, accumulating information, research that can help the business community of this province. Now when I say the business community I am talking about literally every individual who has a new idea and who is interested in trying to promote his own free enterprise business. There has been a tremendous amount of research done. There has been a lot of work done in the Department of Industrial Development in particular to try, and there is a special corps set up in that department to help people appraise the kinds of angles they have got on industry, the kinds of interest they have, and to take existing businesses, people that are in difficulty sometimes, and try to help them straighten out their problems, to help them develop new markets. I would just like to say publicly here, and I wish sometimes there were a television camera in the Legislature so we could communicate some of our things to our people more directly, there is a wealth of information and assistance available to any Newfoundlander who is interested in trying to develop his own enterprise, his own free enterprise. And we have got a tremendous number of people in this province, the age group that I am associated with by virtue of the fact that I was one of the first crop of Newfoundlanders to get a chance to go to school beyond the secondary level and I think that in my age group, from twenty-five to forty years old there must be tens of thousands of young Newfoundlanders -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Confederate babies? Confederate babies?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Thank you very much. There must be tens of thousands of young Newfoundlanders around our province, perhaps the biggest weakness is that they do not themselves realize that they can be business people. They can be free enterprisers. They can have a thrust and have a say in the destiny of our province. I have got all kinds of tremendous confidence in the young people of this province. I am thinking about the people who have gotten a great education. There are swarms of our people who have gotten a great education and have had the opportunity to be exposed to the technical institutions and the fishery colleges and the universities and the various other areas of advance learning and training and these are the people that I would like to suggest to this House, these are the people we have to reach out to to suggest that we will provide the climate, we will provide the research, we will provide any kind of assistance, even including financial assistance, to help the people of this province get off the ground with our resource development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker, it is not for me to elaborate on these areas because I want my colleagues - I do not want to steal every bit of thunder here today. But we talk about blueberries. This Province -

MR. SIMMONS: Did you ever pick them?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: produces and - the hon. member from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) does not want to talk about blueberries.

MR. SIMMONS: No.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I would not want to talk about blueberries if I had his great background in the Newfoundland Teachers' Association and had reached these great stages of intellectual capacity and development. I would not want to talk about blueberries and fish and caplin and spawn and all kinds of things. I was down talking to Ray Bursey yesterday and he said; "Look, if there is any member up there who has not seen a caplin in a number of years -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - a caplin in a number of years - One of the things we have just assisted the gentleman with is a brand new venture in Newfoundland, it was never done before. Small little caplin that all over the world there are people with orders in looking to get that little product, and I would say, you know, I am not a bit ashamed, I am not a bit embarrassed, I am not so sophisticated that I am not able to talk about these kinds of things, and I would like to suggest to my colleague who represents that great fishing area of the Province that he should change his attitude a little wee bit because -

MR. DOODY: That is true.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - because those are some of the finest people we have in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Sure we talk about blueberries. And before this year is out, Your Honour, before this year is out - if I can get through my speech within the year - before this year is out we will see for the first time in Newfoundland's history where there will be a move made to take the resource, the blueberry resource from the stage of export in its present capacity, its present state, and have a development of it. We are not going to pick 30 million blueberries, we are not going to pick 30 million



pounds of blueberries, we are not going to have twenty plants, we are not going to have 5,000 people employed, but we will for the first time try and experiment and perhaps even risk a venture that will enable us to see if we can process that particular product in our Province -- Newfoundlanders for Newfoundlanders.

