



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND
NEI. C. D. (handwritten)

Volume 2

2nd. Session

Number 2

VERBATIM REPORT

Whicker

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1977

SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose a motion on the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Accession of Queen Elizabeth the Second to the Throne.

I would ask that the following communication be sent, but first of all, Sir, I move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition, that the following resolution from this hon. House of Assembly be transmitted to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth:

On the occasion of the Silver Jubilee of Your accession to the Throne, the people of Newfoundland convey to Your Majesty their most sincere congratulations in this expression of their heartfelt appreciation of Your inspiring devotion to duty and Your unceasing labours on behalf of the Commonwealth during the past twenty-five years.

As Britain's first colony and Canada's youngest Province, Newfoundland wishes to assure Your Majesty on this happy occasion of its continuing loyalty and allegiance and joins with all of Canada and the Commonwealth in the fervent hope that You may continue to reign for many years in peace, health and happiness.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: It is with a great deal of pleasure and pride that we on this side, Sir, support the resolution. As the Premier has said I am honoured to have it stand with my name as the

MR. ROBERTS: seconded. I would make only one or two small amendments, I would suggest which I did not have the opportunity to mention to the Premier outside. I do feel we should say "Newfoundland and Labrador," Mr. Speaker, if that is agreeable to the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Sneaker, it is the Province of Newfoundland officially, and if it is from the people of Newfoundland and Labrador I have no objection. But as it is a formal message, and as the official name is the Province of Newfoundland, possibly the Leader of the Opposition and myself could work out the exact verbage to be included in the message, as long as the intent is concerned.

MR. ROBERTS: I think that is important, Sir, particularly in view of the fact that there is an act of this Legislature which requires us to use Newfoundland and Labrador wherever it is appropriate to do, and without getting into any argument about the legal name of the Province, the active part of the resolution is the people of Newfoundland, unless we put Labrador in.

Also, Mr. Sneaker, we are not necessarily Britain's first colony, we are Britain's oldest colony. Britain had colonies before Newfoundland became a colony. But we are the oldest colony and that was our traditional term.

PREMIER MOORES: We were.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

I said we were the oldest colony until we became a dominion in 1931.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution I am sure will commend the support of all of us. The Queen, Sir, is the Queen of Canada as well as the Queen of the United Kingdom. We, Sir, function in the Queen's name. The government of this Province has carried on in the Queen's name. There are no words of mine that can

MR. ROBERTS: add to the tributes that will be paid to Her Majesty on the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Her Accession to the Throne and the way in which she has enhanced the traditions of the monarchy.

Sir, it is a pleasure and a humble duty, Sir, to second this motion, and I do so gladly.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that the message be sent to Her Majesty the Queen.

The hon. Minister of Justice,

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I advise this House of the death on January 26th., 1977, at the age of eighty-seven years, of Commander Raleigh Gilbert of Compton Castle in the Village of Compton, North Devon, England.

The late Commander Gilbert was a direct descendent of Sir Humphrey Gilbert and Sir Walter Raleigh. Commander Gilbert first visited Newfoundland in 1907 and on several subsequent occasions while serving in the Royal Navy. Commander Gilbert was a guest of the City of St. John's in 1957 for the presentation of the civic symbols, and a guest of the Government of Newfoundland at the opening of the new university buildings at Memorial University in 1961.

Commander Gilbert dedicated his life to the acquisition and restoration of Compton Castle which is indeed a Newfoundland Museum in the United Kingdom. The great hall of Compton Castle is filled with artifacts and information concerning this Province.

The late Commander Gilbert throughout the years endeavoured to maintain strong links between Newfoundland and the Gilbert family and there is a plaque in the chapel of Compton Castle placed by the appropriate chapter of the I.O.D.E. from Newfoundland in recognition of that association.

Mr. Hickman.

As a matter of historic interest, 1983 will be the 400th anniversary of Compton Castle. A memorial service to the late Commander Raleigh Gilbert will be held in Malden Church, Compton, on February 22, 1977 at 3:00 P.M.

I move, seconded by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that this hon. House sends sincere condolences to Mrs. Gilbert and her family on the passing of her late husband, who was a great Englishman, with a strong affection for Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, as the minister has said I second the motion, Sir, on the passing of a man who has served this country of Newfoundland, as we then were, so notably, Sir, should be recorded by the House. It is not a matter for joy but a matter of the inevitable cycle of life. It is perhaps particularly appropriate that the motion should come today when the House has already adopted a resolution of loyalty to Her Majesty, because of course, it was Commander Gilbert's direct ancestor, as I understand it, Sir Humphrey Gilbert and his half-brother Sir Walter Raleigh who planted the Standard on the King's Beach, you know, the Queen's Beach, I guess it was, here in St. John's on that August day in 1583 thereby claiming this territory for the Crown of England.

Sir, Commander Raleigh - actually he wrote a couple of very interesting books as well on Newfoundlandia and Newfoundland things - devoted a large part of his life to the family tradition, to re-acquiring the castle which, I believe, had passed out of the family's hands in the intervening time and restoring and adding to it. And I think, Sir, that we, as a Province, should be more conscious of our history. We have a great history, and I think that men like Commander Gilbert, Sir, have served us well. And the fact that we know

Mr. Roberts.

so little of it is perhaps more an indication of failing on our part than a failing on any other part at all.

Commander Gilbert, Sir, I would hope that the government will send somebody to represent us at the funeral. We have a steady parade of ministers to the United Kingdom, Sir, and this might be far more appropriate than some of the reasons for which ministers or other members on the government side are sent overseas.

Commander Gilbert, Sir, served Newfoundland well, and I think we should commemorate the occasion, and I second the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded and concurred in that an appropriate message of condolence be sent to Mrs. Gilbert.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

The hon. member for Fogo, followed by the hon. member for Lapoile.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the parents, students and teachers of Musgrave Harbour. The prayer of this petition is that "We the people, of Musgrave Harbour, do petition the Government of Newfoundland to effect on our behalf the construction of adequate educational facilities in order that our children might have educational opportunities to those often taken for granted and which do exist in many communities in Newfoundland.

"The Integrated Educational Committee recognizes our needs, but the ultimate responsibility lies with government as it is they who must provide the financing before a deplorable situation is to be rectified."

Also, Mr. Speaker, attached to this petition is a copy of a brief which has been submitted to the Denominational Educational Committee for the Integrated School Board on behalf of the Musgrave Harbour school systems.

Capt. Winsor.

I might point out a few of the points raised in that brief, Mr. Speaker:"(1) Severe space restrictions; not enough classroom space, storage space or office space. Present structures are totally inadequate. Overcrowding: The present classroom structures are unable to accommodate the number of students enrolled. Students are even being taught in the school corridors. There are no facilities for a physical educational program^{ING} in the high school auditorium is being used, but it is far too small. And because the noise travels through the walls into the classrooms it causes the problem of disruption of the classes. There are no changing facilities." And I would take it, Mr. Speaker, that this means that there are no facilities for the changing of regular clothing to gym clothing.

CAPT. WINSOR:

"Washroom facilities are totally inadequate causing hygienic problems.

There are no - and this is a very important point, Mr. Speaker - there are no facilities for remedial or special education. Children with problems who need special attention are denied the benefit of this attention because of lack of space and equipment. There are no laboratory facilities for science programmes and they are unable to use the equipment which they now have because of lack of space.

"The present school structures are inadequately ventilated and insulated causing uncomfortable conditions and a poor environment for the children who have to attend the school." I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this situation will be further aggravated next September when there will be another twenty-five students ready to enroll in those facilities. I am sure that a similar situation exists in the community of Carmanville, where there is great need for improving educational facilities.

I strongly support this petition, Mr. Speaker, and ask that it be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay De Verde speaking on the petition of the member for Fogo.

MR. ROWE: I will yield to the minister, Mr. Speaker, if he wishes to support the petition. Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise to support my colleague from Fogo (Capt. Winsor) on this particular petition. I really find it quite amazing that such inadequate facilities still exist within our Province here today and it is not, obviously, entirely confined to the Musgrave Harbour area, because I know on the Northwest Coast similar inadequacies exist at the present time and I think this all stems, Sir, from the way that money is raised for educational purposes in this Province. I think we have to have a whole new look at the raising of money for educational purposes and the method of distributing money for educational purposes at the elementary, primary and secondary levels. There are obviously many inequities and inequalities as far as educational

MR. ROWE:

opportunities are concerned throughout the Province, geographically speaking, and when you compare -

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

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

MR. HICKMAN: I put this early in the session so that we will not, hopefully, have to do this from here on. I draw Your Honour's attention to rule 97 which says, "There shall be no debate on a petition, unless the House has it under consideration." I do submit that the hon. the member for Trinity-Bay De Verde (Mr. Rowe) is indeed entering into a debate on the financing of education and referring to matters not strictly related to this petition. And the rule of relevancy, I submit, and the absolute necessity of hon. gentlemen keeping their remarks confined strictly to that petition is very appropriate and necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: On that point of order, I call to hon. members' attention Standing Order 97 as quoted by the hon. government House Leader, "There shall be no debate on a petition - it goes on to say - unless the House has it under consideration." That is a different matter. And also Standing Order 92 which speaks of, "Every member offering a petition to the House," but of course this applies as well to members speaking in support of a petition, "shall confine himself to the statement of the parties from whom it comes, the number of signatures attached to it and the material allegations it contains." The point of order is well taken.

One, remarks with respect to the subject of the method of educational financing, the raising of money for education, would be outside of the material allegations of this particular petition.

The hon. member for Trinity-Bay De Verde.

MR. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is not much left to say, if I was getting into the realm of debate, except to mention the fact I wholeheartedly support the petition presented by my colleague from Fogo (Capt. Winsor).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I want to just speak to the petition and to say that I have had correspondence from that particular area, as a matter of fact, from three communities related to the same problem and it is in the same area. And without the propriety of the petition coming to the House of Assembly for discussion because we recognize there are a number of things that should be done and we recognize in the petition what they are talking about there, that there are a lot of inadequacies in the school system,

MR. HOUSE: but just for the record, government has made available to the Demoninational Education Committees, dating back three years and ahead seven, which is a ten year period, an amount of \$135 million, and that rises of course to a peak at \$16 million in the latter stages. And what I want to point out is that this money is made available to the Demoninational Education Committees. And there is no way, there is no law, there is no legal mechanism, there is no statute to allow us to make monies available for school buildings to a board or to a community. And just to make the point perhaps a little more strongly, no matter how much money the government made available to the Demoninational Education Eommittees, the government cannot state that a school can be built in either community. It just has to rely on the authorities. I just want to put that in the record.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Lapolle followed by the hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker I beg leave of the House to present a petition Sir on behalf of eleven hundred residents of the Great Northern Peninsula, between Trout River and Parson's Pond, the people who are affected by the provincial purchase and expropriation of land for the Gros Morne National Park. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the member for the House of Assembly for the district of St. Barbe South is not in his seat today, but I did send the hon. member a copy of the petition.

Mr. Speaker, although the government has compromised with the original request of the petition for a royal commission to investigate the charges of political interference and unfair expropriation of private lands for commercial use by others than the owner, unfair compensation for expropriated lands, discrimination on the part of the land deal, according to the prayer of the petition; lack of knowledge or evaluation of land on the part of the land appraisers, and unfair compensation for the loss of cutting rights enjoyed by residents of the area although the government Sir has compromised and set up a commission of enquiry under

MR. NEARY: the Public Enquiries Act, nevertheless I still feel obligated to present this petition because as I pointed out a few moments ago, Sir, the people that requested that the government of Newfoundland appoint a Royal Commission to investigate all these transactions. And in supporting the petition, Mr. Speaker, let us hope as members of this House that there will be an extra emphasis on the need to reach a fair and equitable and speedy report, which will satisfy these eleven hundred citizens of the Great Northern Peninsula and the Bonne Bay area of our province, and to prove to them Sir that justice will not only be done but that it would appear, as my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice would say, it would appear that justice has been done in this particular case. It gives me great pleasure, Sir, to support the prayer of the petition. I call upon members on either side of the House to support the petition on behalf of eleven hundred of their fellow Newfoundlanders who feel that there has been a grave injustice done to them in the expropriation of land in the Gros More National Park area.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker I would like to present a petition on behalf of two hundred and forty one voters of the community of Summerside in the District of the Bay of Islands and the prayer of the petition reads as follows: " We the undersigned from the community of Summerside do hereby submit a petition for the installation of water and sewerage in our community. We have the water supply here. With it properly harnessed it will supply the whole community with water. We look forward to your greatest consideration in this our greatest need." I would just like to make the following comments on this Mr. Speaker. First of all,

Mr. Woodrow:

the acquisition of water and sewerage was the number one priority for me when I became a member of the district of Bay of Islands. Number two, the community is in favour of having a main line put through the community as opposed to spending a whole lot of money in bringing the water to each home. Number three, the source of supply is behind the community; in fact, it is on the edge of the community. And also to conclude, Mr. Speaker, there is a small dam at present used by the school board, and the council and the community advises me that with funds from the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing a large dam could be built.

Now I would like, Mr. Speaker, to place this before the Department of Municipal Affairs, and perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing would be kind enough to make a remark or two on it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that government would like to provide water and sewer and all the other facilities that are required by many of the communities in Newfoundland. And certainly Summerside, -

MR. STRAGHAN: - and not Labrador.

MR. DINN: -and Labrador - and certainly Summerside will be considered as all other districts and communities will be considered in the upcoming months, and hopefully they will be one of the ones that are lucky enough to be provided with funds, to be provided with the water and sewer that they so rightly deserve and need.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, for our side I would like to support the petition as presented by the member for Bay of Island (Mr. Woodrow). Water and sewer is a big problem in his area. It is a problem all over Newfoundland. And I would like in supporting the member's petition to thank him for supporting an effort by me last year to get

Mr. F. White:

a water and sewer system going at Embree in the district of Lewisporte. So I would just like to say we support it, and we hope that there can be some debate on what is going to happen with respect to water and sewer during this session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. McNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the mobile homeowners of Stephenville, protesting the high rates of insurance for mobile homes. The prayer of the petition request the government to investigate into insuring practices and rates imposed by insurance companies. Since action has already begun in this direction by the Department of Consumer Affairs, and I have with me a mobile home analysis report from the Mobile Homeowners Committee of Stephenville pointing out that the mobile home situation in Stephenville is not as bad as it was reported in the IAO's and CIS reports, that is, our losses due to fire and wind are not as high as in other parts of Canada. I am prepared to table this report for the benefit of members. The report gives eleven recommendations and refutes some of the opinions in the reports studied by the Committee. For example, the Stephenville wind velocities are stated by Environment Canada's Report are not as severe as examples quoted for other parts of the country. Also there is a one in fifty probability of an annual wind speed of seventy-four miles per hour. This is below the present construction standard for mobile homes which is seventy-five miles per hour.

The mobile homes in Stephenville are situated within the Stephenville fire distribution system, and therefore are not remote, plus the fact that there has not been any major fire losses within the last five years. The space between the floor and the ground is encased in most mobile homes in Stephenville. It is hoped by the Committee that the Stephenville Mobile Homeowners will get a lower base premium due to the three key favourable points mentioned in their report. And it is further hoped that a certain percentage can be

Mr. Hodder:

deducted for each mobile homeowner, for each of the recommendations that the owner has incorporated into his mobile home. It is also further hoped that the Department of Consumer Affairs would accept the report and approach the insurance companies on their behalf for better insurance rates.

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: The hon. the member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition as submitted by the hon. the member for Stephenville. Although the report he now tables refers to Stephenville and the mobile homes in that area, I think that the same, perhaps, could be true, if we had the necessary data, for other districts in the Province.

I feel that in some instances we have been fed a bill of goods by some of the insurance companies. I believe that the kind of information that the hon. member, and particularly the committee provide, indicating that there are, I believe, less fires in mobile homes than in what we consider normal buildings, normal residential areas; also recommendations, as I remember from reading that report, making recommendations for how you should tie a mobile unit down. Also, I think that it might be a very, very good thing, particularly in my own area and other areas as well, where you have a great preponderance of mobile homes, that perhaps the people should get together and come up with a report, and benefit from this experience so that they can really make the case when dealing with the insurance companies.

Since it is a well-known fact that when you are buying in quantity that you should get a better deal with a package deal, perhaps mobile homeowners should take advantage of the very fine job done by this committee and maybe we can all benefit from it. I hope that perhaps we might have some initiative made on this perhaps from the Minister of Municipal Affairs to assist in this matter, or the Minister of Consumer Affairs in this current session of the House, because many people in mobile homes feel they are being discriminated against as to insurance. So we are very happy to support the petition by the hon. member.

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

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I have reason to support the petition presented by the hon. the member for Stephenville, because in my district we have mobile homes. In fact, unfortunately at the present time the proprietor or the owner of the mobile home park has, at least he is hoping to have, ten families evicted. This to my

MR. WOODROW: mind is a serious matter.

Actually what it is about, Mr. Speaker, is concerning five per cent on the homes when they are sold or change hands. I really feel that we should have a debate on this.

MR. NEARY: Are we talking about insurance?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I should point out to the hon. gentleman a stipulation which was read earlier and that is in speaking to the petition the hon. gentleman should confine his remarks to either the number of parties from whom it comes and the number of signatures and then, essentially, the material allegations it contains, the material that is in the petition.

The hon. the member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, probably I was taken away a bit at the time, but I was about to finish the remarks I had made. I repeat again that I hope that some time during the session a complete debate will be made on mobile homes and that we will have the regulations passed in this hon. House. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further petitions?

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I have the annual duty of presenting or tabling the summary of special warrants for the year. It is always an item of interest and excitement.

The total of the warrants this year is \$83,242,600.

MR. ROBERTS: All for 'George Cross'?

MR. DOODY: The two substantial amounts: There is a \$75,400,000 amount for the Department of Finance which represented a loan to the Gull Island Corporation for work by that corporation. The other substantial amount is an amount of almost \$5 million for the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation which was really a switch of subheads, or a switch of heads. Originally voted in the

MR. DOODY: Department of Health it was transferred to Rehabilitation and Recreation for the homes for the aged and infirm so that they could be cost-shared under CAP. The difference is about \$3 million, so the total is \$83,242,000. There are copies here for, extensive copies of each for the edification of members who may be interested.

I also table at this time the Annual Report of the Newfoundland Liquor Licensing Board, which always makes interesting and scintillating conversation and reading for the hon. members.

MR. NEARY: What about a progress report on the -

MR. DOODY: We also table, with the permission and acquiescence of the hon. the member for LaPoile, who is his usual silent self this afternoon, the Annual Report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services Limited, another document of brevity and efficiency.

MR. NEARY: Will the hon. minister read it?

MR. DOODY: The hon. minister will if the House so desires.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the requirements of our legislation, I am tabling herewith copies of certain regulations which have to be placed before the Legislature.

The regulations in question are: the teacher certification regulations; the teacher certification (amendment number one) regulations, 1976; the school boards' allocation of money regulations, 1976; regulations increasing operation of grants to school boards; the Local School Tax Amendment Regulations, 1976; The Schools Act; transportation of pupils; school board elections regulations; and again The Schools Act, transportation of pupils amendments regulations, 1976.

MR. NEARY: Anybody left to report the School Act?

MR. HOUSE: Yes.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I table the Department of Public Works and Services, College of Trades and Technology parking regulations. I agree, you know, it would be great if we could just put it in the Speaker's Office and not table them; and the annual report of the Newfoundland Public Service Commission.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: I think it is worth at least raising, and Your Honour may want to rule or Your Honour may want to look at it, because I have never heard - When a document is required to be laid on the table of the House, is the minister required by anything other than possibly the tradition to stand and to - as the minister himself indicated, the College of Trades and Technology parking regulations are not exactly, you know, crucial to the public interest in the sense they have been gazetted and anybody who is particularly

MR. ROBERTS: interested is already intimately familiar I am sure.

Is there some procedure whereby they could be tabled, perhaps laid upon the table or perhaps brought to the Clerk's Office and then put in - we get a daily Hansard, usually within the month - and made available that way? I raise it only as a matter of, I think, of importance, but a matter of new importance.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further submission on that point? If not I shall have to consider it and give a ruling later. Are there any further reports?

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. ROBERTS: We zip right down through those, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Premier, Sir, and it is with reference to the job creation programme announced in the Speech from the Throne. We do not have a cute little name on it yet like Canada Works or Young Canada Works or anything as yet. But my question, Sir, begins by asking the Premier if he could let us know, Sir, when the first people, the first of the approximately 500 people who apparently will be hired to work on this programme, when we can expect to see them hired?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can answer that question. I cannot answer the question as to when the first one will be hired. The programme is geared in the area of fisheries and that is really, I would hope, certainly, and I suspect, that it will be in advancing fishery projects which will have ongoing benefit. And the same happens in Tourism and Forestry and also in the Department of Social Services whereby people who have not had an opportunity to get off the social welfare rolls will have an opportunity to participate in the programme, and the expectation is, Mr. Speaker, as I said I do not know when the first one will be hired but I would suspect that the last one will be hired before the next three weeks

PREMIER MOORES: is out.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Can the Premier indicate, Sir, when some guidelines will be made public or when some information will be made public with respect to this programme, and specifically within the context of that can the Premier indicate whether these programmes will be analogous to the LIP, Canada works thing where the initiative comes from the local area and the government responds hopefully with approval and cheque. And secondly, or alternately and secondly, whether the programmes will be initiated by government departments deciding to carry out a certain project and then proceeding from there?

PREMIER MOORES: The situation is, Mr. Speaker, if there is a LIP project presently going on that requires assistance and it comes within the criteria I mentioned of resource development eventually, or if the department concerned has to identify the programme, it will not be a programme where there will be applications from all concerned people, as much as we would enjoy that. The fact is, Sir, that they will be selective programmes geared at resource development and the people, whether it be the Fishermen's Committee or whether it be another group in the local area, will be advised as to the type of thing that we have in mind and with their consultation we will then approve the going ahead of it.