MR. MURPHY: Jam and wine.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Jam and wine, yes. Last year I was intrigued with my former friend from Bonavista North, who is not here today, when he gave us the recipe for blueberry wine, And I hope that my present colleague from Bonavista North will not have to talk about the blueberries, he can end up, Your Honour, my friend from Bonavista North, I hope before the year is out, I hope that he can say to his people that this is one result that we have seen as a result of his representation in Bonavista North. I hope that he can say that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We talk about fish farming and I agree with my colleague, my friend and colleague from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) when he mentioned -

MR. SIMMONS: Oh! Hear that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Perhaps the hon. member will learn that that is what politics is all about, working together for the benefit of the people. And I would like to suggest that we are going to try, my friend the Leader of the Opposition said -

AN HON. MEMBER: You have him for a friend?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: My friend the Leader of the Opposition said fish farming has been talked about for quite a number of years. Fish farming has been talked about. For the first time in the history of our Province we have funded the first project in this area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The first project in this area. It is a \$44,000 grant to an association in the honourable member's riding. I am sure he will be praising us when he gets on his feet. I think it is in his riding. I hope all of this is in his riding, and I would like to suggest that that is an indication of our breadth of political thinking as well aside from our economic attitude. In any event, Sir, that project we hope will be a

success and we are risking some money. We do not know for sure but it is a concept that eighty years ago in Denmark, eighty years ago, that country started fish farming. Today they are an exporter of about 15,000 tons of rainbow trout. So it is not the sort of thing - well the Leader of the Opposition tells us; "Perhaps we can farm a few fish." Well, I would like for him to realize that -

MR. ROBERTS: Fish a few farms.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Well, fish a few farms or farm a few fish, whatever he said, do not treat this stuff lightly and do not frown on it and do not discourage it and do not belittle and do not degrade it and do not tread on it before it gets off the ground. Try to encourage it and try to make it part of his attitude that he supports this kind of a concept. I have already mentioned the sawmills and we talked about the central sawmill, the central lumber yard. Always down through the years we have said to our people; "Why does not somebody try to get an industry off the ground in the sawmill area that can utilize all our products?"

We have already, in the present number of years with the present government, improved our development of our timber resources - to the Leader of the Opposition - at least 4 per cent per year.

I would like for my colleague to reinforce it, but I think we are manufacturing 5 million or 6 million board feet of lumber more than we were when the government took office a number of years ago. We have already, though the assistance of the Newfoundland and Labrador Industrial Development, we have had four major sawmills started up in the Province. And these sawmills are always going to have their problems, and some of them are uncontrollable problems, as my colleague can indicate, but we are moving towards becoming more self-sufficient in this area. We have already indicated our intentions in the particular one that he had some exposure to the other day to try to integrate the operation so we can use all of our resource. Before this year is out we hope to be able to make a major start in one, and even if it is only one project I would be happy at the end of 1976 if we have got one mill, one project where we are trying to use all of our timber, our hardwoods in a way where it can -

MR. SMALLWOOD: One down in St. Barbe way?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - where it can result in a -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The same.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: While I am not -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is the hon. gentleman of the - these four new large mills, are they operating in the old way of a rotary saw, a circular saw, or the new way as Bowaters and Lundrigans established down on the St. Barbe coast of chipping the log, and therefore saving the chips for a paper mill?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that I am not familiar totally with the particular operation that the hon. gentleman is referring to. I will have to familiarize myself with it over the months and the years, and to find out if -

AN HON. MEMBER: They are.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Down Bay D'Espoir they are.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes, but

MR. ROUSSEAU: In Bay D'Espoir they are.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: But the concept we are looking at Your Honour is to try and find a way where we can get the hardwoods in particular, not only harvest it but also in some way or other manufacture it through a

secondary process into certain furnitures and certain things that we use in this Province every day of our lives. We are not saying, and I want the hon. gentleman from Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) and the hon. Leader of the Opposition to recognize that we are not saying we are going to solve the problem, we are not saying we are going to have a furniture manufacturing operation in full flight at the end of 1976. We are saying we are going to look seriously at trying that kind of a venture, and we are not talking multimillions of dollars and this is where the Leader of the Opposition some times does not recognize that development, resource development is not necessarily a costly and a major gamble or a major venture of that sort.