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, growing out of the Premier's answer there, can the Premier indicate whether the government - since this is to be a government initiated programme, if I understood him correctly - whether the government have identified a list of likely areas and projects, you know, that they will have in mind?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The answer is, yes, Mr. Speaker. It now remains to have consultation with the local people to carry on with the programme, and if it is any advantage to the House we will gladly, once the programmes have all been identified, table where they are and why in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River, followed by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. STRACHAN: Again on unemployment, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister of Manpower tell us whether, apart from another Task Force which only delays the problem, whether the government have any plans to alleviate immediately the drastic unemployment and food economic situation now existing in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, where a rapid close down of a number of government projects has really caused a serious situation?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: We formed a committee recently and-
to the area to interview each of the individuals involved.
I think a week before last I received a report, on Thursday of last week, in which they interviewed each of these people who are now working and who were not working to see what could be done. We have a profile of them. We are working closely together with Canada Manpower and the report is ready now, and government will take a look at it. It is an initial report and certainly government have made a commitment to the people that anything can be done to alleviate this situation from a Provincial point of view will be done.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works and Services. Would the minister tell the House what has transpired recently, and if any decisions have been taken in connection with additional office space to house the public servants?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, nothing has happened recently. First of all, the federal study we had done a couple of years ago is being updated. This is a division of the Federal Department of Supply and Services who we retained, I think two or three years ago, and we are having them update their study of two or three years ago which we hope to have -

MR. ROBERTS: Fours years ago.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Four years ago, it was
- by May of this year. We would hope that that would give us an indication of what space we need, based on certain limitations they have in respect to the space requirements of individuals and so on.

In the meantime, I think what the hon. member is getting at is Atlantic Place. And what the hon. minister said, and said it over and over again, is that there are a number of options open to government; build its own building, lease a building, stay like it is, or Atlantic Place or any other large area. It is merely one of the options available because there is a large amount of space there.

The minister nor the government did not say it was going to take space in Atlantic Place. It did not say it was going to build its own building or lease a building. But it is one of the possible options when you look at the amount of space that is required by the various government departments. So it is merely one of the options available. No decision has yet been taken.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: My supplementary, Sir, is directed to the hon. Premier. Would the hon. Premier tell the House whether or not the hon. gentleman intends to proceed with the suggestion that the Premier made in the last session of the House that a special committee of the House would be established to look into office space to house the public service in this Province? Does the Premier still intend to follow that procedure?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I do not know if that suggestion was made in the House or behind the curtain, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: In the House.

PREMIER MOORES: But the fact is that I think there is no question whatsoever that office space is needed for the sake of efficiency. This is always a very delicate situation when it comes up because there are all kinds of intonations read into it and what can happen and so on. But certainly it would, I would hope, be the subject of the Department of Public Works' presentation after which time, when we look at the requirements, we can either have a Select Committee of the House on the matter or the government could put forward a proposition which can be debated by the House, either one.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister tell the House whether it is the minister's intention to lay on the table of this House the report of the Federal-Provincial Task Force that the minister just spoke of that is updating the matter of office space to house the public service in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I will take that question under advisement, Mr. Speaker. The study is merely for a departmental study, for the edification of the Department of Public Works' officials. It is not meant to be any secret document. I am sure the federal department would not in any way tell us

Mr. Rousseau.

anything of a policy nature. All they are saying is that you have so many people, you need so much space, and here are the obvious options that you have. In consultation with my colleagues, I will take it under advisement.

MR. NEARY: Could I have one final supplementary?

MR. SPEAKER: One final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister tell the House then who are the members of this task force and are they being paid by the provincial government? Do they have any consultants under contract? Just who are they running this force? We do not seem to know too much about it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am sorry. I will just mention it there. They are a - I do not think division would be the correct word - they are attached to the federal Department of Supply and Services. They are a group who determine space requirements, professional people. They have nobody working with them unless they need consultation in any specific or technical area. But it is done by an agency of the federal Department of Supply and Services who have that sort of expertise that we were looking for, and the kind co-operation between the Department of Public Works and Services and the federal Department of Supply and Services had them available to the government of this Province.

MR. NEARY: Do we have to pay for it or do they just come in -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Oh, there is payment required, payment of cost, but there is just the cost incurred in the study.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova followed by the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier. I wonder if the Premier is in a position to specifically inform the House as to what criteria will be used in the distribution of the funds for the job creation programme?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: In general terms, Mr. Speaker, it will be in areas where it will assist any ongoing resource development in the future; in other words, if a project is done it will have some ongoing use to create jobs in the future as opposed to just make work.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, again on the same subject of the programme to create jobs. I wonder would the Premier indicate how this programme is going to be administered, if a department has been identified or if a special administrator or administrative division will be designated for this purpose?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: At the present time, Mr. Speaker, it is being done by the four departments I mentioned. In the case of Social Services it will be done by the employment officers in that department, once the projects have been approved on the basis I have said. In the case of Forestry, it is possible that it will be done by one of the Forestry people themselves. But if there is a local committee who can do the same job it would be done under their aegis. Equally in Fisheries, I would suggest, it probably will be mostly done by local fishermen's committees. This is the object of it.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

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

MR. SIMMONS: I believe the Premier has indicated that the areas of the Province to be involved have been identified. I wonder would the Premier indicate to the House what these areas are?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I have already said, Mr. Speaker, that gladly, as soon as the projects have been identified they will be tabled in the House. It has to be done in consultation with local committees first to see the capabilities of each area as done. But the only areas I can say it will be done is in the areas of Fisheries, Tourism, Forestry, and Social Assistance. There have been no, if the hon. member is worried, Mr. Speaker, no political areas identified.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: We are making history, Mr. Speaker, making history.

MR. PECKFORD: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: One further supplementary. I wonder would the Premier indicate whether any of the funds involved are part of a federal-provincial cost-sharing, or does he anticipate that might be the case?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I think I have answered that, Mr. Speaker. I said where there are LIP projects that meet the criteria of eventual resource development area assistance, so to speak, that part of the programme will involve that. It will not involve, for instance, a LIP project where there is a community hall, this sort of thing, as much as we would like to. But it is geared to the resource area. That, Mr. Speaker, is basically the -

MR. SIMMONS: No, but the \$2 million, Mr. Premier?

PREMIER MOORES: That \$2 million is totally provincial, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Manpower. I am wondering if the minister is aware of the fact that we have been informed that a major department store, national department store, or supermarket, I am sorry, located in the St. John's area has given notice to twelve or fourteen of their employees, the reason being they are moving their main accounting to Halifax? One, does he know. Secondly, would he take it upon himself to contact Dominion Stores, I am talking about, to see why it is that they joined so many others in moving and making Halifax the capital of everything in Atlantic Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower.

Mr. Rousseau:

I thought the only Dominion Stores that had any problems, in the Province, Mr. Speaker, were the ones in Labrador City and Wabush which are a handful of problems because they are run from out of Quebec. No, I was not aware of it, but I will certainly take it upon myself to have the matter checked out. I was not aware of it, and I will have it checked out, and I will look into it and take it up with the appropriate officials.

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

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. I wonder would the minister could indicate to the House whether or not there has been any consultation between his department and the Denturist Association concerning proposed legislation to govern the activities of denturists in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there has been numerous meetings. When I say 'numerous' I should indicate what I mean by numerous, and that is, during the past year and a half possibly four or five meetings between the denturists and myself and the officials in the department.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder could the minister be a bit more specific - meetings could be meetings - and tell the House whether or not those meetings dealt specifically with the proposed legislation or draft legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes, generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, that was the purpose of the meetings.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Has the minister made any commitment to the Denturist Association that he will consult with them before legislation is brought before this House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the meetings we have had have dealt with the need for legislation, and the type of legislation which the denturists would like to see. As I said there has been four or five meetings during the past year or fourteen or fifteen months. There is not a big lot that I can add, other than that I am looking forward to bringing in the appropriate legislation in this session.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there somebody asking a supplementary?

MR. F. ROWE: Yes.

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

MR. F. ROWE: I wonder if the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker, could indicate whether there is in fact draft legislation in existence for the denturists and whether the denturists have been consulted on the draft legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: I am not sure if the hon. member is posing his question properly. I presume what he means is, have the denturists submitted proposals to us which they would like to see reflected in the legislation? That is the first part of the question.

MR. F. ROWE: Would the hon. minister permit?

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes, go ahead.

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

MR. F. ROWE: I am asking the minister, Mr. Speaker, whether or not there is draft legislation in existence for the denturists, and whether the denturists have been consulted with respect to this draft legislation, and when and where?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: The draft legislation is in the process, Mr. Speaker, of being drafted.

MR. F. ROWE: It is in the process.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - hon. Minister of Health.

MR. SPEAKER: Having already referred to the hon. gentleman, I will bear in mind that any other hon. member who wishes to ask a question on that subject.

MR. NEARY: I would like to put a question, Sir, to the hon. Minister of Health. I would like to ask the minister if he has yet received a report from Dr. Selikoff in connection with the study that is being done in Baie Verte, on the miners in Baie Verte, concerning asbestosis in the community of Baie Verte, and amongst the miners of Baie Verte? Has the minister received the report? If so, is it the intention of the minister to table the report? And what action, if any, has been taken on the report if it has been submitted to the minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the report to which the hon. member refers is a report which was done by the Mount Sinai University in New York, who commissioned Dr. Selikoff to go into Baie Verte at the request of the unions at Baie Verte, the Steelworkers Union. I might say that this government supported the doctor and his team financially, and in every other way which we could support, every other area where he requested support. He has promised me a copy of the report. The report will be made, of course, to the people who asked him to do it. To my knowledge the report has not been made. I can categorically say I have not received a copy.

MR. S. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware if the individuals who were examined, the miners, the individual miners in Baie Verte, have they received their reports? My understanding is that Dr. Selikoff is going to notify the individuals first, and then give the various parties copies of the report after, including the minister. Have the miners received their report yet on an individual basis?

MR. H. COLLINS:

MR. U. COLLINS: knowledge, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Selikoff had not presented his report to anyone. I might be off base there, but I have a promise from him that I would get a copy and I am sure if there were copies received by the miners, the individuals in Baie Verte, that we would have heard of it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Could the minister tell the House when he expects to get a report on this urgent matter of occupational health hazard in Baie Verte?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker the original date which we anticipated receiving the report on the basis of a conversation with the doctor from New York was September. I know that there has been some discussion since then because additional information was needed and so on. It was my hope that we would have received the report by this time, but, as I said, we have not got it yet. It should be coming momentarily.

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister tell the House if the government itself, without having the Selikoff Report, has the government done anything about this occupational hazard in Baie Verte? Have the government taken any steps to eliminate the dust menace and the asbestos, dust from the asbestos, and have there been any more monitoring done than was done there before? Would the minister give us a progress report on just what the government itself has done through its own initiative, without having to wait for Dr. Selikoff's Report?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker that question would be more appropriately asked of one of my colleagues, either the Minister of Consumers Affairs and Environment or the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. NEARY: Well, I put the question to the Minister of Mines and Energy, The supplementary question. Could the Minister tell us, the Minister of Mines and Energy, what is being done in connection with the asbestos problem in Baie Verte? What has the government done on its own?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Dept. of Mines and Energy, the Dept. of Health, the Dept. of Consumer Affairs and Environment, and there is some connection with the Dept. of Manpower and Industrial Relations, have been continuing to monitor not only the asbestosis problem in Baie Verte but also problems in Labrador City, Wabush and other mines around the province, particularly St. Lawrence where there had been a health problem. There has been an increase in the number of inspectors that came on duty under the Dept. of Mines and Energy over the last year to assist in this. And we are anticipating this year to increase that staff even further to help monitor in a more efficient way than has been done in the past.

Additionally as all hon. members of the House know, there was a major conference that was convened by the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations before Christmas of industry, labour and other interested parties to ascertain from them precisely what way they want government to act as it relates to health safety standards in the province. And out of that conference has come a committee which is to recommend to government whether in fact there should be one agency under whose aegis the proper efficient manner can be done for inspection and proper protection for the people in Baie Verte as well as other mines in the province.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I will have to hear the hon. gentleman from LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied with the answer the hon. member gave and I wish to debate it during the late show on Thursday.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe I had recognized the hon. member for Eagle River as I recall—or Lewisporte. I am very sorry.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education and it is related to the School Attendance Act. Would the Minister tell the House whether or not there has been some changes in the School Attendance Act in terms of the number of school attendance officers throughout the province, and if in fact they have all been given their notices?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, there has been no change in the Act as of the present time, the specific act. We were phasing down for a number of years the attendance officers because, at the suggestion of school boards around the province. The school attendance officers, the truant officers they call them these times, have not been very effective. And we still have the school attendance officers at the department. Some of them are still working, but we are phasing them down.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. WHITE: Could the minister tell us what the long range plan is in terms of phasing them down? Will they be all phased out or will there be three or four left in the province, and also will the supervisors of school attendance in St. John's be retained. Will that position be retained?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: The supervisor is the departmental official who will be gathering the statistics and will be checking with principals from the various schools, or the various boards, about attendance, dealing with it at a departmental level. It is our intention, yes, to phase down completely the school attendance officers in the districts.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. WHITE: Could the minister indicate then who will have responsibility in each of the areas for the enforcement of the School Attendance Act?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: The enforcement will be done through the school principals, through the district offices, the boards, the district offices, and the official at the department.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the answer just given by the minister, would he indicate when he intends to introduce the appropriate changes in legislation of the House to allow school board offices to administer the act? At the moment it is the minister's responsibility and not any districts concerned. Does he intend to bring in legislation concerning the matter and if so when?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: That is being looked into, Mr. Speaker. The way the act is now is the fact that school principals make representation to the various school attendance officers and they will be doing that directly with the personnel we have here at the department rather than to a person in the field.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans followed by - I think I previously indicated that I would recognize the hon. member for Eagle River next, so the hon. member for Eagle River followed by the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy. Could the minister tell us whether he is prepared to take any action against the desperate exploitation of this Province's resources by Quebec, in particular Knob Lake where raw iron ore is mined out of this Province's soil totally by Quebec miners for shipment for Schefferville where it then provides the almost total operation of the iron ore plant there?

I believe that in the months of October, November and December eighty per cent of the iron ore keeping the Schefferville going came from this Province's soil.

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

MR. PECKFORD: That problem is presently being looked at very seriously by government and when any action is taken the hon. member will be advised.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I am dissatisfied with the answer and I wish to debate it on the Late Show on Thursday.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this question to the hon. Premier. Would the Premier advise the House that in light of the fact that the Cabinet have had the Buchans Task Force for the past roughly seven months, would he indicate to the House what recommendations of that Task Force the Cabinet or government is now prepared to implement?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Some have already been done, Mr. Speaker, and others will be done in conjunction with the principals concerned, and as the decisions are made the hon. member and the House will be advised.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary; the hon. gentleman on a supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: The Premier indicated that some have already been done. Apart from the incorporation, could he name one please?

PREMIER MOORES: The hon. member just did. It was the Incorporation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear a supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the Premier indicate to the House if that is indeed the only one that has been implemented?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I wish to draw to the attention of the hon. member to my right that questions should not be argumentative or tend to repeat what has already been asked or answered, as the case might be. But the question has now been asked.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman just asked a question and I have to wait to see whether there is any reply to it.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I either did not get an answer to my question, or my question was ruled out of order. If my question was out of order, I will rephrase it.

MR. PECKFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans now asking a question or is he up on a point of order. Just what is he on?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) asked for a clarification, technically; actually what was whether his question was out of order because if it was he asked he would like to rephrase a question on the same topic. The answer would have to be that the former question was out of order in its wording and I would recognize him now to ask a question on the same subject, rephrased.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Premier advise the House what, if any, recommendations of the Buchans Task Force have been implemented apart from the incorporation of Buchans?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The situation, Mr. Speaker, very simply is that that is the only one, and not only that, Sir, but -

MR. FLIGHT: Inaudible

PREMIER MOORES: No. That is the only one to my knowledge, let us put it that way. There may be others as well. But I strongly recommend, Sir, that before any other further decisions are made we look at the Task Force on Buchans here in the House, plus the new potential of the Buchans area minerally, plus a new approach by Price Newfoundland who have taken over the municipal responsibility as opposed to ASARCO because, Mr. Speaker, there have been a great many more considerations to be taken into consideration since that Task Force report was in.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde followed by the hon. gentleman for LaPoile, time permitting.

MR. ROWE: I had a question for the hon. the Minister of Health but I will direct it to the hon. the Minister of Justice, Sir. As I understand it, the preliminary draft of the denturist legislation is presently being drafted. Could the minister give an undertaking to the House that before legislation is brought into the House concerning the denturists, that they will be consulted before actual legislation is brought into the House of Assembly?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: My colleague the hon. the Minister of Health is not present in the Chamber at this time, but my understanding from him is that there has been very close consultation with the denturists. This is my understanding from him. The hon. the Minister of Health is now in the House and he can answer the question effectively and fully and completely.

MR. ROWE: The question for the benefit of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker, is this: I understand that draft legislation is presently taking place for the denturists. What I am asking the Minister of Health is; before legislation concerning the denturists is brought before the House of Assembly, will the Denturists' Association be consulted before such legislation is brought before the House of Assembly?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall a piece of legislation which has ever been brought before this House, certainly since this administration has been in office, without consultation with the individuals or the groups involved if, in fact, it dealt with professional groups.

Now it was said that legislation is now being drafted, and I suspect that all of the people involved will be given an opportunity - when is something else - but they will be given an opportunity to see the legislation.

MR. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow one further supplementary and the time will then be transpired.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Health aware of the existence of a letter in which he states specifically to the legal counsel for the Denturists' Association that he will consult with the draft legislation before the actual legislation is brought before this House of Assembly?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: I do not have the letter before me. Maybe the hon. the member has. Obviously there has been a bit of collusion between legal counsel and other people involved. It is a well known fact that there is some sympathy on that side of the House for some of the people who have been making statements in recent days. If the hon. member has a letter there, let him read it.

MR. SIMMONS: And some harassment on that side.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 1.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Direct Sellers Act." (Bill No. 2), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 2 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 2.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Consumer Protection Act." (Bill No. 3), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 3 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 3.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Petty Trespass Act." (Bill No. 4), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 4 read a first time,
ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion 4.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of
Consumer Affairs and the Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act
To Amend The Attachment Of Wages Act." (Bill No. 5), carried.

On motion Bill No. 5 read a first time,
ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion 5.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill,
"An Act To Amend The Legislative Disabilities Act," carried. (Bill No. 6)

On motion Bill No. 6 read a first time, ordered read a second
time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education to introduce a bill,
"An Act To Amend The Memorial University Act," carried. (Bill No. 7)

On motion Bill No. 7 read a first time, ordered read a second
time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An
Act To Amend The Statutes Act," carried. (Bill No. 8)

On motion Bill No. 8 read a first time, ordered read a second
time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. President of the Council to introduce a bill,
"An Act To Establish The Newfoundland Statistics Agency," carried.
(Bill No. 9)

On motion Bill No. 9 read a first time, ordered read a second
time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An
Act To Amend The Maintenance Orders (Enforcement) Act," carried.
(Bill No. 10)

On motion Bill No. 10 read a first time, ordered read a second
time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment
to introduce a bill, "An Act To Change The Corporate Name Of The
Society Of Industrial Accountants Of Newfoundland," carried. (Bill No. 11)

On motion Bill No. 11 read a first time, ordered read a second
time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1, the Address in Reply.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the debate
which has now been called is, as Your Honour has just said, the Address
in Reply debate, and it is not only the opening debate of a session by
tradition and by practice, although interestingly enough not by the

MR. ROBERTS:

the rules - there is no requirement in the rules that we begin with it, indeed even that we begin with the Throne Speech - not only is it the opening debate, the first debate of the session, but is it generally considered one of the most important single debates because, Mr. Speaker, it gives the House, the members of the House, the fifty of us who sit here, the opportunity to survey the whole range of public affairs in this Province, to have a look at all of the problems that confront this Province today, to outline some of our concerns, some of our hopes, some of our thoughts and to put forth some of the ideas which we think should be looked at and to have a look at, hopefully in a constructive sense, such ideas as the government may put forward. It is a grand inquest on the Province, I guess, in the traditional sense of the word in which that term was always used. It is a chance to survey the whole range of public affairs and a chance to consider any topic of significance.

Now that is very different from most other debates, because while we do not always adhere completely to the rules, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour

Mr. Roberts.

has had occasion from time to time to bring myself and others of the House to attention, to recall to our attention the rules of relevancy. The Throne Speech debate, I would think, Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to be irrelevant to the Throne Speech debate. That is why it is designed that way. It is designed to let each member, and so I hope that each of the fifty members will speak. I know many of the members personally. The eighteen men and women who sit with me in the Opposition ranks, we have often talked, and I know that each of them has specific concerns, some of them affecting one's district, some affecting the entire Province. I thought the type of speech which the gentleman from Exploits (Dr. Twomey) gave on Opening Day was perhaps a good balance, a balance in which he expressed some concerns on matters that affected his own district, the people who have sent him here to speak for them as their member in the House, and on the other hand some concerns which are obviously of importance to him and which, as a member, he feels should be and, therefore, properly are brought to this House, concerns of importance to the Province. He made some remarks about separatism, about the implications of the election of the Parti Quebecois government in our neighbouring province of Quebec. I thought those were well-made. I have not had a chance to see the Hansard yet. Indeed, Sir, I would hope - and I will say, Mr. Speaker, that if it is possible to be irrelevant to the Throne Speech, I suspect I am about to be irrelevant to the Throne Speech, but I think that it might be permitted - I would hope that we can arrange, Sir, to get Hansard early this year, because it is of no real value to the members of the House, or of little or lesser real value unless we can have it hopefully, the morning after.