The handicraft industry, as I was so pleased to see downstairs from the hon. gentleman's area, or some of his friends, and as a result of some of his work and some of the other colleagues, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) that I will give great praise to if he has got any ideas that we can respond to for his area, we are certainly going to want to co-operate with him, and my other friend from -

AN HON. MEMBER: Naskaupi.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Right, right - Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) was with me and right here behind me, perhaps we will have the most input into our decision-making process as it relates to the handicraft area and as it relates to many of the communities in Labrador. I am not belittling or denying my hon. colleague from the more industrial part of the area, but I suggest that we are very fortunate to have the hon. member from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) with us, who has a deep background in the field that is going to be very prevalent in his communities and in the whole of Labrador. But downstairs to see the presence of the handicrafts, could anybody take the time to have a look around and to see what is being done by our people? That is not the only example of a tremendous handicraft capability in our Province. There are a number of agencies and a number of groups of people working on these kinds of things. There has not been a proper co-ordination of effort, and even some of the programmes we have no control over, some of the work is being done directly by federal funding like the LEAP programme, what is it? the Local Improvement Assistance Programme. And at some point in the future,

without being negative towards Ottawa I would like to express the desire to you, Sir, that we can have more co-operation between the federal and the provincial governments so that with that type of funding and LIP funding and other types of federal funding there can be an input from the Province to have and ensure and make sure that the federal funding in these areas are compatible with their own development strategies. I mention handicrafts - some time before the year is out there will be an effort made to co-ordinate the handicraft industry in our Province. I think it is an area that can provide a tremendous amount of reinforcement of Newfoundland, reinforcement of our culture and our history and our way of life and at the same time have an economic benefit and an economic relationship, and this to me is something that we must encourage.

I am

not going to have the time to get involved- and I did not intend to take this long, because I have been a bit critical in my own mind of the length of speeches in the House but in any event, I have to touch on an area which is perhaps the most exciting and the most fascinating thing in many ways in Newfoundland today.

Three or four days ago some hon. members might have seen on television a reference to Pelcon, a reference to a small industry started in our Province, a small industry. It is the first- to my knowledge again and I am sure I am going to be criticized by the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) on occasion for making this kind of a comment - to my knowledge it is the first time that I have seen a major effort made in the area of technological development in our Province. Pelcon, a small little company that has been encouraged from day one by the number of very, very competent young Newfoundlanders working in the Department of Industrial Development to come to our Province and try to develop a discovery or an invention in the area of underwater connectors. This kind of a thing, we are very proud of this, that the people who discovered it working with the Newfoundland and Labrador Development and Industrial Development came here and set up and we have made available and gave them all the assistance we could in space and some financial assistance to develop and refine and whatever you would call it in the technical sense, this kind of an invention.

It is an underwater connector that is used in offshore drilling and any kind of marine activity, which of course enables underwater activity and reduce the hazards involved. I cannot go beyond that in telling you the details of it. There are twenty-four people involved in that. Many of them are scientists and very technical people. We are hopeful that within the next twelve months that project can get off the ground to the point where we can manufacture the technology in our Province. If that happens - and I could go on. I do not want to tell all of our trade secrets today. But there are a number of areas that relate to the offshore marine dimension of economic life in Newfoundland that is very, very exciting. I will leave that to

other hon. gentlemen in the House who would like to expose some of our work that we have done in this area.

There is a tremendous excitement in this particular field. Right now we are not only moving towards the discovery of the great resources off Labrador in the oil and gas field, but thanks to the efforts of the person who has put the most energy in Canada to try to convince Canadian people of the need for controlling our marine resources, we are looking forward to the day when that kind of a resource will be not necessarily dominated by Newfoundlanders and Canadians but certainly totally under the control and the management of our people, ourselves.

Can you imagine the kinds of need for technological development as it relates to the marine, the sea that we have lived around for so many years, the excitement in this particular field alone. Sir, this is the extent of the remarks I have, and I could go on and bore hon. members for another little while with some of the other things we have in our minds. I just want to say this in conclusion, that we have got a responsibility here in the Province today that perhaps is a bit of a unique responsibility. But two weeks ago I happened to watch a programme on television on the City of New York, an hour long special by W5, and that exposé on the City of New York shocked me, and it is nothing that we have not heard about, but when you saw it, it actually shocked me that 8 million people could be captured in such a economic imprisonment.

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

I have to remind the hon. minister that his time for which he may address the House has expired.

The hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood).

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I doubt that I can finish before 6 o'clock, but if it were just slightly later I would move the adjournment of the debate. But perhaps you would permit me to say before I do so how very much I enjoyed the speech of the hon. minister who just sat down. I am quite sure that every hon. member of the House on all sides had to appreciate the enthusiasm and the very evident, the very obvious faith that the hon. minister has in

himself and in his ideas and in his proposals. I think that is pretty clear. He really means it. He really is going to try. He is trying and he is going to continue trying to get something done. And believe me, I know enough to know that getting things done is the



curse when it does not happen. It is the curse of government. It is the curse of a country or a province when things do not get done, when they are talked about, argued about, debated but not in fact done. Now the minister is very eloquent and with great ease finds the words to express the thoughts that are in his mind, and, of course, he has had a considerable amount of experience doing that up in Ottawa, in the Parliament of Canada. I hope that his men in his department, his deputy minister and his assistant deputy minister, if he has one, and the heads of the different divisions will educate him, because what is he, what is the minister? He is a school teacher and a parliamentarian. But I would assume that he does not know all that much about sawmills and papermills and mines and factories and fish farms and all the rest of it. He can, however, learn. And if he is interested, if he is genuinely interested, and I am quite sure he is, he will learn, and he will learn quickly. And one of the first things for him to do is to get down on the St. Barbe coast and go through that great sawmill that is there, the first in the Province. I am glad to hear from the Minister of, whatever he is the Minister of, Agriculture and Forestry, that they have one of the same type now up in Bay D'Espoir, up in that area.

The idea, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the minister is this, that instead of taking a log and ripping lengthwise through it with a circular saw, which to be strong has to have a certain thickness and, therefore, destroys a lot of the log in the form of sawdust, hence the vast piles of sawdust that are seen at any old-time, any mill that has been operating for any considerable length of time, instead of that the log is put on the table, on the carriage and knives chip it away very rapidly, they chip it up one side, turn it over and chip it up the other side and instead of sawing, you chip three sides of it and then saw it, and the chips are saved and shipped to a papermill. They are excellent for the making of newsprint paper.

In British Columbia I would say that a very large proportion of the newsprint paper that is manufactured in those mills is manufactured from what they would call offal, the waste of logs. They cut those great logs, they saw it into veneer for plywood, and other very expensive and profitable purposes, and the offal, the waste of each log is what is used to make newsprint paper, which, of course, gives that industry an enormous advantage over a papermill in Newfoundland that is using the whole log. I hope the minister goes down to - where is it, Port au Choix or Port Saunders is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hawkes Bay.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - Hawkes Bay. I was through it twice, and tried to help to get it going. I think at one point we put up something like \$1 million.

MR. MORGAN: There is one in Gambo.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is there one in Gambo? Well, no. That is the one just this side of Gambo. They had a forest fire right near to it a few months ago. Well, I pulled in there one night coming along, I drove in there, but there was no one around to show me through the mill, and I am sorry I missed it. In a way, I am just killing time, because to come to the main part of my remarks I would like to have ten or fifteen minutes ahead of me.

I have to say this, first to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for having brought this resolution forward. I congratulate him for that. I think that nothing will be debated in this Chamber in the present session

so important as the main central theme of this resolution. Just look at it, and let each hon. member ask himself what could there be to be discussed in this House, so important, not only more, but so important as this to enquire into and to report upon the prospects for Newfoundland and Labrador, the prospects for Newfoundland and Labrador including the prospects for economic growth and development in particular - economic growth and development and in particular a consideration of those types of development which are best suited to foster and to encourage the way of life. That is the heart of Newfoundland. That is what it is all about. There can not possibly be anything as important as coming to a conclusion, if that be possible, to come to a conclusion as to what are actually the prospects for growth and development in this Province.