Now I realize that it is a big job, particularly when we have had one of our lengthier sessions, and many thousands of words are being spewed out and recorded and to be transcribed. My understanding of it is that the holdup is not with the Hansard staff, that they perform

Mr. Roberts.

admirably, often working very long hours and very late into the night. But the transcripts, the typed scripts, are usually available the next morning, but the problem is in the printing process. And the Minister of Public Works, who I assume is responsible for the government's printing office or whatever it is called, is not in his seat.

MR. NEARY: Printing and Photography.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. NEARY: Printing and Photography.

MR. ROBERTS: Printing and Photography Division, but it is in the Public Works and Services Department, - is it not?

The minister is not in his seat now, but I would hope that he could look into this. I do not know what demands are made upon that office. I can imagine they are considerable. And it is often hard to say whether something is more important or less important, but I do suggest that something ought to be done, and hopefully and surely something can be done to improve the speed of Hansard. I am not particularly unhappy at this point, not at all, that we do not have last session's Hansard. I mean, there it is now and it is of interest, I suppose, to the historians. If some poor benighted graduate student in years to come is unfortunate enough to be assigned by his tutor as a thesis topic, you know, the House of Assembly session of 1975-1976, then he will have to read them, but I venture to say that there are very few others, unless we have some masochists in our midst.

MR. NOLAN: Dissertation in insanity.

MR. DOODY: You should be grateful that they are not video taped.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Finances says that we should be grateful that they are not video taped. I am not so sure about that. He was not here on Opening Day. He was off in Ottawa at a real first ministers' conference, but it was called, "The Minister of Finances' Conference." He and his fellow ministers were there carving up the corpse of the poor, battered Canadian taxpayer a little further, trying to make the pint

Mr. Roberts.

of milk fill the quart bottle, the basic problem which confronts the minister today, and thus he missed the Opening Day. He missed my comment, which I will repeat for his benefit only since he raised the matter, that if our proceedings here were to be televised it might very well result in a great improvement of the calibre of debate, the decorum of the members on all sides. Even, I venture to suggest, possibly on occasion, the minister has a little role.

DR. FARRELL: Would the Hansard be live or edited?

MR. SIMMONS: If it were to be live, it would be up to you.

MR. ROBERTS: The President of the Council asked whether it would be live or edited? There is a motion on the Order Paper by my friend from Lewisporte (Mr. White) if ever we can get to it, it is fairly far down the list, but I think the suggestion that he wishes to put, as I understand it, and I quite agree with it, is that we should possibly look at the Ottawa experience. My understanding is that Ottawa will tape the entire thing. It will not be done by the broadcasting companies, it will be done by the House of Commons themselves. And that will then be available and a media agency - a terrible phrase, but we have never found a better one - but, you know, the television station or the CBC or the private CTV network can tape whatever they wish. I cannot conceive of anybody

Mr. Roberts:

in his right mind wanting to watch three hours of the House of Assembly.

MR. F. WHITE: CBC will be carrying six hours of the House of Commons a day on cable.

MR. ROBERTS: My colleague tells me that CBC will be carrying six hours of the House of Commons a day on cable, but I cannot see a very large audience for that. But nonetheless -

MR. DOODY: Will that pre-empt As The Stomach Turns?

MR. ROBERTS: Well it might replace As The World Turns, at times it looks like Laugh In. I mean, but quite seriously, well we can all agree that, you know, an unrestricted diet of the House of Assembly would be enough to, I suppose, qualify one for psychiatric help under an even tightened up MCP plan.

MR. J. NOLAN: Who will be the sponsor? The manufacture of librium?

MR. ROBERTS: The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that the more publicity given to this House, not only the better for the House, I think it would improve us tremendously if people saw what went on, and not only improve us but I think people would get a far different impression. Of course, what is reported from the House is often, you know, the colourful or the dramatic or the unusual. You know, all we have heard about the House of Commons in England recently, as I recall it, unless we have seen some specialist material or a British newspaper, is the evening when was it a labour gentleman got angry and went and grabbed the Mace, and went for a Tory member or vice-versa, and I mean that does not happen, it does not even happen here every day. It has not happened to my knowledge ever. Once the Mace was seized distrained for debt back in 1833 or something.

MR. NOLAN: Was it ever paid?

MR. ROBERTS: No, and I am told the Mace could never be found. The Mace was never found afterwards. But, you know, the fact is the House does do a great deal of useful work, and if it were to be televised I think it would help greatly. But, Mr. Speaker, if it cannot be

Mr. Roberts: televised, and I suspect that is probably fairly far down the list of priorities, and maybe in a year of restraint, you know, we could restrain that without affecting the body politic in a mortal sense.

To come back to the Hansard point, if we cannot televise the House, then let us at least get the Hansard out the next morning. Now I do not know any reason why we cannot get it out.

MR. HICKMAN: I move we go up and find out.

MR. ROBERTS: The House Leader, I thank him. You know, I can tell him, because I have checked on this, that the Editor of Hansard tells me that he and his staff are able to get their work done fairly quickly. It may not be a final edited version - a very good question; what do you edit, if anything, on Hansard? - but certainly we could have transcripts or typescripts available. And I made that reference with reference to the hon. gentleman from Exploits (Dr. Twomey), because I would like to have read his remarks on opening day, and had the opportunity to consider them. I did not have too much attention to pay the close heed to them I would have liked to, because I had to speak following him, and I was trying to get, you know, my own thoughts and notes in order. So I attempted to have - I was not here today. I was trapped out of town by the bad weather yesterday and did not get until lunch hour - but I had asked my staff to try and get me a Hansard, and I am told it is not yet available. Well, I would simply hope that, you know, can be remedied. It is a new session, and let us forget what is passed. I mean, last year they got bogged down about the middle of May. And, you know, I understand the bottleneck is not up in the Hansard staff we have a very efficient and a very effective staff, do marvelous work, the bottleneck is in the Printing and Photography Division. They have too much work. Well, let the work be rearranged, let the work be - just a few brief notes of some of the headings I intend to touch upon. It is only about eight inches thick, that file.

MR. HICKMAN: Why have all those motions on daily?

MR. ROBERTS: What is the Minister of -

MR. HICKMAN: Why not have those on the Order Paper on Wednesdays.?

MR. ROBERTS: Well the Minister of Justice makes another good suggestion that why do we have, I think, twenty-two motions on the Order Paper today of which ten or twelve are Private Members' Notices of Motions. It might be an idea, Mr. Speaker, it might save a considerable amount of paper, help to preserve our forest resources, if they were printed only on Wednesday. I am not sure why they are printed every day. I do not know why again the rules, I do not think the rules require it, it may just be tradition.

In any event, Sir, let me come back to opening day because I listened with great interest to what the gentleman from Exploits had to say. I listened with equal interest to what his colleague from Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) had to say. I will touch upon that later because there I do not find myself quite as heartily in sympathy. I am certainly not in agreement, but I would not want the gentleman from Exploits to think that I am in agreement with everything he said either. Indeed if that happened one of us would be perhaps in somewhat strange company. And while I know that politics - Well here is Hansard now, Sir, you have only to ask, it appears, it appears, but it should be sent out in the morning, Sir.

In any event, on opening day I said the Speech from the Throne was the

MR. ROBERTS:

emptiest document I had ever seen in my ten or eleven years, whatever it now is, in the House of Assembly. And upon reflection I think that is an accurate and really a somewhat kind description of that document. I spoke with my friend and colleague from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) who unfortunately is not here today. He will be here, he tells me, tomorrow. A touch of ill health, I gather. He tells me that in his twenty-odd years in the House he has never seen a document with less substance in it. I spoke to my friend from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Canning), as the seat is now named, who in his time in the House, which is exactly contemporaneous with that of the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), he had never seen an emptier document. There is just nothing in it.

In thinking it over in the last few days trying to put together a few remarks for a talk today, Mr. Speaker, I can only come to one, there is only one word that upon reflection, I think, accurately describes the Throne Speech. I think it is a disgrace, a complete and an utter disgrace, the programme which the government present. Before anybody on the other side leaps up and says I am somehow bringing the office or the person of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province into either partisan controversy or into dispute, or casting doubt upon his repute, let me hasten to say that we all know that the Throne Speech, of course, while it is the Speech from the Throne and while we can refer to it if we wish as the Gracious Speech, it is nothing more or less than the Premier's or the administration's - the Premier normally being the vehicle by which the administration conveys their advice - the administration's speech. It is written by the Cabinet, and His Honour, I have no doubt, is consulted and so he should be. I am sure that if he has any wishes they are heeded. Was it Bagehot said, "The duty of the Crown is to encourage and to warn and to advise." That is all that the Governor does.

MR. ROBERTS:

So the speech which we had read to us last Wednesday, Sir, really, in my view and in the view of my colleagues, was just a complete and an utter disgrace. To think that we have been called together to open a session in this year of 1977 when there are the problems we face in this Province, the difficulties confronting our people, the issues that need to be dealt with by the Queen's ministers, to think that this is what we are granted and this is what we must begin with, Sir, I think it is a disgraceful show and I think it is one of which every member of the ministry should be heartily and thoroughly ashamed.

Now, Sir, it would have been a great speech if it had been the first speech of this administration. If they had come into office just a few months ago following a general election, if they had gathered themselves around the Cabinet table and said, "Let us address ourselves now to governing this Province and let us go to the Legislature and let us outline our concerns, our analysis of the state of affairs of the Province and our priorities," then it would have been in many ways an acceptable speech. I say that because much of the wording in it, Mr. Speaker, I do not find objectionable. I would not find it in the least bit objectionable. Many of the intentions stated in it I can only welcome because they should be welcomed, because they are laudable and sound, not all of them but many of them. The only difficulty, Mr. Speaker, is that, I think without exception, we have heard them all before, time and time again. And what we are getting is not a new broth but stale porridge, old porridge, stale, stale and staler.

If we just look at one or two of the headings, Sir. I have gone through the exercise of taking some of the topics in the speech, topics into which government activity is organized, and just put through one of two or them and looked back and some of them sounded familiar. So I got out my little file of previous Throne Speeches - Tory and dragged them out. There have been six previous

MR. ROBERTS:

speeches. There were two in 1972. Then there was the 1973 session, 1974 session. There were two sessions in 1975, one before the general election and one after when we were called together to remedy the hypocritical programme which the government had confronted and had taken to the people of the Province and on which they were presumably re-elected. We were called in then for the truth as opposed to the election budget and we got the present Minister of Finance's budget which told the story as it really was, and then of course there is this particular speech, the one we are now debating, Sir, which was the seventh in line.

There is a line - it is on page 2 as I recall it, Sir, of this year's speech,

MR. ROBERTS: and I am quoting just a portion of it but hon. gentlemen I think will believe that I am quoting in context and quoting fairly. If they do not I invite them to get out their own file of throne speeches and to read along with Roberts if they so wish.

There is a line on page two that, "My government have prepared a programme of resource development." And that is the pith and substance of a particular portion. Well that sounded familiar, Sir, so I went back and, lo and behold, in the March 1, 1972 speech, the famous one-day session before Mr. Saunders' somewhat mysterious resignation was presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor - no more mysterious, I might add than the resignation of that Tory MP the other day out in Western Canada, a man from British Columbia, and that is quite a story too I understand.

But in any event in the one-day session, the March 1st., which was the election programme, of course, Your Honour, at that stage Your Honour had not ventured forth into the public life in the elected sense. Your Honour may not have read it with close attention so Your Honour will perhaps permit me to refresh hon. gentlemen's memories. "A determination to bring forth plans and programmes to ensure an active and well planned programme of development." So in five years, Sir, almost to the day, fifty-nine months, we had come from "a determination to bring forth plans and programmes to ensure an active and well planned programme of development" to a commitment that "my government have prepared a programme of resource development." Pretty substantial stuff for five years.

Let us look at Fisheries. The present speech has in it among other things four references to the Fisheries. There is the statement that the 200 mile limit represents the greatest opportunity for growth and development, and it goes on and tells us it is essential that a comprehensive approach, one which builds on

MR. ROBERTS: the advantage of the inshore, mid-water and offshore fishery. Another quotation, "My government have been working to attract new investment capital into the fishing industry." And then, "My government will be introducing a programme of assistance for new products along with a programme to encourage processors to undertake more advanced processing." That is this year's fisheries programme. That is essentially what the Minister of Fisheries brought to Cabinet and his colleagues fell all over themselves. I said, "Great, that is more substantial than anything else that any other minister brought into the Cabinet but does it sound familiar?" Well let us trot back, Sir, through some of the others because fisheries has been, and properly so, a constant concern of throne speeches.

Back in 1972, the glorious one-day session, we were told that "the Department of Fisheries would be greatly expanded immediately so that it can provide greater assistance and information to the fishermen of this Province." It has been expanded but I am not so sure what greater information it is providing any fishermen in this Province.

We were told there would be a bait assistance programme established, and the only bait that was established, Sir, was a little election bait. We were told there would be an inexpensive shared cost involving Ottawa, an inexpensive shared cost insurance programme covering the loss of fishing gear. Well now that has a familiar ring, does it not, Sir? Back in March 1972 - since then of course we have had the scandal of the fishing gear replacement programme where the government under the present Minister of Health as Minister of Fisheries introduced a programme of gear replacement and I suppose I cannot say too much about it because of course two individuals in fact are presently before the courts charged with crimes or alleged crimes growing out of that programme. But there is a great deal more to come out, because that is all the government have done. Oh the present Minister of Fisheries recently set up a committee, four years and ten months after the commitment was made we had a committee

Mr. Roberts:

set up to look into it and consider it.

We are told that - this is a grabber, Mr. Speaker, this is a grabber. "I will immediately embark on a programme to encourage the establishment of additional advanced reprocessing facilities for fish within the Province." Now that was in 1972. In 1977 we have come forward. Now the words are "we will be introducing a programme of assistance for new products along with a programme to encourage processors to undertake more advanced processing." That is what we have done in five years, Sir, in five Ministers of Fisheries. In 1972 we were going to immediately embark on a programme, and now we will be introducing a programme, some immediately.

In 1973 another Speech from the Throne came along and once again it was time for the annual statement about fisheries. And what were we told there? Introduce legislation, this one is familiar. We have all heard about this one. If this were You Bet Your Life Sir, this, Your Honour, is where you would win the big prize, because this was the Throne Speech where we were solemnly told that legislation was going to be introduced to establish the \$40 million fund for the construction of deep water fishing boats, the great

MR. ROBERTS: trawler fleet, the twenty trawler fleet, the twenty of them. And indeed the present Minister of Health, who at that stage gloried in the position of Minister of Fisheries, I think at one stage told the House in response to a question from one of my colleagues that tenders were about to be called for the construction of those ships. Well, of course, Sir not a keel has been laid, not a keel has touched the water and nothing more has been heard of from that day to this.

True, we did have the sculpin class, those three magnificent boats built by the fine people up in the Marystown Shipyard. That cost an outrageous amount each. I do not know their names, but they are called the Sculpin class at least by the men and by people, and my friend from Burin-Placentia West, I am sure is familiar with them. And I am told they are all fishing. They are apparently getting good catches of fish, but they are costing about seven times per pound what any other fishing boat is.

Well anyway, that was another Throne Speech. Now, Sir, let us come back to February, 1975, the Throne Speech opening the session for the general election. And is anything there familiar? Remember, we were told just last week the government's plans. Now some of them have a familiar ring, though. Listen to this, Sir, "Industrial grants will be made to assist with other improvements and innovations on inshore, middle distance and offshore fishing vessels." Well now it is a little different this year, Sir. There is a great new principal, because this year the words are "Inshore, midwater and offshore." We have changed middle distance to midwater. We have made a great change.

February, 1977, the Throne Speech last week, we were promised a programme for the revitalization of our longliner fleet. In March, 1972, we were promised a new programme to give better assistance to inshore fishermen to obtain boats, gear and equipment. The same stuff keeps coming back. If it had been the first speech, Mr. Speaker, if the speech last week had been the first statement of the government's policy, it would have

MR. ROBERTS: been glorious. But it is not glorious, Sir, it is inglorious, a disgrace to have the same ideas, shopworn, tattered and unimplemented, trotted out five years later. Just look at tourism, the department that is presided over by one of the giants of the present ministry, the Minister of Tourism.

I am not being sarcastic, maybe he thinks I am. The hon. gentleman from St. John's East Extern, Sir, in the present ministry is in fact a giant. Because in the Kingdom of the Blind the one-eyed man is king. In February, 1977, we were told that "My Government," again the Queen's representative speaking, of course, "has developed a comprehensive tourist development strategy." In 1972, Sir, we were not told that. We were told that the government were going to expand their tourist promotion programme throughout Canada and the U.S. to draw tourists into the province. That was the George McLean benefit programme. And in 1972, no in April, 1972 we were told that "the government would embark upon a master tourism and outdoor recreation plan for the province."

So apparently in five years, Sir, they have planned and planned, and today we have a comprehensive tourist development strategy. We have not seen it, it has not been implemented, it has not been outlined, and I wager there will be precious little in the estimates when the Minister of Finance gets through with the Tourism Department for the new programme in the Department of Tourism. Unless it is to send the Minister of Tourism on the Norma and Gladys on another round the world trip. The Minister of Finance might agree to that. Indeed, Sir, I understand the Minister of Finance might be willing to subscribe out of his own pocket an modicum towards that particular project. And I, Sir, would match him, dollar for dollar. Provided it was a one-way trip. The Minister of Finance loves a sea trip, that is how he goes over to Bell Island, across the Tickle.

Mr. Speaker, in February, 1975, that Throne Speech we were promised a new "wildlife programme of management, conservation and enforcement" - This is great - a new wildlife programme of management, conservation and enforcement aimed at the protection of this natural resource and of

MR. ROBERTS: the environment." If somebody had only said that to those poor animals and birds up behind LaPoile Bay, was it or Cinq Cerf Bay. "Greater love hath no man than this to lay down his life for his country," we are told. And all those poor animals, Sir, the moose that were slaughtered and the little birds—five hundred, was it, or two hundred—carried in on aircraft, landed at Paddy's Pond. Nothing but the best, Sir, for those poor little birds that lay down their lives for their country, or for the benefit of their country's rulers. Well that was the new Wildlife Programme of Management, Conservation and Enforcement. Particularly the enforcement, Sir, particularly the enforcement. And if ever we can get into the estimates of the Department of Tourism, Sir, I say now to the minister that we shall be expecting some detailed answers. If we get into the Ministers of Transportation estimates, I am going to ask him how much it cost the government for the aircraft that was stationed at Stephenville all during that day, in case not that the birds wanted to fly back to St. John's because until the poor things were shot, Sir, they got here on their own, but in case some of the hunters, if indeed the way they went at it was hunting in case some of the gentlemen involved wanted to come back by that particular method of transportation.

How much it might have cost for the helicopters? Not the ones owned by private individuals, because, of course, we are not concerned by that, although

Mr. Roberts.

It is interesting, you know, that one would accept that sort of lift, but the ones under contract to the government. In any event, where was I? Oh, yes!

Forestry and Agriculture - I do not see the minister here again, but we have one of the previous ministers, the gentleman from Gander, (Mr. Collins), because he has been minister of almost everything.

MR. DOODY: A very capable man.

MR. ROBERTS: A very capable man, Sir, I agree, and one of these days he will show us that capability.

February, 1977, we are told, "Greater emphasis to forest improvement, and programs for thinning and reforestation. In the past year a large sum has been spent and in the coming year this figure will double. This program is highly labour intensive." Very laudable, very laudable, Sir. And if it can be implemented I would be the very first to welcome it.

But, Sir, let us just look at the government's record in this same field because this laudable new programme must be measured. This is not a new administration, Sir. This is a group of men who have served Her Majesty, as Her Majesty's ministers, for five of the twenty-five years during which she has graced the Throne, and they have had ample opportunity to transcribe, to translate some of their intentions into action. Back in 1972 we were promised a Newfoundland Conservation Corps. There would be 500 partridge alive today, Mr. Speaker, if that Newfoundland Conservation Corp had been in existence, and about fifteen moose, I am told. The Newfoundland Conservation Corps, Sir, has, you know, died aborning. We were also promised "a sane and sensible forest management policy in order to promote and to develop the orderly expansion of forest related industry. Negotiations," we were told, "must commence between government and industry in order to ensure that our full forest potential be realized." That is five years ago.

Mr. Roberts.

Today, Sir - and again this is a subject which must be debated in this House, in this session - the forest industry of this Province is on the verge of what is the most serious crisis ever to confront it, the crisis which, I am told, in many ways goes to the very roots of its existence. The spruce budworm is the imminent problem. It is the immediate problem. It is the one which must first be dealt with. But there is the further problem, Sir, and I believe the Throne Speech adverts to this, that we are running out of so-called economic wood, wood which is accessible to the mills and to be harvested at a price that will enable paper to be produced at a price that can be sold competitive on the world markets, with the world competition.

So after five years, Sir, we are deeper into the crisis, and all we are told is that the government are going "to increase their forest thinning and reforestation programmes." The great hopes of five years ago have been shattered and discarded along with the ministers of the day. We are also told, in that same speech, Sir,- Your Honour might well wish to take that speech home and read it through. If ever Your Honour wanted to see a catalogue of broken promises and unkept commitments, there it is. "Introduce legislation," we were told, "to bring into active and productive use the large quantities of arable land lying vacant because of absentee ownership." And, of course, there has not been a comma put on the Statute Books to achieve that end.

We were told, for example - this was in 1973 in the Throne Speech, Your Honour - that there was going to be a marked increase in expenditures for forest access roads in the coming year. And there they get full marks, Sir. Of course, it was thanks to DREE that that was done, because the government's expenditures, if anything, went down.

Mr. Roberts.