Now I deprecated the few remarks of the Leader of the Opposition that were of a purely partisan character. This is not a partisan matter. Surely the Premier and the Minister of - whatever it is that he is minister of - the minister who just spoke -

AN HON. MEMBER: Industrial and Rural Development.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Industrial and Rural Development. Surely they too and everyone on that side of the House is as interested as I am, as is the Leader of the Opposition or anyone on this side of the House, if we are Newfoundlanders, by birth or adoption really matters not, if we are Newfoundlanders this has got to be the most supremely, fundamental problem that we can consider.

Therefore, while perhaps a little bit of it was just banter back and forth I would have preferred if the Leader of the Opposition had kept the thing completely, entirely on the high level of non-partisan or bi-partisan, a seriousness so that we, all of us regardless of our alleged party differences but just reacting as Newfoundlanders who live here, who have families here, who have children and grandchildren and some great grandchildren here, who are going to live and die here except maybe for a month or so in the Winter farther South, we Newfoundlanders surely can not think of anything or consider or think about or debate anything so basically, so fundamentally important as the future of this Province.

Now I myself began a long time ago considering the future of this country as it were. If you were to go, Mr. Speaker, to the files of The Daily News and read my column from the masthead you would see there column after column, after column, day after day, for weeks, for months, and years a discussion by me as to what future we had. What did we have in Newfoundland to base anything on? What are the ingredients of greatness besides the quality of our people? What did we have materially? And then there have been so many, many attempts to make surveys - just think of them. There was a Royal Commission on Agriculture headed by the greatest agricultural expert in the whole of Canada and perhaps North America Professor Arthur Shaw of Alberta as Chairman, and Pat Kennedy as a member, and I forget who the other member was - three. We had a Royal Commission on Forestry, headed by the famous General Kennedy of Ottawa who was perhaps the greatest authority in North American on - certainly in Canada - forestry. And he had been head of a royal commission appointed by the Government of Ontario to consider the problem of forestry in that great Province. We had - and I was instrumental in causing it to be done - we had a commission appointed by the Commission of Government and headed by the late Mr. Justice Kent, fishery investigation. We had another one that I was instrumental in getting done, headed by the late Sir Albert Walsh, the Walsh Commission on Fisheries. We had a great three day conference, held down in the Sir Robert Bond Auditorium for three days, covered on live television and men attending it from all around the world, We brought them here from Europe, we brought them from the West Indies, we brought them from across Canada; the Government of Canada were there, the Government of Nova Scotia, of New Brunswick, of Prince Edward Island and of Quebec were there, We had the salt codfish people there. We had everything for three days. We talked nothing but fish for three days. We had something like 150 fishermen there from all around the Province. Three days we talked nothing else but fish and that is when I brought in the two men to whom the Leader of the Opposition referred Headlin and Menzies, the speech writers for the then Tory Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Diefenbaker.

MR. ROBERTS: They developed the vision.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They were -

MR. ROBERTS: They developed the vision.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right. Well, they did and they were very great men.

And the greatest ideas that the Tory Government had with Mr. Diefenbaker was those that were put forward by Alvin Hamilton, and these two men were Alvin Hamilton's right-hand men, and though they were I did not hesitate to bring them in here and help us in this conference and to write the great report which I myself took and delivered into the hands of the Government of Canada.

Another time I asked everybody in the government - ministers, deputy-ministers, heads of the various divisions - to give me their estimate of the prospects for the fishing industry in Newfoundland. What was it likely to be? How many people were likely to have jobs in it? And that must be in the files somewhere. Then Memorial University have made study after study, and if the hon. minister has not read them get them fast, Ask the University even if only they lend them to you. a pile that high of special studies they have made of all parts of the Province. They are magnificent. They are a magnificent contribution to the very theme of this resolution.

I myself here in this House, not this building, spoke for five days, the longest speech in the history of politics in Newfoundland - five days in succession, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, five days I spoke and never mentioned a solitary thing but fishing and fisheries. So in agriculture, in forestry, in fisheries, and then we had a royal commission on mining, we had one on forests, we had one on minerals, we had one on agriculture, we had one on water power, we had a royal commission on manufacturing, we had a royal commission on tourist industry, we had a royal commission on education, we had a royal commission on economics, to which the Leader of the Opposition referred, of which I think the present Premier was a member - I think he was a member of that famous royal commission that made that report. The point I am trying to make is that this has been done, It has been done again and again and again in the past, It has been done by

brilliant men, men of brilliant mind and enormous capacity and experience, it has been done. That does not mean that it is open and shut, there is nothing more to be learned. That does not mean that there is not still a lot to be learned. That does not mean that the evolving, changing situation does not require new attempts and new approaches. So I say that ought to be done. Now I am doubtful, I am doubtful, Mr. Speaker, that this is the way to do it. I will vote for it. I will vote for it, and have a select committee, but I would rather see a Sir Andrew Ray Duncan brought in to do that kind of a thing that he did for Nova Scotia.

MR. SIMMONS: The committee could love that kind of power, could it not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well if the committee did nothing but to look for the best brains that they could find around the world and bring them in, and let them make a specialized studies of the various aspects of our life and our future then it would be worth doing. But the select committee of us members of the House here I would take a sort of a - I will vote for it, but I would

take a dim view of it. Perhaps I have said all I wanted to say, and I do hope this debate goes on. If somebody - if you like I will move the adjournment so that it goes on next Wednesday, is that it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It will continue next Private Members' Day and so I hope I will not have anything more to say but it is for the purpose of keeping the debate going. I move the adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 6 o'clock on Wednesday and pursuant to Standing Order (7) I now adjourn the House until 3 o'clock tomorrow, Thursday. This House is now adjourned.

On motion House adjourned until tomorrow Thursday, November 27, 1975 at 3 o'clock.





CONTENTS

November 26, 1975

Page

Resolution of tribute to Archbishop R.L.Seaborn on his installation  
as Metropolitan of the Ecclesiastical Province of Canada.

Moved by Premier Moores	178
Seconded by Mr. Roberts	180
Supported by Mr. Smallwood	183

Presenting Petitions

By Mr. Hodder on behalf of residents of Port au Port West objecting to imposition of a property tax.	185
---	-----

Oral Questions

Negotiations on the sale of the Atlantic Fish Processors plant at Marystown. Mr. Canning, Premier Moores.	186
--	-----

Application of the increase in SSA on the use of electricity for heating and cooking. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	186
---	-----

Investigation of health hazards at the Baie Verte asbestos mine. Mr. Rideout, Premier Moores.	187
--	-----

Query as to whether Premier Moores has received a copy of a telegram from the president of the union at Baie Verte stating he is unaware of any such investigation. Mr. Rideout, Premier Moores.	187
---	-----

Ownership of the fish plant at Fox Harbour, and the possibility of its sale. Mr. Strachan, Mr. Carter.	187
---	-----

Status of \$820,000 designated for water and sewer system at Botwood. Mr. Mulrooney, Premier Moores.	187
---	-----

Road paving in Trinity-Bay de Verde. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Morgan.	188
--	-----

Paving of the Custer's Head road. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Morgan.	188
---	-----

Sewer programme for Bishop's Falls. Mr. Mulrooney, Premier Moores.	189
---	-----

Closing of small fish plants. Mr. Neary, Mr. Carter.	189
--	-----

Query as to ministerial awareness that his predecessor publically stated such an agreement existed and plants would be closed. Mr. Neary, Mr. Carter.	189
---	-----