January, 1974, the Throne Speech that began that year's session, Sir, we were told, "The government intends to research - oh, this is a good one, the gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) can tell us about this - intends to research possible markets for all species of timber, particularly the extensive stands of birch in order to intensify further its policy of fullest utilization of forest resources." You know, Mr. Speaker, another unkept promise, another broken commitment. Oh, we had the holiday crowd off in Scandinavia, with the big parties and enjoying themselves and in the good hotels, and with the best of meal and mead or whatever they are serving these days in Scandinavia, but we have not seen any results. All we have seen is a few more dollars for Air Canada and the hotel keepers in Scandinavia. And I have no doubt some of the better establishments, Sir, in that particular part of the world who were given the opportunity to play host.

You know, I saw in the paper the other day - I do not know whether the hon. gentleman noticed it - the manager of Air Canada, Mr. Eugene Burden, was quoted as saying that one of the reasons why Air Canada was down somewhat this year below the projection was that the government were cutting back,

MR. ROBERTS:

and he went on to say that one of the biggest single users of Air Canada services in this Province is the government. And he was not just referring to the ministry, although they are notable users, consumers of services, most of them paid for. Sometimes EPA are allowed to give the odd free airplane ride up to Montreal, a free lift on the jet, nice work. CFLCo - we will be getting on to this a little later - of course contribute generously by allowing the aircraft -

MR. N. WINDSOR: Bunkum!

MR. ROBERTS: Oh yes, the hon. gentleman for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor), his constituents may be hit by the odd tax increase here and there but they will be pleased to know that that is financing weekend shopping expeditions in Montreal on the CFLCo jet which of course is not directly owned by the government but, you know, we have a two-thirds interest in that company for which we are paying very dearly, and so any expense, it is reasonable to say, that we are paying two-thirds of the cost. In due course we will asking some questions which I do not think will be answered - I wish they would be - as to the number of trips made by members of the government, families of members of the government, or civil servants on the CFLCo jet.

From time to time it is legitimate. And the Premier has used it on occasion to go to a meeting and that is perfectly proper. Other ministers have as well, perfectly proper, no problem at all. But there are other usages, I venture to suggest, Mr. Speaker, which are not quite as attractive. We heard a lot recently about Mr. Otto Lang, the Minister of Transport at Ottawa and his Nannygate affair. Well, Sir, we would have Nannygates and Nannygates and Billygates and other things, Sir, if ever the log of CFL - whatever that jet - the CFLCo jet was made public.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, getting back. I am taken away by the gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie). I apologize to him. I had not meant to. Because, of course, nothing has been done on this particular

Mr. Roberts:

researching possible markets for all species of timber, other than whatever, if anything, he and his colleagues did during their holiday jaunt. It was before Christmas was it not? The Fall, Ian? When was it the Fall?

MR. STRACHAN: The Fall.

MR. ROBERTS: The Fall. Before the weather got too bad in Scandinavia, and that they went over and came back.

Mr. Speaker, the tale is a sad one. I could go on and go on. Oh let me just - the Minister of Education is here. He is a gentleman with the best of intentions. Let me give him some words from a previous Throne Speech which I would commend to him. In the present Throne Speech we are told, indeed the minister, I am sure, either helped to draft the section or draft it or approved it, but I have no doubt was involved and consulted, that the government are committed to amalgamating the major functions of the College of Trades and Technology and the Fisheries College, and to increase the range and scope of programmes offered. The Newfoundland Polytechnical Institute Act, which will be introduced in this session, will facilitate this amalgamation, and will enable the establishment of a new post-secondary seat of education, expanded and so is the Trades College. And I welcome that, I think that is terrific stuff. But it sounded familiar and I went back and the same commitment, Sir, is in the 1975 Throne Speech, and that sounded familiar and I went back a little further, out of my file of Tory speeches into the file of Liberal Throne Speeches, and I find that in March, 1971, that must have been the latter years of the administration which the present gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) led, the Liberals proposed exactly that idea. Now of course we were out of office very shortly thereafter, within a number of months. We did not have much opportunity to implement it. If we had been there I venture to say that it would have been implemented.

Mr. Speaker, I could go through every sentence almost of every Speech from the Throne which the present administration have

Mr. Roberts:

sponsored, but I think I have made the point. My colleagues may be tempted once in a while, indeed I hope they will, to refer from time to time to some of the promises in their own individual areas of interest and concern. The fact remains, Sir, that this present speech has nothing of significance in it that is new, and we are given the same stale old words, the same stale old promises that we have heard in some cases for three and four and five times. The gentleman from the Bay of Islands ventures to rise, please, go ahead.

MR. WOODROW: Thank you for allowing me a question, Mr. Speaker, and the Opposition Leader also. It seems now quite obvious to me that everything in the Speech from the Throne has been condemned.

MR. ROBERTS: That is not the question.

MR. WOODROW: Now what I would like to ask the Leader of the Opposition very seriously, because we are not here to waste people's money, we are here as members of this House of Assembly, I would like to ask him, first of all, number one, rather what he have put in the Speech from the Throne? And number two, before he finishes speaking, he will probably be speaking maybe three or four days, I do not know, if he would outline what he would have said in the Speech from the Throne? And after that is said we will hear then the comment from the news media. I challenge the Leader today to - he is probably well intentioned, if he is - tell us what he would put in it, and let this be outlined, maybe in three or four days before he finishes speaking. Thank you.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for his question, if there was one there. And I am grateful as well for his suggestion that I shall speak for three or four days. I hate to disappoint him, but I do not plan to at this point. But I may be tempted. The hon. gentleman may lead me astray, instead of leading me on the straight and narrow, he may tempt me off the straight and narrow into digressions which would be fascinating, but would not be my intention.

Mr. Speaker, if he wants to hear what I or my colleagues would propose I can merely invite him to listen to the next Throne Speech prepared by a Liberal Administration which will be here after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And, Mr. Speaker, I can say further in response to the hon. gentleman's challenge, I will say two things in an insubstantial way; I shall first of all say that when one is after elephants one does not bother with rabbits. So I do not propose to pay much attention to the hon. gentleman's interventions at this time.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention his former leader, a man whom he followed through thin and thinner. Mr. John Crosbie, the present member for St. John's West in the House of Commons, who I believe said the other day when somebody asked him, "Well what would you do if you are so smart if you were the Government of Canada?" He said, "Well, I have not got 8,000 civil servants to advise me, I am not going to tell you."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And I think, Sir, that for once Mr. John Crosbie, formerly member for St. John's West in this House, was dead on. He was really dead on for once. So I say to the hon. gentleman that if that is the best he is able to come up with in his campaign either to get into the Cabinet or to try and worm in, if that is the word, or to curry favour with his colleagues in the caucus he will have to do better than that. He will never get, he will never rise, Sir, to the eminence

Mr. Roberts:

of the Minister of Tourism or the Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment or any of these great men -

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Social Services.

MR. ROBERTS: - the Minister of Social Services, he will never, Sir, rise to the eminence now occupied by the gentleman from Trinity North (Mr. Brett), he will probably never even rise to the eminence occupied by my friend and colleague from Harbour Grace (Mr. Young), who is Deputy Speaker as we know of the House. The hon. gentleman from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), Sir, will have to try harder, he will have to try harder. He should remember the old Davis slogan, "He is number two, and he should try harder."

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I was led astray, and really I say to the hon. member from Bay of Island that in view of his former calling, he should be the last to lead any of us astray. That indeed, Sir, his role as shepherd is to guide the flocks safely and not to lead them, Sir, not to lead them astray, and off the straight and narrow. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman, Sir, is the ninety and nine, to carry on the analogy, or the one, but, Sir, we will find out in due course.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had had a brief look at some of the old Throne Speeches, referred to some of the highlights of some of them to support my point, which I think is incontestable, that this administration, Sir, have nothing new. We were not given a programme for action in the Throne Speech last week, we were given a mess of warmed over pottage and not very nourishing pottage at that, and that the whole proceeding was a disgrace.

Now, Sir, that leads me to another point, and I say for the benefit of the gentleman from the Bay of Island there is a progression from point to point, and they lead from there to there, and one point leads to another point, and they are numbered here in my notes. There is first, one, then next there is two, because two generally follows one, and then there is three. So I say that for the benefit of the gentleman from the Bay of Islands

Mr. Roberts:

because I have finished what I wish to say for the time being on one point.

I now come to another point, and he hopefully will govern himself accordingly. Mr. Speaker, the Opposition traditionally move a motion of nonconfidence in the government, the Throne Speech. The Premier will not be shocked, nor will his friend, colleague, the soul mate, adviser and House Leader, the hon. gentleman from Grand Bank (Mr. Hickman), will not be shocked to know that I proposed to move an amendment which would have the effect of being a motion of nonconfidence. I do not expect the government to resign on the strength of it, I expect several of their stalwarts will leap up to defend the ministry of which they are a part, and so they should be, and so they should defend it. But I purpose, Sir, to offer an amendment to the Throne Speech, and I will move it in a moment. Perhaps the page might be kind enough, Sir, to take a copy or two up to Your Honour, as Your Honour

MR. ROBERTS: May be apprised of what I propose to move, seconded by my friend and colleague the gentleman from Conception Bay South, who is our House Leader.

Before I move it, though, let me say, Sir, that this motion is perhaps a little stronger than the normal opposition motion. Not necessarily stronger in the sense that we expect it to carry the day because, of course, the measure of confidence of a government in the modern world in a very real sense is not taken in the House of Assembly. This is the forum in which ideas are advanced and debated but the real measure of confidence comes from the country as a whole. The words are somewhat stronger, Your Honour. I hope they are not offensive and not out of order, because they are stronger, Sir, because I think the case demands stronger words. So accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I propose the following amendment to the Speech and the motion before the House, Your Honour, as I recall it, something along the lines; that the following Speech be presented to His Honour, namely: "We thank you for your gracious Speech from the Throne and we humbly tell you that we are delighted you came along," or whatever the precise words are.

I think the gentleman from Exploits was named Chairman of the Committee and in due course he will be asked down, or it will be arranged that he and his colleagues go to Government House and they will be asked in and present the Address to His Honour and will doubtless be asked to partake of a glass of sherry and a little conversation and that will conclude the proceedings.

Well, Sir, I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman from Exploit's prospects of a glass of sherry at Government House, but I do want to move an amendment so let me read it, Sir: The amendment would delete all the words in the motion after the word 'that' and replace them with the following: "This House condemns the failure of the Ministry to prepare and to present to the House measures adequate to deal with the problems confronting Newfoundland and Labrador today, and demands that the

MR. ROBERTS: Ministry forthwith take all measures possible within their constitutional authority to alleviate these problems."

Now, Your Honour, I move that, seconded, as I say, by my friend from Conception Bay South. I understand that the procedure now is that Your Honour will rule whether this is in order or not. If it is in order we proceed to debate the amendment, if it is not I will have to try again. Does Your Honour wish to make a ruling or am I to assume it is in order?

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): An amendment has been moved to the motion for an Address in Reply, not to the Throne Speech but to the Address in Reply.

MR. ROBERTS: That is right, yes.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): The motion is as follows: "To delete all the words after 'that' and replace them with the following, 'this House condemns the failure of the ministry to prepare and present to the House measures adequate to deal with the problems confronting Newfoundland and Labrador today and demands that the ministry forthwith take all measures possible within their constitutional authority to alleviate these problems.'" Moved by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and seconded by the hon. the member for Conception Bay South.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. the member for Conception Bay South, Sir, of course will not speak because that might possibly be to forfeit his - if he were wearing a hat he would indicate it, I understand, by a tip of his hat.

MR. NOLAN: I am lucky to have hair.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member has spoken.

MR. ROBERTS: No, he did not. He did not.

MR. NEARY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would like for Your Honour to give a ruling. The motion made by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was seconded by the hon. the member for Conception Bay South. My understanding is that you are not allowed to utter a single word when you are seconding a motion and the hon. the member for Conception Bay South spoke, Sir,

MR. NEARY: and I presume now that he has spoken in the debate. I would like for Your Honour to let us have a ruling on this.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I do wish often that we had a rule that not a word could be said. I usually wish that when the gentleman from LaPoile is speaking. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the point of order is specious, fallacious, weak, non-existent, ill-founded, unfounded, mis-founded, misplaced, displaced, unplaced and replaced. The fact remains Sir, that my friend from Conception Bay South did not speak. He did not address himself to the Chair, he has not got the floor, he has no right to speak. What ever rights he has, I suggest, Your Honour, have been preserved unimpaired. Unfortunately, as he would say, his hair has not been and therein, Sir, lies the nub of the problem.

MR. NEARY: Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker, and the comments of the Leader of the Opposition, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would ask the hon. the member for LaPoile to be brief in his remarks because I am prepared to make a ruling on the point of order.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir. I want to draw to Your Honour's attention that there is a precedent already, Your Honour, in this hon. House involving none other than the Speaker, Sir, the Speaker of the House, who just uttered one word at one time. I happened to be a member of the House, Sir, the day it happened. The hon. the Premier at the time, the former Premier rather, 'Mr. Smallwood',

Mr. Neary.

raised the point of order, Sir, and Your Honour ruled that the member had already spoken in the debate. So I would like Your Honour to refer to Hansard of that day, and perhaps Your Honour may need a few minutes to consult with the Speaker, because the Speaker happened to be the one involved, who was Leader of the Opposition at that time, and was not permitted, Sir, to speak any further in that particular debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): A point of order has been raised that the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) has already spoken in the debate on the amendments. I would refer hon. members to Standing Order No. 47, under Rules of Debate. And the Standing Order reads as follows: "Every member desiring to speak is to rise in his place, uncovered, and address himself to Mr. Speaker." The point has been raised that a precedent exists in this House which covers this point, but it is well-known that any written Standing Orders are the first authority that we go to. If Standing Orders do not cover the point we will then go to precedents. If the precedents do not cover the point, we may then consult other authorities. In this particular instance the Standing Order is clear, that a member desiring to speak rises in his place, uncovered, and addresses himself to Mr. Speaker. I am not aware that any hon. member, other than the hon. Leader of the Opposition, did so rise and address himself to the Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. gentleman from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) is uncovered, he tells me, but had not risen.

We are now debating the amendment - am I correct, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, as I had said before the amendment was moved and the point of order was raised, the amendment is probably a little harsher, a little stronger in terms. I do not think it is offensive. But it is certainly a little stronger in its terms than the amendments which certainly we on this side have moved in the five or six years that we have been here, sitting to your right, Sir. I have not checked back to the days, those halcyon days when we sat to Your Honour's left and hon. gentlemen opposite, or some of them, at least, sat over here. But it is much stronger in its terms than the normal amendment. Now I do not expect, Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentlemen opposite will have a great difficulty in bringing themselves to vote against this amendment no matter how strong the terms simply because the very nature of party politics requires that this motion, in a sense, is doomed to defeat. We do not move it for that reason, Sir. I move it in behalf of my colleagues, because in our considered opinion, Sir, the conduct of this administration, the failure of this administration, has been so great that we must ask the House to condemn it, not to regret, which is the normal word, but to condemn the failure of the ministry. Their dereliction of duty, Sir, is so great, their failure to respond to the needs of this Province is so far-reaching and all pervading that we think that they should be condemned by this House, Sir, just as they are being condemned by the people of the Province.

The Premier on opening day, in his remarks on the debate then before the Chair, the debate on the motion that a committee be appointed, spoke of negativism, and he has made those remarks several times since. I have no doubt they reflect his considered opinion, his considered view of the world. And he told us about negativism, and he warned us against the perils of negativism and particularly indicated, I think, as a sensitive and sensible, but not unbiased observer, that he was very sensitive to this charge of negativism. Indeed I got the impression that it has been very much on his mind. And I would say to him, Sir, that

Mr. Roberts.

he should not be so concerned. First of all the press, when they are being accused of negativism, are only saying what everybody else in the Province are saying anyway, so they are not being particularly negative. Secondly, Sir, this is an instance of what I call the 'Bunker' mentality, that here we are in the 'Bunker', just a few of us faithful ones left, and the whole world has turned against us, and, you know, we know we are right, and, you know, the rest of them can go to blazes for being negative. Well that is no approach to the public affairs of this Province. The government, Sir,

MR. ROBERTS: should state their programmes state their priorities state their solutions. We are not the government and we are not going to govern until we are the government. But I say to the gentlemen from Bay of Islands that let his colleagues govern, let them not continue—He is not in the government. Heavens knows he has tried, and heavens knows he will try, and maybe through heavens help he will get there. He will not get there any other way. But let him say to his colleagues, "What are you guys going to do? You are the government. You are her majesty's ministers, you have the seals of office. You have the responsibility."

And this government, Sir, have failed. And I could take—I am allowed unlimited time according to the rules, I could take near on limitless time just to list the areas of failure. I do not propose to do that. I do not think the House deserves to be treated to that kind of lengthy harangue by me or anybody else. But I will take what time I need to demonstrate some of the areas where I think this government have failed, and to indicate some of the areas where I think they can still respond positively, not with a jerry-built five hundred job programme that the Premier under questioning today was forced to admit—though these are not his words—this was the underlying thought, we all heard it—I was forced to admit it was ill-conceived and had not been thought out. It is not a job creation programme. It is possibly a supplement to LIP in many cases. We are not going to ask responses from the people of the province. We are going to go around in the Forestry Department and in the Fishery Department and the Tourism Department and Social Services and are going to create a few jobs. are going to create a few jobs.

I would like to get the Minister of Social Services at some point, if ever we are allowed to debate his estimates, I think he would like to be able to speak to this to and put forth his side of it, tell us some he has allegedly created. I have run across some. I have run across some. And I would like to hear him. He gave a figure the other day, Mr. Speaker, what was it, a couple of thousand. I am speaking from memory and I do not attempt to hold the hon. gentleman to it. But we had made significant progress, I think were his words.

MR. ROBERTS: And if I misquote him perhaps he would do me the kindness to set me straight. We have made significant progress in creating new jobs and getting, you know, the long-term unemployed. And I heard him on the radio, in his very own voice. In a cut, a radio squib they call it, I think, squib on the radio news saying that it is well known we have two and three generations of welfare situations. And that is not a quotation, but it accurately, I think, reproduces the hon. gentleman's thought. And I would like him to tell us just what they are doing about that. I know the total numbers on social assistance, and here I speak mainly of what used to be called short term and still is short term, as opposed to the people who are permanently going to be wards of the state in recognition of our responsibility as a people to look after them, people who cannot, through no fault of their own, support themselves.

These are the people, short term assistance, I do not know what name is used in the department now. Still the same name is used? Even though at one stage the government announced a great restructuring that was going to end that distinction. But the distinction is there because it is a valid one. It is a necessary one. The people who are - my friend from LaPoile calls them unemployed employables, I think is the term. Or is it employable unemployed, the short term people on welfare.

MR. NEARY: Unemployed employables.

MR. ROBERTS: Unemployed employables. I thank the hon. gentleman. People who want to work, you know, want to work; want to work, but have no work or some of them possibly cannot take advantage of work opportunities which may exist. But I would like to hear what the government are doing. The five hundred job programme is no answer. It is a Band-Aid when we need a bandage, a major bandage at that. It is petty, picayune, there is nothing to it. It is not even thought out. It was obviously a last minute inspiration. I can see them now, Sir, down here on the floor below this one, around that big circular table where the Cabinet sit. And they have been there a week deciding their priorities, frantically trying to find a way out of their difficulties, frantically trying to

MR. ROBERTS: find a way out. And somebody said, "Well, boy, we have got to have something in the Throne Speech." And another of them said, "Well, gosh fellows, we are all here. We have been here a week, what can we put in the Throne Speech? Give us something, as opposed to the empty words that we have got now." Somebody stuck up his hand and said, "I have got an idea" and they all turned to him and said "Hosanna and Hurrah" you could hear the shouts, Sir, down on the Lower Battery. And they said, "What is your idea?" And the brave man said, "We will have a job creation programme. We will take \$2 million and we will create jobs." And they said, "Terrific, put it in the Throne Speech. It will give the boys something to write about. It will give us something to talk about. It means we can get up and say "Oh any criticism of this speech is negativism", because we propose to create five hundred jobs." And my friend from Windsor-Buchans tells me \$400 a month, barely the minimum wage. Even the Canada Works manages to get up to \$115 a week, is it?

Mr. Roberts.

\$470, or \$480, or \$490 a month, depending on how many weeks there are in a month. And I asked a question or two to the Premier today, and a number of my colleagues asked a question or two of the Premier, other ministers, and got some answers, half answers, full answers, partial answers. But it more and more looks to me as if this great 500 job programme, which has not been heralded by the usual flackery - normally in the past wherever this government had stumbled across an idea, we would have a massive press conference, a great kit. Remember the one on restructuring? You would think it was, at least, Sir, without being the least bit sacrilegious, a second coming. And I mean the cameras were called in from across the Province. Television networks were put on instant alert. The radio stations were told to broadcast full and complete. The papers were assured of extra supplies. Tree after tree was sacrificed to make the paper so that this news could be carried to every last part of this Province, Sir. Down in Nain and if the odd fellow had gone up to Cape Chidley, and did a little bit of fishing at the time, they were breathless with anticipation, all with the great restructuring which simply added several hundred thousand dollars to the Province's current operating expenses, another minister or two to fill an already swollen Cabinet. That is all it achieved. Now this 500 jobs, Sir, surfaces in the Throne Speech and then it promptly disappears. And today when we asked a question or two, we get some information, and it turns out that more and more this programme looks like it is a combination, a mishmash. A mishmash is what the kids at home call cabbage and potato and turnip and carrot, all cooked the second time and mishmashed up together and put in and heated in a frying pan on the stove.

MR. O'BRIEN: Hodgepodge.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Ferryland (Mr. O'Brien) tells me it is a hodgepodge. Other hon. gentlemen may have different names for it. I have some other.