Extension to the hospital at Baie Verte. Mr. Rideout, Mr. H.Collins, Premier Moores.	190
---	-----

Airstrip for Cartwright. Mr. Strachan, Mr. Morgan.	191
--	-----

Industrial inquiry into the Newfoundland newsprint industry. Mr. White, Premier Moores.	191
--	-----

Attempts to resolve the strikes of papermill workers. Mr. White, Premier Moores.	191
---	-----

Transference of papermill strikes to federal jurisdiction. Mr. White, Premier Moores.	192
--	-----

Tunnel under the Straits of Belle Isle. Mr. Neary, Mr. Morgan.	192
--	-----

Masts on the <u>Norma and Gladys</u> . Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	193
---	-----

Cost of replacing masts. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	194
---	-----



Oral Questions (continued)	Page
Cost sharing of the <u>Norma and Gladys</u> voyage. Mr. Smallwood, Mr. Hickey.	194
Situation of the vessel. Capt. Winsor, Mr. Hickey.	195
Electricity for William's Harbour. Mr. Strachan, Premier Moores.	195
Renegotiation with RCMP of contract for municipal service. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickman.	196
Third Appellate Court judge. Mr. Roberts*, Mr. Hickman.	198
Mr. Speaker, called the attention of members to the requirement that answers to oral questions must be brief as possible.	
*Mr. Roberts expressed dissatisfaction with the answer and gave notice that he wished to debate it on the adjournment on November 27.	
Allowance for needy blind people. Mr. Neary, Mr. Brett.	200
Office space for the public service. Mr. Simmons, Premier Moores.	200
Approval for the Workmen's Compensation Board to construct its own building and rent space to government. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	202
Extension of teaching day at institutions of secondary education. Mr. Neary, Mr. House.	202
Extension of Confederation Building. Mr. Nolan, Premier Moores.	203
Insolvency of the Fishermen's Co-op on the Port au Port Peninsula. Mr. Hodder, Mr. Carter.	204
Itinerary of Minister of Fisheries. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Carter.	204
000	
Congratulations to Premier and Mrs. Moores on the birth of a son.	
<u>Orders of the Day</u>	
Private Members' Day	
Motion No. 4 - Mr. Roberts to move that a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into and report upon the prospects for Newfoundland and Labrador, etc.	
Mr. Roberts	205
Mr. Lundrigan	244
Mr. Smallwood	270
(Adjourned the debate)	278
Adjournment	278

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes that this is essential for ensuring transparency and accountability in the organization's operations.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and tools used to collect and analyze data. It highlights the need for consistent and reliable data collection processes to support informed decision-making.

3. The third part of the document focuses on the role of technology in modern data management. It discusses how advanced software solutions can streamline data collection, storage, and analysis, leading to more efficient and accurate results.

4. The fourth part of the document addresses the challenges associated with data security and privacy. It provides guidance on implementing robust security measures to protect sensitive information from unauthorized access and breaches.

5. The fifth part of the document explores the importance of data quality and integrity. It discusses strategies for identifying and correcting errors in data collection and ensuring that the information used for analysis is accurate and reliable.

6. The sixth part of the document discusses the role of data in strategic planning and performance management. It explains how data-driven insights can help organizations identify trends, set goals, and measure progress against those goals.

7. The seventh part of the document provides a summary of the key findings and recommendations. It emphasizes the need for a holistic approach to data management that integrates all aspects of the organization's operations.

8. The eighth part of the document includes a list of references and resources for further reading. It provides a comprehensive list of books, articles, and online resources that can be used to deepen understanding of the topics discussed in the document.

9. The ninth part of the document includes a list of appendices and supplementary materials. These materials provide additional information and data that support the findings and conclusions of the document.

10. The tenth part of the document includes a list of contact information and a disclaimer. It provides details on how to reach the authors and organizations involved in the document, as well as a statement regarding the scope and limitations of the information provided.

1

2

3

4

5

6

1  
2  
3

4  
5  
6

7  
8  
9