MR. DOODY: Bubble and squeak.

MR. ROBERTS: Bubble and squeak says the gentleman from Harbour Main (Mr. Doody).

MR. DOODY: That is what we call hash where we come from.

MR. ROBERTS: Well all I can say to the gentleman from Harbour Main is that he has made a hash of it.

Mr. Speaker, the fact remains, Sir, that this programme - whether it is a mishmash or a hodgepodge or bubble and squeak or a hash or goulash or goulish or anything else - is not even the beginning of a thought-out and coherent attack upon the unemployment problems of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: It is an expedient put forward by a group of politically desperate men, who have no ideas, who have no idea how to solve the problems facing the Province, or even to begin to solve them, after five years in office, hundreds of thousands of dollars lashed out on royal commissions and task forces and trips. They even took the gentleman for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) overseas, causing a diplomatic incident, and then they brought him home, and that was the final insult. You know, all this effort to produce so little, a promise of 500 jobs, \$2 million, one-tenth of LIP.

MR. NOLAN: They took the hon. member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young), too.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, they took the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young). Nobody else would take him.

MR. NEARY: He could not quite make it to his destination.

MR. ROBERTS: I did not know that.

The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that it more and more looks as if this programme, the gem of the Throne Speech, the big gripper, the grabber in the Throne Speech is going to be a programme to take people now on short-term assistance, and in effect tell them, "Get to work, and we will create a job for you, so-called. We are not going to ask you the way LIP does or Canada Works to come together and work out an idea, and send it in to us, and we will evaluate it, and put it through the constituency advisory groups, and get a reading on whether we should do it or not." It is going to be the

Mr. Roberts.

Fisheries Department going around to LIP projects and saying, "We will put a few bucks in, boys." Small craft harbours are already doing it. We are not going to get anything for all the projects that the Minister of Fisheries has had to write to me and other M.H.A.'s to say, "We cannot do it. We have not got any money." Project after project, suggestion after suggestion.

Tourism. We are going to get a few jobs down at the Wildlife Park, are we? That is the Salmonier Wildlife Park, not the other ones - to probably to try to clean up some of the scandals that have come there, and the maladministration, the overexpenditures by the - the incredible story if it ever comes out. The Auditor General's Committee, the Public Accounts Committee should have a look at that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: If they could ever - we will talk about wildlife and some of the Premier's wildlife.

Mr. Speaker, the story of the memoranda that have gone back and forth, the confusion between the Public Works Department and the Tourism Department that has cost this Province several hundred thousand dollars, I will venture to say, on the wildlife park in Salmonier, the story of contracts not finished, of contractors

Mr. Roberts:

being changed midway through it, all attempted to be brushed under the carpet. But I say to my friend from Lewisporte (Mr. White) and my friend from Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) who are on the Public Accounts Committee that they could possibly have a look at that. Maybe this year's Auditor General's report will make some reference to it, I do not know.

Mr. Speaker, this government, Sir, have not developed any plans, have not come up with any ideas. All we are getting is the same tired, stale old phrases.

Now let me talk, Mr. Speaker, about one of two specific areas of policy that I think are of importance to this Province today, and where I think the government got to take some meaningful initiatives. Let me talk first about Labrador. I think, Sir, the affairs of Labrador should be given a priority. And I say to my friend from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) who is I think genuinely and deeply concerned about the needs of the people of Labrador, and about the fact of the government of which he is a part, an integral and an intimate and a full-fledged partner that government is not only ignoring Labrador it is treating it in the very worst of colonial ways. I say to him that he should listen, and listen carefully, because I have a lot of sympathy for the position in which the gentleman from Naskaupi finds himself. He came into politics, as he told us, as a P.C. because they were the government, because they could do something. And he put his name on the ballot, and stood behind his name with his honour, as a man, as a man who calls himself with pride, and reasonably so, a Labradorian, and rightly so. And he has been led down the garden path, Sir, and into gardens that he did not even dream of time and time again. I think I can understand the position in which he finds himself. I can only say to him, Sir, it will become more difficult because the government of which he is an intimate part, an integral part, a full-fledged partner, the government which he has to defend in Goose Bay and Happy Valley, just as he has to defend it here in St.

Mr. Roberts:

John's, that government has apparently, and I say this with regret, no intention of doing anything at all to try to come to grips with the problems facing Labrador.

The gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) could listen too, because I think I can understand the feelings of some of his constituents. And I understand that feeling is being communicated to him with increasingly frequency and increasing intensity in his visits to the area, to the district, and in his communications from his constituents.

The problem of Labrador, Sir, is one which should engage the attention of every man and woman in this Province today who is concerned with this Province and with our future. People tell me it should not be raised in the House, it is making it partisan. Well I suppose the system is that nothing can be raised unless it is raised in a partisan sense. I do not bring it up in the more usual partisan sense of trying to grab a few votes here or a few votes there, I am concerned as a Newfoundlander, I am concerned as a Labradorian in the sense that my constituency partially in Labrador, the people of one part of Labrador are my constituents, and the people of one part of my constituency are Labradorians. They are there, Mr. Speaker, much against their wish, they are there as a result of the broken word of the Minister of Transportation, no, who is the hon. gentleman? the Minister of Public Works who assured the then member for Labrador South it would be all right. They were there despite their expressed wish, they were there despite a resolution of this House of Assembly, an Act of this House of Assembly which said that if a district was to be created, partially in Labrador, partially on the Island, it would be fifty-fifty, instead of being 20 per cent in Labrador and 80 per cent in the Island of Newfoundland as it now is.

MR. ROUSSEAU: To a point of order. I gave no such undertaking to the best of my knowledge to the hon. then member for Labrador South.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I accept the hon. gentleman's assertion, and if I have inadvertently - and if I have misrepresented it, it was inadvertent - I of course apologize to him. But he was part and is part of a government that broke its word to the House of Assembly and to the people of this Province. The original act setting up the redistribution commission, 1973 I guess it was, said that a district would be created half in Labrador and half on the Island, and instead of this it was created 20 per cent in Labrador, 80 per cent on the Island. And that is a breach of faith. The people of the Labrador portion of my district resent that bitterly. And they have reason to. When you cannot believe your own government, you cannot believe your own Premier, who made that statement here in the House; you know, when his words are not supported by his actions, when the words of a government are not supported by the actions of that government, then who is to blame even the most fair-minded person for drawing the inevitable and proper conclusion.

But, Sir, the problem of Labrador is a very serious one. The feeling is growing throughout Labrador in Labrador West, which is a distinct part of Labrador, where the people have different concerns and different needs and different perceptions than do the people in Goose Bay-Happy Valley, or the people who live along the Northern Coast in the area represented by my friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), or the people who live in the area I represent, the Southern Straits, and the people who live -

MR. NEARY: They just killed a wolf.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, they killed a wolf, and I am happy to say that thanks partially to the hon. gentleman, and thanks to some more effective assistance the problem has been solved. I give due credit to the Minister of Justice as well.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is a serious one, because people in each of the four parts of Labrador increasingly,

MR. ROBERTS: and these are not crackpots, these are not people running off half cocked, hot tempered, thinking with their lips, these, Sir, are people of substance and people who have a genuine feeling and concern. These people are more and more coming to the conclusion, it should be stated here and it should be discussed here, coming to the conclusion that their future may not - I do not say does not - I say may not lie within the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. And I say, Sir, that problem, that feeling is growing and I say, Sir, that this government are adding fuel to it, negligently. I do not think they are doing it deliberately. I do not think for a moment they have treated the member for Naskaupie (Mr. Goudie) deliberately the way they have treated him, I think it just reveals their compelling and complete lack of care. They could not give a hoot!

The fact the Throne Speech, the fact the Throne Speech, and I will leave aside the quibbles about legal names of the Province - we could have a look at section 92 of the BNA Act and make a good argument there - reference after reference to Newfoundland and no reference to Labrador. "The main problem in Newfoundland today" it says on page 2, and I think that is the first time Newfoundland is used. No, on page 1, "The past twenty-eight years in Newfoundland." Down in the next paragraph, "The vicious inflationary spiral that has affected all of the Western World was not of Newfoundland's making." Reference after reference. The only references to Labrador are colonial. We sit here superior and supreme and you can like it or lump it in Labrador! Colonial attitude! We are going to set up a division of a department, maybe.

The hon. gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), the Minister of Industrial Development, is going to have a division within his department, maybe a whole division that somehow will - it will be concentrated on Labrador, all four or five people there. The minister obviously recommended

MR. ROBERTS: to Cabinet the creation of a Crown corporation and was turned down because he made the mistake of announcing in advance what he was going to do, what he was going to recommend to Cabinet and the Throne Speech reflects an entirely different policy.

Mr. Speaker, the government are approaching the problems of Labrador in a colonial attitude, or they are showing their only interest in Labrador is to take her resources and that is just the attitude that adds fuel to the fires in Labrador. I am not saying what went on during the years of Liberal administration was perfect, of course not. The feeling was there. Presumably it has been there as long as there has been people in Labrador. I am told in the old days when the floaters went down and the stationers, going down from Conception Bay to fish, fish along the coast of Labrador, the bitterness was there, the ill feeling between the settlers, the Labradorians we now call them, on one hand and on the other hand the people who came from the Island of Newfoundland, great bitterness. But, Sir, it is increasing.

The Liberal administration in its last few years showed some heed, maybe not sufficient, obviously not when Mr. Tom Burgess got himself elected with massive support in the then constituency of Labrador West in the 1971 election, and the NLP candidates took such strong votes in the other two Labrador seats, Labrador North as it then was and Labrador South as it then was. But this government, Sir, has added fuel to that fire.

We believe there has to be a constructive and a reasonable attitude taken. And I say there is a particular responsibility on the gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Rousseau). The people in Labrador look to him. They say, "He is a minister, he is one of the men running this Province," just as they look to the gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), who has been very vocal and very outspoken on his feelings. I hope he says here in the House what he says in Goose Bay and Happy Valley because I think

MR. ROBERTS: that would add greatly to the information,
to the knowledge that each of us has.

 The people in Labrador, Sir, the people
of Labrador do not want to leave this Province. More and more they
are coming to feel that that may be not only their best
alternative, but their only alternative. The idea of separatism
is gaining credence. We now have a government in our neighbouring
province that, while it was not elected as a separatist government,
indeed specifically pledged itself not to implement a policy of
separation unless and until a referendum had endorsed it, but a
government that is separatist, that is a separatist party, a
government whose Premier, whose ministers

Mr. Roberts:

openly, proudly - they believe they are doing the right thing, the only thing for the people of Quebec. That makes the feeling a little more respectable now. It is not just a bunch of crackpots running around or a bunch of oddballs. Up there in Quebec the Premier, the Premier of Canada's second largest province, a man elected with great support among the people of the province, whatever the reasons why they gave him that support, elected a man whose party, whose administration are openly and avowedly separtist. Produces a threat to Canada, as the gentleman from Exploits (Dr. Twomey) said, and has very serious implications for those of us who live in this Province, or has this extra added dimension. And so I say to the government the time has come to wake up. The time has come for some constructive leadership, not the sort of thing exemplified by the Paddon Memorial Hospital where the people of Happy Valley go up and take the signs down to show what they think of the Minister of Public Works, to show what they think of the government, that without consulting them and in the face of their expressed wishes - now whether they were right or wrong I do not know; the fact remains that a group of people in Labrador, Happy Valley, felt so strongly that they marched up to that hospital on the Hamilton River Road there and took the sign off the outside, took it down, saying, "We will not let that sign stand if the government are going to take this building and make it into an office building."

CAPT. WINSOR: They took the picture of the late Dr. Paddon too.

MR. ROBERTS: They took the picture of the late Dr. Paddon.

CAPT. WINSOR: I think so.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Fogo (Capt. Winsor), who knows Labrador well, tells me that the picture of Dr. Paddon was taken. The gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) could tell me. I understand some friends and possibly even some relatives of his were among those among whom a very deep cord was struck, among the people of Happy Valley with that. It is not an important act. You know, I mean the decision

Mr. Roberts:

to change the Paddon Hospital into an office building, if in fact it has been taken, and I do not know if it has been taken, I mean I only know what people in Labrador feel, because they have expressed it through the media. But that decision to change that building into an office or not to change it into an office is not in itself terribly important. I mean, that is not the stuff of which provinces are made. What is important is that it exemplifies the feeling, and I say to the gentleman of Naskaupi, he is at liberty to contradict me if I am wrong, if he believe I am wrong, but I do not think he believe I am wrong. I think he knows deep inside of his heart, he knows in his mind what I say is not wrong, that what I say is right.

There are steps we can take, Sir, in an effort to come to grips with the problems of Labrador, and to help to resolve them. My friend and colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) has put down a motion on the Order Paper, indeed I believe will be the first one debated, the first one of which notice was given. I think it is first, is it?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: That means it will come up Wednesday. A motion which will allow an opportunity for this House to debate the specific problems of Labrador. And I will say to the government that if they have any interest in Labrador they will let that motion be debated on Wednesday and on Thursday and on Friday. Let them use some government time for it. It is just as important as anything else the government have in mind. Just as important, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, for the future of this Province as an Act to Amend The Statutes Act or an Act to Amend The Petty Trepass Act. The discussion on Labrador is just as important as that, Sir. Let the government reflect their priorities. Let the government reflect their priorities and allocation of the time of the House. We private members, and that is everybody other than the ministers, we private members have

Mr. Roberts:

only one afternoon a week, and indeed it is a short afternoon, The government will not even give us the good grace to have the House meet at 2:00 instead of 3:00. The House meets at 2:00 o'clock on Monday and on Tuesday and on Friday, but only at 3:00 o'clock on Wednesday. They even want to restrict that debate.

But I think, Sir, that the problems of Labrador are very important. And I think it is something which the government must deal. And I was disappointed and disgusted that the Throne Speech had in it no references of any significant indication of anything to do with Labrador. Indeed the only references were to taking the resources again. Boy, the feeling among the people of Labrador! Look, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Grand Falls has every right to speak to his seat mate if he wishes, but he does have a very loud and penetrating voice, and I would ask him, please, either not to speak to his colleague or to speak to him outside of the House where their conversation does not carry across the House. I mean, if he wants to speak to his colleague well and good, I mean that is between the two of them. But his voice, Sir, is loud, and it is penetrating. It is one of those - well that is not parliamentary.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Churchillian.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, no, no! Anybody who knows anything about Churchill would never compare the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) to Mr. Churchill in any favourable sense to the gentleman from Grand Falls. It would be favourable to Churchill.

Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that the problems of Labrador, Sir, are something to which we should pay heed. All we have got in the Throne Speech are a couple of references to a few offices being set up, you know, a little colonial status. "The natives are getting restless now," you know, the old line, "We will send them a few boys in dinner jackets to run the show." That is no answer. That is no solution. That is no policy. That is no programme. That is just a confession of despair, an admission of ignorance, an inability to grapple with the facts, and let them come to grips with it. Because if not, Sir, if we do not in the next few years come to grips, I venture to predict that we will see an avowedly separatist party running, putting candidates up for election in Labrador. The NLP was never separatist. It was close to it. Some of the members of it, I suspect, were committed to a policy of separation. The gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) can tell me. He had many friends who were NLP. He may himself have supported the NLP. I do not know. But certainly many of his friends and associates did, and in turn they supported him the Fall of 1975. But, Sir, the potential is there. When all the bickering back and forth is gone, when all of the Throne Speeches and all of those of us who are here are gone from the scene, be it, you know, next year or twenty years from now, let it not be said of us that we stood by - "Nero fiddled while Rome burned," we are told - let it not be said that we stood by while in Labrador the problems festered and grew.

MR. STRACHAN: They are even poisoning the fish.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, my friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) has some remarks which he will make in due course, and so he should, about fishing camps, and government helicopters going into fishing camps while there were no machines available to fight fires. That is the sort of thing that adds fuel to the fire, to mix the metaphor. And it indicates priorities. We cannot afford to put water and sewer into community, after community. We can put a couple of hundred thousand

Mr. Roberts.

dollars into a fishing camp - what is it? How do you pronounce it, 'Ian'?

MR. STRACHAN: Adlatok.

MR. ROBERTS: Adlatok. We can put public money into Adlatok but we cannot put anything into water and sewer. The gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) can go to visit Adlatok, go in to fish. I think the Premier has been there to fish on occasion. And I have no doubt, Sir, we, the people, paid for that, and I do not think we should.

PREMIER MOORES: I have been at the member's motel.

MR. ROBERTS: He has been at the member's motel. Well, I hope he does come. They have a bar and a nice lounge, I am told, and a good room to stay in, and I am sure the Premier would be treated with honour and with respect. And if he paid his bill, he would be treated as a gentleman. And if he goes to Adlatok, let him pay his bill. I do not care if the Premier wants to fish, Sir. The Daily News and The Evening Telegram get upset over that. I do not. But I do care when it shows the priorities of government.

My friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) will have, I think, some points to make on that, because he feels very strongly. They are his constituents. We cannot get water and sewer. There is no money, we are told.

Down in L'Anse-au-Loup last year - here is a story now, Your Honour, to show this government's attitude towards Labrador - a group called the Quebec Labrador Mission Foundation - they have now changed it, I think, to the Quebec Labrador Foundation - headed up by a gentleman whose name is the Reverend Robert Brien, have become very active these last few years in parts of my district, in parts of the North shore of Quebec and in parts of New Brunswick. And it is much like the old Grenfell work without pay programme which some of the members here might have heard of or might be familiar with in one way or another. But for the last two years they have had a programme of teaching children to swim, a pretty valuable programme.

Mr. Roberts.

It is much more than the Department of Rehabilitation has achieved in many cases under the inspired leadership of the present minister. That foundation gave the community of L'Anse-au-Loup, which is the central community on the Straits between L'Anse-au-Clair and Red Bay - L'Anse-au-Loup is the central community, and it is also the largest single community - they gave them a swimming pool. Now it may not be quite as elaborate as the aquarena over here, or as the ones in the Arts and Culture Centres around the Province, but a swimming pool. And there is no other place where you can swim in L'Anse-au-Loup. It gets too cold to go out in the sea water, and the brooks are used by people for water supply. There is really no other place to swim. So the people of L'Anse-au-Loup came to the government, and they asked for a sum of money to help them close in that pool. I wrote at one stage, as their member, to the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) who at that stage was the minister.

MR. ROBERTS: They were not asking for a lot. All they wanted was a few thousand dollars, it was \$18 thousand. A helicopter at \$300 an hour - that is what helicopters are now going at - that is sixty hours hire on a machine. It would have provided \$18 thousand.

My friend, the gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) wrote me back in due course to say he had taken the matter to Cabinet and with regret the Cabinet had concluded they could not provide this money because the policy was that no new funds - am I representing the hon. gentleman's letter correctly? I do not want misrepresent it.

PREMIER MOORES: I did not hear what you said.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I am speaking of the hon. gentleman for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) who was then the minister who wrote me to say in effect - I will get the letter if he wishes or he doubtless has a copy in his own file - that he had taken the matter to Cabinet and with regret the Cabinet had concluded that they had a policy of freezes on projects of this kind. Now that freeze did not apply in Bonavista North, of course, or in Exploits but it applied in Labrador and Southern Labrador. It applied elsewhere throughout the Province. So they could not provide the \$18,000. So the children of L'Anse-au-Loup were denied the opportunity. Not very important. There are things more important, true, than being able to swim without having the flies eat you alive, the black flies. Just an indication of priorities, an indication of what this group of men are concerned about, what they care about.

They care about a lot of things, I am sure, but they obviously do not care about the people of Labrador. The people of Labrador, Sir, particularly the people who live between L'Anse-au-Clair, which is next to the border in the South, and Cartwright in the North, those people, Sir, are forced to live and to tolerate conditions that nobody else in this Province today can even recall with any vividness. I do not think there is a proper sewage disposal system in the communities right along that coast. I do not think there is a proper water system along

MR. ROBERTS:

that coast except possibly in Black Tickle because when my sometimes friend, the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was the Minister of Welfare, as it was then called -

MR. NEARY: I love you really, boy.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman loves me I will keep my back to the wall. Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman was the Minister of Welfare he got the agreement amended I believe - I think he was the minister at the time - to bring Black Tickle into the federal-provincial agreement on shared-cost programmes for native peoples. But other than that, Sir, I do not think there is a proper water system anywhere along that coast. There are next to no roads.

The Minister of Transportation promised a group he would go and look at the roads, and that is another broken commitment. He has been too busy going hither and yon, flicking around, having a look at Redcliff and all the other things, Harbour Mille Road, too busy to keep his word. The schools are inadequate. They are becoming better, no thanks to the government. The boards are struggling manfully. The Consumer Affairs Department the other day released a study they had done, the request of the Development Association, showing that food prices were significantly higher and the availability of types of food, of quality of goods was significantly less.

There is not a fire truck. If a house burns, Sir, it burns. There is not a proper ambulance. Blame it, if you want, on the member. Sure. Blame it on the Liberals, the years gone by if you want. But also accept the fact that in five years of a P.C. administration nothing has been done, nothing, not even \$18,000 to put a roof on a swimming pool so the children who live along that coast from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay can learn to swim. Somebody else, Americans, gave from charity the pool, supply the instructors, and we are not even getting \$18,000. If we had had a by-election and they were trying to buy the election of a member! Maybe I should resign and let them say to the people - all right, maybe the gentleman from Port De Grave (Mr. Dawe) would be well advised to resign and let us see then what

MR. ROBERTS:

the government do.

I mean Bonavista North, to hear the hon. gentleman who now represents it boast, they probably would have had 100 swimming pools. And if they did not think of it, they should have because now the day is gone. We have the hon. gentleman with us now and no need for any more of that sort of trick.

Mr. Speaker, the way in which this government has treated Labrador is shoddy beyond belief. I do not say that with any partisan joy. I say that, Sir, with a sense of regret as a citizen of this Province. Because I say that unless we come to grips with this problem now, in this time and place, that the threat to our Province will grow greater and greater and greater.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not want that to happen, Sir. I have not come into politics, I do not think any member of this House has come into politics to preside over the dissolution of part of this Province. But, Sir, to make this Province united the people of this Province have got to want to be united. It is the same dilemma as all of us as Canadians face with respect to the separatist threat in the Province of Quebec. If the people of Quebec do not want to be part of Canada, Sir, then no force on this earth can keep them part.

The same is true with Labrador, Sir. We have got to show the people of Labrador that their future lies within the united Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, that they are part of it and their wishes are being heeded and their concerns are being dealt with. Not just empty words. Not just saying, "Oh, well, they have great resources, we might as well get them, boys. We will get the Churchill power and we will get the gas and oil and we will get whatever else they have and we will make good use of it." People on the Straits are ecstatic at the thought of watching the power from the Lower Churchill come right past their door and go down in that tunnel and go across the Straits, whenever that time, that happy day comes, while they are paying the highest prices for electricity of any people in this Province - they are paying the diesel rate - and if it is not possible, and probably it is not, I am told by technical people, to take off enough power from the great power lines to feed the relatively small needs in power terms for the people who live in that part of Labrador, then let the government at least equalize the rate. It is peanuts compared - it is not peanuts in absolute terms, it is a lot of dollars - it is peanuts compared to what this government have wasted on the Lower Churchill, just flung away in a mad, insane policy to attempt to get re-elected, and to bluff and to ignore reality.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on about Labrador but I do not want to accept the hon. gentleman for

MR. ROBERTS: Bay of Islands' invitation to be here for the next three or four days. I feel very strongly and I feel more strongly every time I am in touch with the people from the Labrador part of my district or they are in touch with me. I get, maybe not a new insight but my view are reinforced. What I am saying, Sir, is mild compared to what many of them say.

Ministers do not go near Labrador or if they do they only go to fish or to sight see. They do not go to listen to people or to talk to people. They do not visit, they do not find out what is on people's minds, they do not consult with them. It would have done everybody here a great deal of good - I hope it did me some - to be at the Labrador Resources Advisory Council meeting the other day. The member for St. Barbe, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, as he now is, was there. I was there and a number of officials.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) and the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) are at it again. Now as I said earlier, I do not really care if they want to talk to each other but, Mr. Speaker, could they please either keep it to a dull monotone or could they carry on their animated conversations, Upper Island Cover or not, outside the House? If they want to go back to Upper Island Cove to do it, that is fine. That is our gain and Upper Island Cove's loss. But, Mr. Speaker, let them not do it in the House. I do not want to start this session with that kind of a thing. If they do not like what I am saying that is fine, that is their perfect right, but let them either suffer it in silence or let them leave, as they wish.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk for a little about the economy because it is a subject about which a great deal needs to be said. The economy, obviously, is the basis of everything. If we cannot make the economy work in this Province then all else will come to naught. The Minister of Finance knows -

MR. ROBERTS: - Mr. Speaker, I do not think I am particularly weak voiced. I may have weaknesses, I do, but I do not think that is one of them. Is there anything that can be done? And I do not think my hearing is unusually acute.

MR. DOODY: I was speaking with the hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. NOLAN: Who, me?

MR. ROBERTS: It may be the hon. Opposition House Leader but he too should be spoken to.

MR. SPEAKER: The requirement that hon. members in the Chamber remain silent, or without making interference when an hon. member is speaking is also operative in the precincts of the House. So those who are making noises in the precincts of the House should refrain from doing it. I presume the officer at the table, the Law Clerk, is now informing them of that and if not, if that does not work perhaps the Duty Constable would inform them similarly.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a valid point. I could probably outshout people, particularly with the advantage of the microphone, but you should not have to tear your throat out to speak to a group of, at most, fifty or sixty men and women in the House and people in the galleries.

The economy, Sir, is the subject which I think should give us more concern than any other single subject because the economy underlies the basis of everything we are trying to do.

The Minister of Finance will bring in a budget and I would hope he will bring it in very early.

MR. ROBERTS:

I think it is essential we have an early discussion of the financial affairs of this Province and the ministry's plans with respect to the coming year, whatever they may be. But I do not envy the minister his job because he can only make a coat with the cloth that he has. He must cut the garment according to the cloth. His problem is made immeasurably greater because the cloth is so skimpy, because the economic resources of this Province - I am not saying the potential or the natural; I am saying the developed, economic resources, the economy of this Province - can produce so little in the term of revenue either in the private sector or in the public sector.

The hon. gentleman's taxation officials take a large bite of the revenue of the citizens of this Province. On a percentage basis it is probably a larger bite than any other Province in Canada. I know the individual taxes are higher. The hon. gentleman has not levied those taxes or does not collect them, he and his colleagues, because they want to. They would love nothing better than to be able to come in and reduce the sales tax to five per cent or wipe it out entirely. They are collecting them because they have to have the money. I venture to say without in any way infringing on any budget secrets that all they can collect is still not enough. And there is a grim process going on now of trying to bring a balance of some sort between projected revenues and projected expenditures for the coming fiscal year.

The real reason that is so, Sir, is not entirely maladministration. I think there is some maladministration. I think there are some very perverted priorities by the present administration. The real reason is that the economy is not producing enough. It is just not big enough. The machine is not strong enough. I was talking to some friends of mine on the weekend and one of them made an interesting analysis of our economy, which is not perfect and I do not put it up as an economic treatise, but I put it up as an interesting and I think an insightful idea. The gentleman in question said, "Look at our

MR. ROBERTS:

economy today in 1977 compared to what it was thirty years ago after the war, before Confederation. In those days," he said, "the whole economy of Newfoundland and Labrador really boiled down to two paper mills producing paper, one at Grand Falls, one at Corner Brook; a number of mines dotted around the Province wherever there was a mineral resource that was sufficiently attractive to be distracted and concentrated or milled and sold, the fishery, and then the service sector, those of us who live, lawyers, doctors, all the others, by taking in each others wash, living not on productive dollars, not producing new dollars but in effect, the money that is circulating in the society.

"Now," he said, "what has happened today, thirty years later, and hundreds of millions of dollars spent and all the ideas and all the theories and all the ventures and everything else? Well we have three mills, not two. We do. The Linerboard mill in Stephenville is providing a fair number of jobs, apparently at very high cost but we have three mills. We have some mines, we have some new mines. But some of the old mines have closed." I do not have any figures here but I would venture, Mr. Speaker, that the number of men employed in the mining industry in Newfoundland and Labrador today is not significantly greater than it was twenty-five years ago.

True we have the iron ore mines in Labrador, massive mines, millions of tons of ore. In those days before Confederation, Bell Island had, what? 2,000 or 3,000 men at peak working in the mines, of that order. A whole community of 13,000 lived on the mines and lived reasonably well by standards of the day. The fishery may be better off in some respects. It may be worse off in others. But certainly it is not significantly greater in the economy. Nobody would pretend that the fishing communities of this Island by and large are examples of unrivaled prosperity. All that has really happened is we have a bigger service sector. That is what has grown in the last thirty years really dramatically in Newfoundland and Labrador, the service

MR. ROBERTS:

sector, government, public service. And then the people who live in the economic sense by taking in washing and putting out washing.

You know, it is staggering if you look at the figures that I had drawn up for me just to show how unbalanced the economy is. The gross provincial product for December, 1975 - that is the most recent year in respect of which I can get breakdowns, I can get a total - but it was about \$2.4 billion. That is the sum total of everything we have produced in Newfoundland and Labrador in goods and services, about \$2.4 billion.

Mr. Roberts.

The private sector of that, Sir, was less than half, \$1.1 billion. Forestry contributed \$29 million; fishing and trapping, \$46 million; mining \$267 million. Now these are not jobs. I mean obviously these numbers are not very closely related to the employment, most of these, but these are the Gross Provincial Product. Electric power \$169 million; manufacturing \$270 million and construction \$321 million.

MR. NEARY: Are these the 1975 figures?

MR. ROBERTS: These are the 1975 figures, yes. The 1976 figures I cannot get as yet broken down. But the Gross Provincial Product went from \$2.37 billions to \$2.681 billion.

MR. DOODY: About seventeen per cent.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I was going to say I suspect the relative proportions are not changed significantly.

MR. NEARY: Is that the hon. minister's policy?

MR. ROBERTS: The fact remains, Sir, that our economy is hopelessly and terribly, terribly one-sided. If you took out of Newfoundland, Sir - it is great fun to kick Ottawa, and I suppose at times I have done my share of it - but if you took out of Newfoundland's economy what comes in from Ottawa: Unemployment insurance this year, 1976 year, will be about \$213 million out of a Gross Provincial Product of \$2.7 billion. That is eight or nine per cent. Now one-twelfth, one-eleventh of the total economy activity of this Province today is unemployment insurance. It is the biggest single industry we have. Other than government it is the biggest single payroll that we have. All the teachers together - are what? One hundred and twenty-five million dollars? Is that \$125 million, the teachers' payroll?

MR. DOODY: That is correct.

MR. ROBERTS: One hundred and twenty-five million dollars.

MR. DOODY: That was last year.

MR. ROBERTS: Last year. It will be somewhat higher this year, and I realize there is a difference of opinion as to how much higher it will be.

Mr. Roberts.

Let us add on some other federal government payments, support payments, transfer payments. Now they are not giving them to Newfoundland because of anything particular about us. We get them as Canadians. Family allowance was \$56 million, and those figures are for the 1974-1975 year. Statistics Canada people do not have any more up-to-date ones they could give me now. Fifty-six million and another seventy-three million for old age security. So if you add those up and by my arithmetic, Sir, that is about \$130 million. Add that on to the \$213 million. You are talking \$340 million. Let us add \$10 million for the increase in family allowance and old age security last year. Three hundred and fifty million dollars in this Province today coming from federal social security transfer payments. I am not counting equalization. I am not counting share-cost programmes or DREE or any of those things. Three hundred and fifty million, it is the largest sector of our economy. Construction is only \$321 million. The fishery, even at seventeen per cent up, is not \$70 million in total dollars. It is a lot of jobs, but it is not \$70 million this past year. The minister may have a figure there. He says ~ forty-six, seventeen per cent. That is about \$7 million or \$8 million. It is under \$60 million. The minister nods acquiescence. And neither he nor I is particularly happy about that. I am pleased there is an improvement. I wish it would be a great deal larger. But we got to realize just what the economy in this Province is all about. I am not proud of those figures, Sir.

UIC - if you would like something, Your Honour, that will keep you riveted to your Chair, in the metaphorical sense - in 1967 the total UIC payments was \$20 million in this Province. And they had risen by 1971 to \$30 million. That is a fifty per cent increase. In 1972 they went from \$30 million to \$70 million and then to \$90 million and then to \$120 million and then to \$160 million and now to \$215 million. It is

Mr. Roberts.

astonishing. That is our economy. That is the reason the retail trade is having a relatively good year. I know they are not paying dividends, and some of them are having a rough go. But our economy has not improved significantly in thirty years, Sir. If you took out government's spending - I have only talked of federal government spending directly. I have not talked of the provincial government expenditure, including that portion of it, well over half, I think, that comes from the Government of Canada in one form or another. I have talked only about direct government expenditures, the cheques that are sent out by the Government of Canada's own departments direct, and I have not talked of their payroll or the CNR's payroll, which is what? One hundred million dollars or one hundred and fifty million dollars a year in the subsidies on the CNR alone.

MR. NEARY: Federal Public Works.

MR. ROBERTS: Federal Public Works.

I have only spoken of three, the big three, but only three of the programmes, the old age security, family allowance, the unemployment insurance programme.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the way the economy is. It has not changed significantly, really when you look at it, Mr. Speaker, since 1946. We still got a couple of paper mills, a couple of mines and fish, and the rest of us are living by taking in the washing, fueled - and praise be, I mean if anybody ever doubted the wisdom of Confederation I mean this itself proves it, - fueled by dollars from Ottawa. God bless the taxpayers in Ontario and British Columbia and these other places who willingly or unwillingly pay their shot.

MR. PECKEORD: Only three of them.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes there are only three have provinces in the equalization sense. And they have got it. You know I wish we were a have Province.

MR. DOODY: Manitoba -

MR. ROBERTS: Manitoba is - and Saskatchewan depending on how the wheat goes, comes on and off the scale. And I say too, God bless the Government of Canada, be it Liberal or PC, because both governments have adopted this policy that equalizes the national wealth in some degree.

Mr. Speaker, that is the analysis. I could go on. I could develop it, expand it, but the point is there. This is not an economic seminar, it is the House of Assembly. But what are we going to do about it? What are we going to do? We go on this way? Do we want to go on this way? I think the answer to that is no. No Newfoundlander, no Labradorian, wants to go on with our prosperity - whatever measure there may be of it and it is prosperity by comparison to what has gone before - but it is not prosperity by comparison to almost any other part of Canada. With our prosperity dependent upon federal government social security payments and these are not equalization. I am not talking equalization, Sir. I am talking the payments that have come to individual citizens as a right. The old age pension you get if you live to be sixty-five, if your spouse is sixty-five and you are sixty.

MR. ROBERTS: The family allowance you get if you are born or under - is it sixteen, eighteen for children in school? The unemployment insurance you get if you get your contributions in and go through the other regulations.

Is that what we want? I do not think it is what we want. What are we going to do about it? What are we going to do? Are we just going to go on? It has been getting worse and worse. I could draw up these figures for the past ten or twelve years and compare them. One of the ministers could ring the central statistical people who provide a very good service here. I am sure he could get all the statistics. It ought to be an interesting exercise to set them out and to make them public. What percentage of our **Gross Provincial Product** for each of the last ten years has come from what source? And I will bet, Sir, that the proportion coming from the Federal Treasury, and I am not talking of equalization or shared cost, let me stress that, but the proportion that comes, simply new dollars coming in from outside, getting greater and greater. It is by far the greatest of any Province in Canada and the proportion that is coming from our own economic activity, the fishery, the mines, what we manufacture, whatever else we make and sell be it a good or a service, but that proportion is getting smaller and smaller and smaller.

MR. DOODY: Mining is climbing.

MR. ROBERTS: Mining is climbing.

MR. DOODY: The value of it.

MR. ROBERTS: The value of electricity is climbing. That \$170 million includes a lot of Churchill power, you know. It is true. It shows up in the statistics. Mining - \$270 millions, but I will bet there are no more jobs in mining today than there were ten years ago, probably not as many.

MR. DOODY: Probably fewer.

MR. ROBERTS: Probably fewer.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the question is what are we going to do about it? What have the government done? It is their job to do it. Let me say quite clearly it is not our job. And I do not propose to try to do it from here. If ever I am there then it becomes my responsibility and I must attempt to discharge it and we will see. It is the responsibility of the Minister of Municipal Affairs with that supercilious smirk on his face over there. He and his colleagues are there and they must govern. They must try to govern. They have not. When they were in Opposition how the welkin rang!

I can remember Mr. John Crosbie, By Heavens! none of us will ever forget him. He was a giant when he was over there, among pigmies, not quite a giant now because he is no longer among pigmies. But he was a giant among pigmies in that government, Sir. But when he was in Opposition how the welkin rang day after day in this House, day after day after night after night with talk of priorities and planning and holding himself out - you know, all that the Smallwood Administration had done was wrong and he was going to solve it, he and his party, or the three

Mr. Roberts:

or four parties he had when he flitted around, finally found a political haven in the present P.C. Party. And so the people of this Province, Sir, elected that party to be their government. They sent them into office to change things, to make them better. The Liberal years had wound down, the cornucopia had dried up, the economy was not producing, and Mr. John Crosbie and the present Premier and the other spokesman for that party said, we will make it better, we are going to solve things. They talked of priorities and planning. Oh we heard it here in the House, and then we heard it outside of the House. We heard it on the hustings, we heard it in every way that political propaganda can be spread. And now they have had five years in office, five long years, seven Throne Speeches, and they have not come up with a priority or a plan. Mr. Crosbie is long gone, and he left his political testament here in this House in December, not last December, December of 1975 in a speech of gloom and doom and despair. He could see no way out with his intellect, very great intellect and his ability to work, and his desire to work, and all of the qualities he had that made him a giant among pygmies, as he was.

He would see no way out. He gave it up. Quit. Resigned. He went to run off to Ottawa. If he could not solve Newfoundland's problems he is going to solve Canada's problems now. He certainly did not solve ours as he himself would admit. And any man on the other side, Mr. Speaker, who doubts what I say has only to get out that Hansard. The gentleman from Exploits (Mr. Twomey) was not a member of the House at that time, and I doubt if Hansard was widely circulated in the Botwood Cottage Hospital. The paper is much too harsh. But I invite him to have a look at that speech by the man who was in many ways the intellectual force, the ideological force, the creative force behind this administration. I do not think a great many realized it at the time, but of course that speech was his final will and testament in the political sense. Because of course by then he had already made up his mind to leave the administration and seek

Mr. Roberts:

election in St. John's West to the House of Commons, which he did, and which he was.

I do not want to go into the details of the unemployment figures, Mr. Speaker, but any other indicator you have, any single economic indicator in this Province has gone up and up and up and up since this government came in. I do not want to do that and so I will not. And I want to say, and I want to say it clearly and unequivocally, that I do not think this government are fully responsible for the economic problems of this Province. I do not think the government of any province controls all of the economic policy. In fact they control only a relatively small part of it. I am not going to say that it is all their fault. The Canadian economy has not been behaving terribly well. I will say that. Now mind you when they were over here how they used to jeer the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) when he would stand up and point out quite correctly that, you know, there were worldwide economic problems and they were having an effect here. But how hon. gentlemen opposite, who were then over here, used to jeer, and sneer and pretend; of course now they have known better, now they realize better. And I will say that it is not all their fault. I do not think it should be held out to be all their fault, and I will not hold it out to be all their fault. Let them accept their responsibility, but let them not have to attempt to discharge a responsibility beyond their means. The Government of Canada has a very real, and a very active responsibility.

So what has been the government's response? We know the debt is up. The Minister of Finance, I am sure, has it engraved on his heart, double in the last five years. The Premier is worried the Province cannot sell the bonds. It is the only conclusion I can draw from a very strange reference that he has made two or three times, including opening day when we were told the Bank of Canada might have to save three or four provinces. And one can only conclude that the American bond market has sent signals which have become shock waves

Mr. Roberts:

by the time they have reached Cabot Tower to our people, to our agents in the bond market.

The debt is up. It is frightfully up, frighteningly up. And yet it has got to be said, what could we have done without? You know, it is all very well, I could stand over here, and possibly maybe I should, and try to denounce the government for going up \$200 millions a year, and on and on and on. I can remember - gosh I guess I was not even a member - it was the 1964 or 1965 period, and Mr. Denis Groom, who is now Chairman of Hydro, was financial adviser to the Premier, coming into my room one night about 7:00 o'clock and worried sick that the Province at that point had \$160 millions or something in short term notes backed up to the banks and in the hands of the various gentlemen who lend money and arrange these things, and worried that we could never survive, that the province could not carry that kind of debt load.

MR. ROBERTS:

Now of course we look upon \$200 million a year as being - well was it the Minister of Finance or the Premier the other day boasted that we would manage to keep borrowing down to the colossal sum of \$197 million. That, I know, is a tribute. I mean if we had had six by-elections instead of three we would never have done it. With only three we managed to do it. Every other economic indicat you can go through the whole works, Mr. Speaker, the participation rate, the unemployment rate, the percentage of our revenue that goes to service the debt.

Every municipality in the Province is on the verge of bankruptcy. The government have the negative and sterile policy of saying, "Raise more money," as if somehow there was more money they could raise. You know, in area after area. And what is the government's response? Well on opening day when I made a few remarks the Premier leaped in to defend his administration, and so he should. If I remember him correctly - now I took the figures down in notes, and at that stage I had not seen the Hansard - as I recall it he told us that among the glories of his tenure as Premier of this Province to date was the creation of 2,700 jobs in the Rural Development Authority and I think, was it 1,500 or 1,800 in the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation? I do not quarrel with those figures, but I do not believe them. So I say that I would like to know where the jobs are. I would like to know how we count out the 2,700 jobs in the Rural Development Authority. The figures do not coincide with anything that has been made public before.

MR. NEARY: There is a new drive-in theatre out in Corner Brook.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh yes. And there was a hairdressing salon, I think, here in St. John's. The periodic releases by the Minister of Rural Development just do not square with the Premier's figures at all. You know, you would think we were talking of cheese and chalk, we are not talking about the number of jobs. Where are the 2,700 jobs?

MR. ROBERTS:

I wonder if these are two of them. Let me read a letter that came to me in an honourable and an honest way. It is about a gentleman and family who live in Exploits district. In fact they wrote to me, I say to the member, because they told me they had been in touch with him and gotten no answer. So they wrote to me and asked me to help them with their problem and in due course I got some information which I shall now read. I shall leave out the names of the individuals, Mr. Speaker, although if any hon. gentleman opposite wants them I shall gladly give him those names, you know, outside. I do not want to bring in the names of individual people.

We will call them the Smiths because that is not their name. What an insight this is into the Rural Development Authority. The Smiths are an able-bodied childless couple who have been married for nineteen months. During this time - and the letter is dated this January - during this time they have been living with Mr. Smith's parents, both old age pensioners at their home in blank, and blank is a community in the district of Exploits. Mr. Smith was employed by Mr. Jones, a local woods contractor up until October of 1975 at which time he was laid off due to a shortage of work. Doubtless true. Now remember, however many jobs have been in Rural Development have been in the logging industry. The Premier told us that and we all know that to be correct. You know, sawmilling, lumbering, logging, the woods industry.

While employed Mr. Smith was given a government grant of \$10,000 to start a sawmill operation which he got into operation in June of 1976 - oh month of blessed memory! - after drawing unemployment insurance benefits from October to June. So you could say he got off UIC and that was good. That is economic development. That is good stuff. He worked at the sawmill for three weeks but finding no markets for his material he ceased sawing and went back on unemployment insurance. His benefits expired in September after which time both he and his wife lived off his parents income. In December government officials came and confiscated his machinery in

MR. ROBERTS:

lieu of the \$10,000 he had spent. The rest of it, Mr. Speaker, is not relevant to the -

MR. RIDEOUT: Does that count as a job creation?

MR. ROBERTS: Well I think obviously, Mr. Speaker, that is three or four of the 2,700 jobs. So I say now

Mr. Roberts.

to the Premier, to the minister responsible, who has consistently and constantly refused to account to this House, has deliberately concealed information, malevolently, if that is a parliamentary word. That is no requirement in the act that a report be made, and the ministers lived up to that requirement. I say to the minister or to the government, any of them, all of them - I could not care less who it is, Sir, but I want one of them or more of them - to tell us where those 2,700 jobs are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And tell us how many of them are permanent jobs, and how many lasted for a month or two or three. They do not have to include the gentleman for Bonavista North, who three or four years ago got one of these \$10,000 loans, which people think are grants, and promptly went off to Toronto on it, and enjoyed his \$10,000, I have no doubt, and enjoyed Toronto as well. You do not have to include the morgue that they financed or the hairdresser's salon or all these other things. I just want to know where the 2,700 jobs are, and I want to know how many of them are in the woods industry or this type of thing? How many repossessions have there been? I am told that the Highways' yard out in Grand Falls is blocked with skidders and tractors and things that the government, RDA have had to repossess. And the paper every day has in it three or four or two or six notices saying, "For sale," - well all the equipment that goes into these logging ventures.

I would like to hear about the man in Phillips Head who told me last year that he had been promised a loan from the Minister of Rural Development if he voted PC in the election. And I checked afterwards, he got the loan. I did not ask how he voted, but he got the loan. So I give the minister credit - a man in Phillips Head. There were three or four with me that day, I thought I had heard it all in politics.

Mr. Roberts.

How many repossessions have there been? How many permanent jobs have there been? How many jobs are like these jobs in this great project, this poor man, this unfortunate man, who was given a \$10,000 loan to start a sawmill operation, and did not know if he was punched or bored, Sir. He did not know that there was no market for his materials. And the minister letting a man get into that position to borrow \$10,000, which for a man who has no resources and no assets - all the man has is the determination to work ,to support himself.

When the Minister of Social Services talks of two and three generations of welfare and things, how is this going to affect? Here is a guy who tries to get off, takes on a relatively large amount of money, large in his terms, and he is encouraged to get into the sawmill business. And after three weeks he has to give it up, because he cannot sell anything. How many of these sawmill things have gone wrong? Half of them? Three-quarters of them? Why do we not get any reports in this House on the Rural Development Authority?

MR. NEARY: I would like to see how many tomatoes the fellow that I defeated twice has actually grown .

MR. ROBERTS: Well the member asked a valid question. I would like to know why we cannot get names, Public money - never before in the history of this Province have the government ever had the authority to lash out public money on loans without revealing names. Oh, they will say, cannot do it. It is not done anywhere else. No. The minister announces names of RDA loans. He has to, because the Government of Canada insists upon it. If RDA put up money then the loans are made public. Here they are quoting the minister's deputy minister, grants and loans totalling almost \$250,000 and there they are spelled out. The Daily News, the 2nd. day of September had that. It is a very interesting story.

Mr. Roberts.

How come the minister and the government of which he is part refused to make public in this House or anywhere else a list of the names? Is it because they are ashamed? Are they trying to hide something? Or is it because the programme has been one of the great mishmash snafus. Millions of dollars gone and no jobs to show for it. How about the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation which seems to be turning out one of the great disasters of our time? A good idea, but they backed the Gander - whatever it was called - the flying operation in Gander. Hundreds of thousands of dollars gone there. Hundreds of thousands of dollars more gone out in that Octagon plant. Imagine, money to make hovercrafts.

MR. RIDEOUT: The Green Bay mine.

MR. ROBERTS: The Green Bay mine. A good idea, but no chance ever to survive. I would like to see the viability. I would like to see the feasibility studies tabled here. I would like to see a report from the NLDC as to how many of their loans have gone wrong? How many taverns have they financed around this Province?

MR. NEARY: A little over \$1 million. Now they are trying to get another one for a mining -

MR. ROBERTS: In area after area, disgusting, shocking. The money gone, and that is bad enough, but even worse than that, even worse than that, no jobs. You could maybe accept the money gone if there were some jobs. The Premier, again I hope I quote him correctly, said 1,800 jobs the NLDC had created. I would like to see them. I would like to see a list of them.

MR. F. ROWE: This is the crowd who tell it the way it is.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, my friend from Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe), Trinity-Bay de Verde tells me this is the crowd - the hon. crowd that should be, I think - who were going to tell it the way it is. Distortions, deceptions, hiding things, that is what they do day after day, and time after time. Well now the Premier has made the statement 2,700 jobs - is it here John?

MR. J. NOLAN: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Let me see if I can find his very own words, Mr. Speaker. Where are we? Where are we? 2,700 jobs. "The fact is, Sir, the Department of Rural Development have made loans in just under four years, they have established or have been responsible for creating 2,700 at a cost of \$2,300 per job, and that is if the loans are not paid, \$2,700." Now the press releases from the minister are directly different. As a matter of fact, the minister in his wisdom back on the 23rd. of April 1976 was claiming 3,400 jobs. Now that is an interesting little - here is his press release

AN HON. MEMBER: Seven hundred difference.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh yes, yes. Oh me! Yes, 3,368 jobs.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Does it say what programmes?

MR. ROBERTS: Rural Development Authority - and now mind you, that was, Sir, - on the figure I just gave you of 3,368 was the result of the meeting of Wednesday, February 25, 1976. Right? 3,368. By March 31 the Authority had held its forty-fifth meeting, and it had

Mr. Roberts:

then raised up to 3,420 jobs. In other words, the result of the next meeting was a net loss of, or a net gain, I am sorry, of 52 jobs. And yet, you know, the Premier now tells us 2,700. Well where is the truth? I do not think the minister was lying, and I do not think the Premier was lying. But both facts are not correct. And I say now -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I will explain it.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman will have all the opportunity in the world to explain, Sir. I wish he would explain. He has been in the portfolio for a year and hiding things, and trying to confuse and berate. I say now to the hon. gentleman let him speak in this debate and tell us where the 2,700 jobs are. Let him tell us how many repossessions there have been. Let him tell us how many jobs are full-time and how many part-time. Let him tell us who got the names. You know, we can go on and on. Let him tell us about the man the man in Phillips Head who said, "Boy, I cannot even be seen with you, Mr. Roberts, because," naming the hon. gentleman, "will soon be here," and he said, "I have been a Liberal all of my life," he said. "But if I voted Tory this time," P.C., naming the candidate, the candidate did not know anything about it, "why I would" - and I could take the gentleman from Exploits (Mr. Twomey) to the House, to the man today, "Boy, he said, I got in for a loan, me and my sons, we want a J-5. And the minister told me if I did not vote Tory I would never get it." I am not saying that is true. I am only saying the man told me that, and he believed it to be true. And he told me later, because I made it a point to check back, that he did in fact get the loan.

He was better off than Peterview. The town of Peterview was promised a loan, and never did get it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It would be unparliamentary for me to tell what I heard about you, but go on.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: the hon. gentleman from Grand Falls, Sir, may say whatever he wishes subject to the rules of the House. He is getting low and dirty because he cannot answer with the truth. So all I say to him is let him, when his time comes, answer my questions, and then say whatever else he wants. Where are the 2,700 jobs? How many repossessions have there been? How many - I mean I have not counted the ones out in Grand Falls in the Highways' Depot. My colleagues who drive in and out for sessions tell me that every time they come by there are more machines there. Why will not

MR. ROBERTS: the minister make names public of people getting our money, Newfoundland and Labrador money, when Ottawa makes public, or his officials make public Ottawa and Newfoundland money recipients because ARDA is fifty-fifty.

MR. NEARY: Ottawa refuses to make the Newfoundland Development Loan Board -

MR. ROBERTS: Well they say then Ottawa should be made to answer. But I say there is an inconsistency even in the minister's department. He will not make public Rural Development Authority - the names of borrowers. But he will make public the name of ARDA borrowers. You know, no possible rational and acceptable explanation. There is an explanation and there is a rational one. But it is not acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, either the Premier or the minister were talking through their hats. Let us just see where the 2,700 jobs are in this great Rural Development Authority. We have never been allowed to debate it, never seen other than the once, once; Mr. Jim Reid was then the Minister before he met his fate at the hands of the electors of the district of Trinity Bay de Verde. And he produced the list and of course was just about dismissed from the Cabinet as a result.

Let us find out about the NLDC, see our money. Where is it going? Financing drive-ins, financing taverns, that is economic development? Oh that is great economic development. That is really getting to the guts of our resources. That is the exemplification, Mr. Speaker, of the Premier's oft stated cliché, we must do best what we do best, or whatever it is he says.

MR. NEARY: What about Mr. Ed Ralph? He is after bailing out.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh yes, the Ralland Forest Products Mill down -

MR. NEARY: Rolland.

MR. ROBERTS: Rolland, Ralland, Roland, Ralland, Bay d'Espoir, I could go on. The government have deliberately withheld information from the House and more than that. That is serious enough, Sir. That

MR. ROBERTS: is offence enough. But they have failed to do the job. If they had created the jobs, you know, you could at least say, all right, you have done something.

There are not 2,700 jobs out there. I do not know how many there are. I know there are not 2,700. I know there are not. And how many cases I have heard of, we all heard of men who said, "They called me in to RDA. They wanted their loan paid. I said, 'Boy I cannot pay the loan. I have had it rough the year. I cannot pay the loan.'" "Oh well, you lend it to us and we will lend it back to you," or words to that effect. How many? I do not know. I do not know. I have heard of a half dozen myself but I am sure there is not a member on our side who has not heard of that. It does not make it true. But we do hear, and the minister's refusal - now he will get up with his billingsgate and blatherskite and put that forth. If he wants to do that well and good. Let him also give the facts and if he feels that I am full of hot air, as he presumably does, I am using some parliamentary terms, he might want to use some others, then I say to him let him expose me. I say simply where are the 2,700 jobs? I do not think they exist. And I say the whole Rural Development Authority has been an exercise in disaster with thousands and millions of dollars of public funds gone, squandered, wasted and not a job to show.

MR. NEARY: They are like a bank. They do not have to give out the interest. They are like a bank.

MR. ROBERTS: They are like a bank except a bank has shareholders and the bank must answer to shareholders. The minister recognizes no authority. The electors of Bonavista - Trinity-Conception gave him one answer.

Now what has been the government's response to all this economic problem? The 500 jobs! We talked about these earlier. The 500 jobs, that is ten for every district in the Island. Well that is going to make a real rock hard assault on unemployment down

MR. ROBERTS: my way, Sir. It is really going to knock them down in Ferryland. Ten jobs, ten jobs of which at least five or six are bound to be fellows on social assistance so they get turfed off so the minister gets at them and says, "Oh well, we cleaned them up, got them off social assistance." Get them off stamps, get UIC. That is their policy.

Where are the jobs? There is no planning gone into it, no planning, no forethought, no policy, no philosophy, just a frantic desire to try to say something to stave off, and then the Premier gets up and says, "We are worried about negativism." Well he has good reason to be. Of course the people of the Province are negative. They are only speaking the truth. The great figure of that administration, Mr. John Crosbie, the giant among the pikies, gave up, made his gloom and doom speech and went away, went away.

MR. ROBERTS:

He was the best they had. Now where is their philosophy now? It is not in the Throne Speech. Where are the answers? Where are the programmes to deal with our resources? We are told all the time we have great resources, limitless resources. But when are we going to get some benefit out of them? Let the government govern and if they cannot let them get out and we will govern. Then the member for Bay Of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) can say, "Where are our plans," and I shall tell him. But until then I quote his friend, his fervent admirer, his soul mate in political terms, the hon. gentleman for St. John's West in the House of Commons who said, "I have not got 8,000 civil servants." Funny how he changed from what he used to say when he was over there.

MR. RIDEOUT: He told all of Canada.

MR. ROBERTS: He told all of Canada that. Was it on the Patrick Watson?

MR. RIDEOUT: The Patrick Watson.

MR. ROBERTS: On the Patrick Watson Show exposed, laid out bare. So I say to the gentleman for Bay Of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) there is the chant.

Meanwhile, his question more properly might be directed to his Premier. But he better be careful because, of course, entry into the Cabinet or for that matter as the Premier's secretary for Western Newfoundland is dependent upon the Premier. You cannot get elected to the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, you cannot get elected to the Cabinet.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is a secretary in Botwood too now.

MR. ROBERTS: Although there is an assistant in Botwood, yes. That is the fellow who was otherwise going to run for the nomination. And they could not take a chance on that so they had to hire him and persuade him not to seek the Tory nomination. What is the man's name? Billard? Mr. Derm Billard?

MR. RIDEOUT: Billard, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Dave, Mr. Dave, Dan or Dennis Billard. He is now a special assistant to the Premier. And I venture to say if anybody had sought the Tory nomination in Bonavista North we would have had

MR. ROBERTS:

a special assistant to the Premier in Wesleyville and maybe one in Gambo.

MR. NEARY: Out in LaPoile, Al Evans was the winner twenty-four hours after.

MR. SIMMONS: Or Indian Bay.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. RIDEOUT: I wonder when he is going to appoint one in Harbour Deep.

MR. ROBERTS: And, Mr. Speaker, you know a sordid, shabby record of public administration.

MR. SIMMONS: Down in the Premier's office there is apparently one.

MR. ROBERTS: Well there is one that is not used, that is the one here. And the others are at least used.

The Premier on opening day my note showed he said as if this were a boast, "Unemployment is stable." "Unemployment is stable." I mean the Titanic is sinking but boy she is going down only one way. She is not going two ways. I have just finished reading the marvellously gripping book by Mrs. Cassie Brown, The Wreck Of The Florizel. The gentleman for Bay Of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) would be interested to know I had a great uncle who died on the Florizel, a Baggs from Curling. He lost his life on the Florizel along with many, many other people. It is a very, very magnificent book. And I mean the Florizel, the captain there drove her right on Horn Reef off Cappahayden, drove her right hard fast ashore. She only went one way too, straight ashore onto the rocks. And the Premier says, "Unemployment is stable". The only connection with that is it is more reminiscent, the Premier's policy, of the product of a stable. "Unemployment stable"! As if that was an achievement!

Sir, let me talk for a moment about the fishery. I am glad to see that the Minister of Fisheries is passing through St. John's and has joined us today. I welcome him. It is very nice to see him.

MR. ROBERTS:

Now we have a number of references in this Throne Speech today to the fishery. I will not bore or weary honourable gentlemen by reading them. As courtesy to His Honour, the Governor, we heard them once but that is surely enough. The Minister of Fisheries was not here earlier when I read some of the previous references to the fisheries in previous Throne Speeches. But all I can say is that the ghost writer who wrote this speech is no better than Mr. George McLean when he wrote the previous speeches. The previous speeches were much more effective.

It is not even warmed over hash, you know, the fisheries platform or programme. We all agree that the fishery is a vital part of this Province and it may not be a lot in dollars. I am glad to hear it is gone up seventeen per cent although the minister could hardly claim credit for that. Indeed of the \$70 million in it at least \$50 million has come from Ottawa. It is shocking what Ottawa has put into - not shocking, I mean, not shocking that we have too much - but it is shocking how much of the fishery is directly government supported. Is it three cents a pound and six cents a pound for the plants and then two cents a pound for each fisherman as well? You know, absolutely incredible.

The minister cannot claim, I would not think, very much credit. Whatever credit he can properly claim I will gladly give him. But there is no fishery policy in this administration. They say they have worked out some plans, but where are they? If ever an area of our activity deserved some attention by government, not just the words. I mean we have had enough words. If words were fish, Sir, we would all have 100 quintals each in the store by now. But if ever an area would pay off - it is a relatively high employment sector of our economy.

MR. ROBERTS: may only be \$70 millions out of a Gross Provincial Product of \$2.6 or \$2.7 billions. That is 3 per cent, five per cent of our Gross Provincial Product, the value of the fisheries. But what it represents in jobs is immense.

MR. DOODY: Fifteen per cent.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister says fifteen per cent. Very significant! Very large per cent! And not only a large per cent of our work force but even more importantly is the way in which those jobs are distributed. Because in large parts of this Province if it were not for the fishery there would be no work, no work at all, no productive economic work. The gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) used to name the districts, I will not bother, but in district after district going around the coast if it were not for the fishery there would be precious little work, and in many of those districts there would be no work at all.

But what have the government done?

We have had all the words. My heavens, we have had more - is it five Ministers of Fisheries in five years? An insurance company would not sell the Minister of Fisheries a policy even for a term. We have had five ministers. We had one of the colossal scandals of our history in the gear replacement programme, and I hasten to say that the minister was not in any way, ministerially or otherwise, responsible for that. It was his colleague the gentleman from Gander (Mr. Collins) who was the minister responsible and who will have to bear the heat when the truth comes out. The minister came to that late and the minister does not have to answer, does not have to answer except in that he is there now, he is the buckle there now. We have had five ministers. We have gone up and down the scale. We had Mr. Roy Cheeseman, who gave it up in despair after six or eight months, chucked it in, resigned his seat in the Cabinet, resigned his seat in the House thereupon doing the additional service of allowing my friend, the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir

MR. ROBERTS: (Mr. Simmons) to be elected to the House of Assembly.

MR. SIMMONS: Bringing untold benefits to the district as well.

MR. ROBERTS: I have no doubt, although they never did build the road to Conne River that the Premier promised them, did they? I think the - he is not here, The gentleman from Humber East (Dr. Farrell) was the Minister of Transportation then. Did they not go down there one night and promise it? I remember reading of a promise and a dance.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: They got the dance but not the promise.

MR. SIMMONS: The Minister of Tourism.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Tourism, was it? Was he in charge of it then?

MR. SIMMONS: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: That was the day, remember? when the Tory Cabinet announced that the twenty trawlers were about to sail? There was a picture of a trawler there and, you know, if you did not read too carefully you would say, "Boy, there is one of them. That is the first one coming off the ways now. She will be steaming up here and out of McCallum any day to put her to shore in the McCallum fish plant or the Francois fish plant, or over there in Sandyville." And that was when the Minister of Justice distinguished himself by campaigning - remember in Seal Cove?

MR. SIMMONS: Seal Cove too.

MR. ROBERTS: And the result of Seal Cove was that we had 110 votes and the Tories had twenty. And after the minister went down there and had a mass meeting they got five and we got 150.

MR. SIMMONS: Correction, they got six.

MR. ROBERTS: Six, was it?

But, Mr. Speaker, to come back to the Fisheries Department, Mr. Foy Cheeseman gave it up in despair. Now I am trying to remember who was next.

MR. R. MOORES: The Premier had it for a while did he not?

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier had it for a while but he did not give it up in despair, he did not know he had it. Who was next? The member from Gander (Mr. H. Collins) then became the Minister of Fisheries. He was an unmitigated disaster as a Minister of Fisheries. He cannot say a word in his defence. His only thing is to plead nolo contendere, in the American terminology.

The story of that gear insurance programme - a man who was warned by his officials that the programme was hopelessly out of control and it was open to all the possible abuses - I do not think he knew of any abuses. I do not think he was aware of any potentially criminal activity, of course not, but a man who is so inept at administration that he had that warning - and I say to the Minister of Fisheries the warning is down there in the files yet in the form of memoranda from the officials and the minister may well have seen them since he became the minister. But the member for Gander (Mr. H. Collins) was best forgotten. The best thing that can be said about him is that he left the office of Minister of Fisheries. That is the best thing that can be said about his role.

Then we got Mr. John Crosbie who was the best. Was it Kipling who said, "Send forth the best ye breed." Well, Mr. John Crosbie went into the breach and I have no doubt he put his formidable intelligence to work, and his incredible capacity to work, to master detail and he laboured mightily like the mountain and in due course produced, and every fisherman eventually got a little green book called the Fisherman's Handbook.

MR. NOLAN: With his picture.

MR. ROBERTS: Did it have a picture of Mr. Crosbie in it?

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes it did.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I am glad. So it was worth it. It was worth it. In every home in my district tonight that book is treasured, and it is gotten out religiously before supper and read responsively as in the Gregorian chant.

Mr. Roberts.

but it is not better than Dr. Carter's little liver pills.

MR. SIMMONS: It is a better parallel than you think.

MR. ROBERTS: No, it is more like castoria than Mr. Chase's almanac.

But anyway, Mr. John Crosbie, and whatever he and I may think of each other's political attributes and careers, I have a very healthy respect, deservedly so, for Mr. Crosbie. We will miss him in this House. I mean it will not be half as much fun. There is not ten of them over there together who can equal Mr. Crosbie. I am sure the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will miss him, the jousts back and forth. He will miss him. There is nobody over there who can even hold the garment of Mr. Crosbie.

MR. NEARY: I am tempted to go up to Ottawa, to try to get elected, and to go up to Ottawa so I can take him on again.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I think, Ottawa deserves that, and I think it would be a fair exchange. I think it would be a fair exchange.

MR. DOODY: That would pay up for all the thirty years of equalization grants.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, that was well said by the Minister of Finance that that would pay up for all the thirty years of equalization grants.

But in any event Mr. Crosbie, with all his strength and attributes, who came to grips with the fisheries, his efforts turned to mush and jelly, and he made no more impact on the fisheries policy of this Province or in the lives of the fishermen of this Province than if he, Sir, had never gone closer than going down to the harbour and looking. It is just what he accomplished, nothing. It was like the man who put his fist into a bowl of jelly, and when he had taken out his fist the bowl of jelly was unaltered and unchanged. We have done nothing in the fisheries.

Now we get another minister, a man who has great ambitions, who believes as Napoleon does that every corporal carries a field marshal's baton in his knapsack. I encourage him, and commend him. The Premier will be retiring at some point as leader of the P.C. Party. He will be retiring

Mr. Roberts.

as Premier rather shortly, I would think. But in ten, twenty or thirty years the Premier is bound - I say to the hon. gentleman that Premiers have a habit of liking the job. I can testify to that. And he feels with some discretion and some discernment that the fisheries portfolio is a very good place for a man to make a mark in public life. So it is. That is an honourable and the proper thing for the minister to believe. I would give him every encouragement. The only thing is that I wish he would start that he would do something. We have had a year now of flitting around the Province. And every time I am in an airport anywhere all I see is every senior official of the Department of Fisheries with a long face, except when the minister is not looking at them, with a long face, and you say, "How are you to day, blank?" Because most of the men I have known for years. And they say, "Well, we are off to such and such a place for another little blankety-blankety conference." And blankety-blankety are not parliamentary words. You know, so we have had the conferences, and I gather we are going to have another one here next month, are we? We will have a time.

MR. W. CARTER: I have heard no complaints.

MR. ROBERTS: No, they have complained ever since. They say, "What does he do? When is he going to do something?" And I mean if the minister would like I would reveal the letters that he and I have exchanged from fishermen after fishermen. No, they are delighted to see the minister. Some of them even remember him from the once he visited them when he was their member fifteen years ago, delighted to see him, happy. And, you know, I do not want to disparage - it would be wrong of me in every way - the minister for going out and listening to the fishermen of this Province. I suspect what he heard is what he ought to have known anyway. Has there been a meeting where the Gear Insurance Programme did not come up in some form? They are not all Wallace Holletts. Mr. Hollett makes a

Mr. Roberts.

particularly strong mark, as my friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning) can tell. But as there been a meeting where a fisherman has not stood up and said, "What about the Gear Insurance Programme, Sir?"

MR. W. CARTER: There was one meeting.

MR. ROBERTS: Where?

MR. W. CARTER: Port aux Basques.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is the only one then.

MR. NEARY: They do not get it out there anyway.

MR. ROBERTS: All right. That is the only one I will wager of all of them.

MR. RIDEOUT: They had the subsidy programme for last year.

MR. ROBERTS: You know, and yet in 1972 - when the present minister was up in Ottawa as the then member for St. John's West - at that stage the government made a solemn commitment. It was in a Throne Speech. I will put it in the words of the Governor - when Bill Saunders did his bit for his country, that day - and said, "There will be a Gear Insurance Programme." And five years have come and five years have gone and gear has come and gear has gone. The programme has not come. Members go and members come. Ministers of Fisheries come and go. If the Minister of Fisheries - I do not know how long he will be granted the privilege of being in that office. I have no idea what the Premier plans. I hear there is another Cabinet shuffle coming and, you know, indeed I hear the Minister of Finance may be relieved of that duty, and I know that would please him. That may prevent the Premier from doing it but, you know, it may be gossip. I do not know if it is true or not, and I do not really care. But however long the Minister of Fisheries is given the responsibility and the privilege of being the Minister of Fisheries, if he can come to grips with this one issue, the Gear Insurance Programme, he will have done more than the whole Tory Government in the last five years for the fishermen of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And I will be the very first to stand here or anywhere else.

MR. W. CARTER: We will.

MR. ROBERTS: We will. Well I believe that. I believe the hon. gentleman except I have heard it before and before and before and before.

MR. W. CARTER: Not from me.

MR. ROBERTS: No, not from the minister, no. He set up a committee. But I have heard it from his predecessors, and they are all one hon. group.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: You know, a Cabinet has continuity. A Cabinet has a flow from one to the other, and the minister has only been Fisheries Minister - for what? - a year and a half or thereabouts. But there was a Minister of Fisheries before him,

MR. ROBERTS: and one before that, and one before that, and one before that. I think then you came back to my friend from Fogo, who was the Minister of Fisheries in a much better administration.

The hon. gentleman cannot choose that. Indeed if the hon. gentleman had his way he might have been Minister of Fisheries in that same better administration many years ago.

Well be that as it may, that is water gone under many bridges, a long time ago.

CAPT. WINSOR: They are more choosey now.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, well that is why he did not get in. But, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Fisheries wants one thing he can do that. Let me give him a second. What about the gear bank? We have been promised that. I think it is a good idea. Mr. Crosbie had some of his bright little friends at the university do a little study for him from which he read us carefully edited versions. You know, selected paragraphs which purported to indicate that the gear bank was not a good idea. He would not table the whole study. He would not make it public.

Now what about the 200 mile limit? We were told it was the New Jerusalem and I am sure I could go back through Hansards and find speech after speech in which people said, "If only we had the 200 mile limit." Then subsequently when we had the 200 mile limit, we have got it now, problems! All we hear now is we are in trouble again. It is not as we thought it would be. I am not saying that - the Province did not bring in the 200 mile limit and the Province did not make the management plans. No one is not responsible for that. But I have not heard or seen or become aware of any great initiatives or plans taken by the Province with respect to it. We are told there are longliner fleets, that something is going to be done. Let me see if I can find

MR. ROBERTS: the figures here. I had them - I cannot get figures on the age of our fleets. I rang, or had one of my people ring the Chairman of the Fishing Industry Advisory, was it, Mr. Rupert Prince, whatever that board is called, who I think is very knowledgeable. I think the minister will agree and Mr. Prince, I am sure, would give us any information that was public and would not give us anything that should not be given to us. And that is fair. To get some information on the age of our fleets, because I suspect our fleets are getting pretty old right now and they need to be replaced, and I was told there were no figures available. They would have to be run through the computer and it would cost \$250. And they said, well the Opposition has limited and recently increased by a modicum opposition research funds but you know we are not going to lash out \$250 on that. Although if the minister can get the information I think it would be of great value and interest to the House, to all of us.

But I am told that there are ninety offshore trawlers in this Province. There are 1,000 longliners. There are 12,000 registered commercial fishing vessels and there are 11,000 small boats thirty-five feet or less in this Province today. I do not have an age breakdown but I should imagine that of those thousands of longliners there have not been 100 built in the past two years.

MR. NEARY: They cannot get a licence.

MR. ROBERTS: They cannot get licences or money. I mean they have cut off both.

MR. W. CARTER: Talk to your friends in Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER: Everything is Ottawa.

MR. ROBERTS: And what is a longliner good for? Ten, fifteen years. The Minister of Fisheries says talk to my friends in Ottawa. He gave up Ottawa to come back here. If he wants to talk to Ottawa why did he give up a seat in the House of Commons? He gave up to come back here to try to do something and all we have heard since is whining of, "Oh well, go to Ottawa."

MR. ROBERTS: Ottawa put \$40 million into fisheries in this Province last year. The Province put \$6 million in. Of the total net landed value of \$60 million or \$70 million Ottawa put up \$40 million. There would not be a fishery without Ottawa.

CAPT. WINSOR: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: I do not think Ottawa is perfect. The minister went to Ottawa or the Premier did and asked for a joint venture of 20,000 tons of fish, that is what he asked Ottawa for, 20,000 tons, every last cod's head they could drag out of that Hamilton Bank stock.

PREMIER MOORES: That is incorrect.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not incorrect. It is not incorrect. It is not incorrect. If the Premier says it is I must accept his word. But it is not incorrect. I will come to joint ventures. We will have a chance for a chat on joint ventures tonight or tomorrow or Wednesday, whenever we get at it. Because there are a few questions about joint ventures which have not been answered.

MR. W. CARTER: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: But the Minister of Fisheries says go to Ottawa. Go to Ottawa and save the fishery in this Province time and time again, and

Mr. Roberts:

again, and again, and again. They have not done enough. They have not done too much. But what they have done is no thanks to the minister. What has the minister done? Name me one thing that has resulted from Ottawa, as the result of the minister's year and a half in office? One thing? I mean I cannot think of any. And I do not know all of them. There may be a hundred. And I was talking about boats, I said there are 1,000 longliners, and I will wager 10 per cent of them, 100 are less than two or three years old, and all the rest are older than that, and many of them I suspect are ten and fifteen years old, and should be replaced. The ninety offshore trawlers, ninety of them, what? half of them are ten years old? My friend from Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor) manned a trawler fleet for a number of years, is that a good guess? Maybe half the trawlers in this Province are ten years old?

MR. J. WINSOR: More than that.

MR. ROBERTS: The first ones built at Marystown are ten years old now.

MR. P. CANNING: Over half of them.

MR. ROBERTS: You know, what plans exist? The twenty trawler plans was not a bad idea. I do not know why the government did not carry through with it. Think where we would be today if we had even ten trawlers available to send out instead of having to go to charter foreign ships. You know, there is fish out there. I know the Gulf is restricted now in redfish, and the management plan is, you know, a painful one. It may be inescapably painful, I do not know. But where would we be if we had ships? It is not a bad plan. It had problems, I know it had weaknesses. I know the Premier got advice from many people not to go through with it, presumably that is why he did not go through with it. But for once the Premier was on the right track. What are we going to do with our vessels? You cannot get longliners now. We are not even building enough, I say to my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), to replace the ones that are lost each year

Mr. Roberts:

or worn out.

Where are you going to get the money? A longliner now is \$100,000 or \$200,000. No fisherman can afford it. I know the minister has set up a committee again, we have got committees in everything, and if the minister had his way the ten commandments would not have been brought down from the mountain, instead we would have had a committee come down from the mountain to give us the ten commandments, and we would never get them, we would have had three and a quarter.

AN HON. MEMBER: We would go up but not come down.

MR. ROBERTS: What are we going to do to get our fishermen into new gear? A half cent a pound is not the answer. A laudible idea. It is a different way to do it, divide up \$1.5 million. But I have not found a fisherman yet who thinks it is the answer. They welcome it, sure. I would welcome it, too. But I have not found anybody who thinks it is an answer. You know, you go through the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, our fisheries policy as a province, and there is no policy. We are getting the same trite, tired, trashy, old statements in the Throne Speech saying reprocessing. What have they done to further repossessing? Five years ago we were promised it. There have been even a pilot programme on it, an experimental programme.

AN HON. MEMBER: Admiral's Beach.

MR. ROBERTS: No, not to reprocess, Admiral's Beach was a filleting plant, a nice, lovely little plant down there. It does not create any more jobs, all it does, is they are there in Admiral's Beach instead of somewhere else, Harbour Grace, wherever that fish is taken. And if it improves the quality of fish then good. That is obviously an essential thing.

But five years ago we were promised further - I read the words, I forget them, I will find them if you want, They are here somewhere - further processing was the great breakthrough. Oh the

Mr. Roberts:

Premier used to get up and wax eloquent; there was not going to be a piece of breaded fish in North America that had ever swam in our waters that did not get its coating of bread here in our own shores before it went off to be eaten in the Boston states.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: I think the industry have made some progress, but I do not think the government have done anything to help them one way or the other. And we are going to talk of loans, and additional capital. What additional capital? What new capital have come into the fisheries in this Province in the last five years? Atlantic Sugar gave up, Fishery Products took it over. And whatever that is that is not new capital. The government hold a 40 per cent share in Fishery Products, and all that happened was the lease was transferred from one firm to another, the buy-back lease.

AN HON. MEMBER: B.C. Packers -

MR. ROBERTS: B. C. Packers gave it up on Harbour Breton, and are going. The Nelpack interests gave up in Isle aux Morts, and they are owned by Westons, by George Weston -

MR. NEARY: The same owners.

MR. ROBERTS: And another arm of the corporate empire, the Weston Empire the Connor Brothers plant, is it? in New Brunswick, their operation, which is owned by Westons as much as Loblaws are or all the other things.

AN HON. MEMBER: Burnt Islands.

MR. ROBERTS: Burnt Island? No I do not think Westons owned the Burnt Islands.

MR. ROBERTS:

But the fact remains that it is not new capital coming into the business.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why did they give up then?

MR. ROBERTS: Why did they give up? I think they just moved it from one corporate arm to the other. I am told it was a tax loss situation.

MR. NEARY: A marriage of convenience, that is all.

MR. ROBERTS: It was a tax loss situation, I am told. Now I do not really know. I can assure the hon. gentleman I am not privy to the Weston or any other corporate empire's secrets. But I mean both firms are owned by the Weston empire, the Garfield Weston-is it? - empire.

DR. FARRELL: Why did they stop processing?

MR. ROBERTS: I did not say they stopped processing.

MR. NEARY: They wanted to use the plant, I suppose, for another loan from the government under a different company.

MR. ROBERTS: But the point is, you know, I am trying to establish whether any new capital has come into the fisheries in this Province. Perhaps the Minister of Fisheries will be kind enough to tell us, or the Premier. What are the government doing to attract new capital? I have not heard of any new capital coming in. I have heard of capital going out. I have heard of firms giving up and going. Booth have put a big expansion in Fortune down in Grand Bank district. That did not result in a lot of capital from them. Most of that came from DREE, the federal government, one way or another.

Mr. Speaker, the record in fisheries has been dismal and dull and dreary. I hope the present minister can reverse that. I encourage him to do it. I plead with him to do it. I welcome him doing it. If he can do what all of his colleagues have not been able to do, then more power to him. And I would be the very first to say so, the very first.

MR. RIDEOUT: You forgot the other Minister of Fisheries, The Minister of Transportation was going to put the plant down in Old Perlican.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh yes, I had forgotten that. Maybe the minister when he speaks can deal with that. I would like to know about the plant in Old Perlican, the Minister of Transportation announced; when that will be started, when the sod will be turned and when it will be starting and all the things about it. Because as I recall it the Minister of Transportation-did he not take a helicopter and an executive assistant down -

MR. NEARY: On a Sunday afternoon.

MR. ROBERTS: - on a Sunday afternoon and went down to Old Perlican and - I am not sure if he made the announcement there or if the announcement was made in The Daily News.

MR. SIMMONS: Went down to see his friend.

MR. ROBERTS: Has he got a friend in Old Perlican?

MR. MORGAN: I think so.

MR. ROBERTS: Have you got a friend there?

MR. SIMMONS: He is a bit cuter.

MR. ROBERTS: But in any event he went down there.

AN HON. MEMBER: The second member.

MR. ROBERTS: No, the ex-member. The people of Old Perlican turned down there previous member. Indeed the member who was there, I would remind the Premier, had to be shuttled up to go down before the gentleman for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons). That was one of the benefits of redistribution.

AN HON. MEMBER: The leadership thing.

MR. ROBERTS: The leadership thing, I am delighted. We are going to have a leadership campaign but ours is open, unlike what the Premier's colleagues are doing to him all the time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying I wish the Minister of Fisheries when he speaks, as hopefully he will in this debate - I mean,

MR. ROBERTS:

I will shut up in due course and let him get on and his colleague over here, the gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), who is trying to recapture the parliamentary reputation which he had before he came into this House. But I want the minister please to tell us, you know, when the plant is going to start because, as I recall it, the Minister of Transportation, there were no ifs or ands, it was categorical. He announced it. We all thought it was somewhat unusual. We thought the minister should have at least been told about it in advance and given -

AN HON. MEMBER: DREE turned it down.

MR. ROBERTS: DREE turned down the application the Minister of Transportation announced.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. ROBERTS: No, that is what I - we will deal, if you wish, with the Alec Moores one in due course. But I am talking not about Mr. Alec Moores. I am talking about the one that the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) announced on one of his visits.

MR. NEARY: It involved Connor Brothers of Canada.

MR. ROBERTS: Quite possibly. I mean it involved some other people too who have since found other diversions for their time. But I mean it was somewhat unusual because to begin with the Minister of Transportation - there might be three reasons why the Minister of Transportation would go there: One was, it was his portfolio. Well I mean he might as well worry about fisheries because his record on roads is dismal. We will deal with that in due course.

The second might be that he ran there. Well he has run a number of places. He ran for the nomination in Bonavista North back in 1971, and the present member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) and the gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) had a bit of a tussle which was not carried out in the dark of night. It got quite public. But he has never to my knowledge even sought the nomination in whatever constituency the town of Old Perlican was contained in. It cannot be that reason.

MR. ROBERTS:

Was he born there? No. He first saw light, if that is the phrase, or drew breath - I do not think he has seen the light yet - on Flat Islands out in Bonavista Bay, which I guess is probably in the Bonavista North constituency although I have not checked the map. There is nobody living there right now.

Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: He is taking on Joe Clark now.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh he is taking on Joe Clark now, is he? Well, somebody has. I mean you have heard of the new Tory leadership convention. They are going to have a circle and fire in.

MR. NEARY: Think of the damage he is doing on PEI.

MR. ROBERTS: What is that? I did not hear that one.

MR. NEARY: Is the Premier going to recall him from PEI before he does any more damage?

MR. ROBERTS: You know the Minister of Transportation in the old days, you know, when Mr. Crosbie was there, was not allowed to go to Ottawa without Mr. Crosbie going with him.

MR. SIMMONS: Well let us face it. It is better than having him here.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Government House Leader in his munificence wants to call it six o'clock. I may be a quarter through my preliminary remarks here. The problem is I say to the House Leader, he may not have been here at the time, that his colleague from Bay Of Islands, who is the new intellectual giant on the Tory side, has replaced Mr. Crosbie, as the driving force in the administration, has - well I mean we have come ahead. We are making progress, that he invited me to speak for three or four days and the more I think of it the more I think it may be a good idea. My colleague now may desert en masse, other things to do -

MR. SIMMONS: Either you or him.

MR. ROBERTS: Well my colleagues say if it is either me or the gentleman from Bay of Islands they would just as soon have me. I am grateful gentlemen, grateful, grateful.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, if the House Leader prefers, I shall call it six o'clock and we can adjourn to whatever hour he may be able to persuade the House to adjourn to. The rules say three o'clock tomorrow, and then we will come back and deal with whatever business the government wants. And I have a few more thoughts for the Minister of Fisheries and then one or two other subjects, joint ventures, a few things I would like to touch upon in this brief introduction to the affairs of the Province as we see them. So I shall move the adjournment if that is in order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: MR. Speaker, with the consent of hon. members I move that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred and that this hon. House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Tuesday, at two o'clock.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: This of course requires unanimous consent because it is a change in Standing Orders, and I am prepared to consent if we can have an understanding the House is not to meet tomorrow night. I think the feeling on our side is that it is very early to get into night sessions. Now if the government are going to go into night sessions -

MR. J. NOLAN: They want to get the House closed.

MR. ROBERTS: - and to my knowledge there has been no consultation between the House leaders on this, if the government feel we must go into night sessions this early on then perhaps we should not come here until three tomorrow. But if we are meeting from two until six then I for one will agree.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is true that I have not discussed it with the hon. the House Leader, but the hon. gentlemen, the Leader of the Opposition and I have discussed it and I have indicated to him I would like, I would hope, that we could commence sittings as appeared to be very satisfactory last year, sitting at two in the afternoons, opening at two on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and then Fridays at ten o'clock and Wednesday, Private Members' Day, at three. And I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition that it needs unanimous consent, if we do not have unanimous consent we do not have it and we can go back to three o'clock.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that the business of the House could be very expeditiously carried out and hon. gentlemen accommodated by sitting the hours that we sat last session. But, you know, if we have not got the unanimous consent then it is until three o'clock tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared, like the Leader of the Opposition, Sir, to give the government consent for the House to meet from two until six and even if the government saw fit to have the House meet in the mornings I would not object to that, but Sir to meet two nights a week starting off the sitting I think is -

MR. ROBERTS: We did not start off with it last year.

MR. NEARY: We did not start off with it last year, and another thing, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to let the Government House Leader suggest and try to get it passed that the House meet two o'clock every other day except Private Members' Day. If we are going to meet at two o'clock, we meet at two o'clock on Private Members' Day also, and I will not give my consent unless the government agrees to that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! What I need to know now is what motion with respect to adjournment is before the Chair.

MR. HICKMAN: The motion before the Chair, Mr. Speaker, is that this House do adjourn until two o'clock tomorrow.

MR. ROBERTS: That is not a proper motion, Sir, because I for one will object and I suspect some of my colleagues would too unless the government are prepared to indicate that we will meet two to six and not two to six and eight to eleven. If we are going to have an evening session the only way we can object, Mr. Speaker, the only way we could object is to signify by refusing consent. I am quite prepared to have us sit two to six -

MR. FLIGHT: Tuesdays and Thursdays.

MR. ROBERTS: - if we can do without the nights. I do not think it is necessary this early on. I do not think there is any business before the House to justify it and I do not think it would help the spirit of co-operation across the House, and when the House Leader indicated to me the government's plans he will agree that I objected thereto.

MR. FLIGHT: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. FLIGHT: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I draw the House's attention to the fact that we have been listening for weeks and weeks and weeks as to why is this House not open to debate the great issues that are before this Province and we come and we ask to sit two nights a week, and where are the issues now?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Where are the great issues now?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Where are the great issues now, Mr. Speaker? I therefore move -

PREMIER MOORES: Three hours.

MR. HICKMAN: - that as the sense of urgency -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: - is no longer on the Opposition benches that this House adjourn until tomorrow at 3:00 o'clock.

PREMIER MOORES: Right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is it possible to amend the -

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. NEARY: - member's motion, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: No.

MR. NEARY: Because I would like to amend it that we meet at 10:00 o'clock until 1:00 o'clock, and from 2:00 o'clock until 6:00 o'clock, and 2:00 o'clock on Private Members' Day.

PREMIER MOORES: No, no, no. Do not play politics now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The motion to adjourn is not amendable. It has been moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at 3:00 P.M. Those in favour "Aye",

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour "Aye".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the "Nayes" have it.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 8, at 3:00 P.M.