

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

House of Assembly

For the period:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

February 8, 1977

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, there have been three industrial accidents at Labrador City causing deaths during the past two weeks. This is indeed regrettable and of great concern to government, and, in my opinion, warrants a full enquiry. The Industrial Accidents Enquiries Act, Chapter 165 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland provide that where it appears to the Attorney General that an accident involving loss of life or bodily injury is of sufficient importance to require a formal investigation of the accident and of its causes and circumstances, the Attorney General may by order direct such investigation to be held. The act also provides that the Attorney General may appoint a competent person to hold such investigation and may appoint any person possessing legal, medical and special knowledge to act as assessor in holding the investigation.

I wish to inform this hon. House that pursuant to the provisions of the Industrial Accidents Enquiries Act, I will, at the earliest possible date, appoint a competent person to hold an enquiry into these three fatalities. It seems clear to me that the Industrial Accidents Enquiries Act envisages a full enquiry in this type of case which will be a public enquiry with the commissioner having very broad powers of investigation. I have reached this conclusion after consultation with my colleagues, the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, as well as the Director of Public Prosecutions. I hope to be in a position to announce the name of the commissioner so appointed to conduct such enquiry within one week.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we on this side welcome the announcement of the government's decision. We have all read with regret of the three separate accidents which have claimed lives. It is a matter of great regret that all three have occurred within the one industrial operation, the Iron Ore Company of Canada's operation at Labrador City. There has obviously been considerable public pressure, and pressure from the union, to have an enquiry into the circumstances of these three accidents. And I would hope as well - or let me deal with that. The government have made the right response by undertaking to have this enquiry carried out. I can only say that I hope the commissioner is appointed quickly. I hope he holds his hearings quickly after his appointment, and that his report is presented quickly. These, I realize, are not matters within the control of government. All the government can do is appoint a commissioner. But I would hope that in appointing a man or a woman to carry out this task that they would ask - I think it is a proper thing to ask of a commissioner - ask indeed before his appointment to get an assurance that he or she, as the case may be, will meet quickly with those concerned, will undertake the enquiry quickly to expedite it, and then get us a report. Because it is obvious that there is a great deal of public concern. In fact this morning's issue of The Daily News has in it a story quoting - I am not sure if it quotes a gentleman by name - but quoting union sources within the Steelworkers Local that represents the men at this operation saying, "They want the whole operation closed down because of this." Well that obviously is not, to my knowledge, justified. I do not see any case for it at this stage, but it is obvious that we must have a quick investigation. That operation over the years, I think, has been relatively safe. I am not aware of very many fatalities. It has had a very good record. And all of a sudden they have three within a period of - what? - ten days, a fortnight.

MR. NEARY: Ten days.

MR. ROBERTS: Ten days. I mean it

MR. ROBERTS:

may or may not indicate something seriously wrong. It certainly is extremely unfortunate. If there is some serious problem with the administration or the operation of the Labrador iron ore, the IOCC operation at Labrador City, then it should be made public speedily.

So really all we say is that the investigation should begin quickly. I hope it will not be restricted to simply the circumstances surrounding the deaths of these three gentlemen, that it will be a broader one in looking into at least the whole IOCC operation and possibly even the Wabush Mines operation just across the lake which is so similar to the IOCC operation that really if there is a problem with one, the odds are the same problem occurs at the other. But we welcome it. I hope the commissioner will be appointed quickly and I hope the report will be brought down speedily.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further ministerial statements?

The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain how my department is planning to carry out its share of the special job creation programme that was announced in the Throne Speech. The House is aware that \$2 million has been provided for this purpose and of that amount \$702,000 has been allocated to the Department of Social Services. This money will be spent by my department on jobs for able-bodied social assistance recipients. This means that there will be an immediate saving in social assistance expenditures for every person we put to work.

Specifically our plans call for undertaking twenty-seven labour-intensive community development projects in various parts of the Province. These projects will be relatively small and thus easily manageable. Each project will employ an average of fifteen persons. In total we plan to create approximately 400 jobs. As indicated this will result in a corresponding reduction in our able-bodied social assistance case load. These projects are already planned and work on

MR. BRETT:

them will commence almost immediately.

Many of the projects will have lasting value to individuals in communities. For example, repairs to houses, and somebody has written here, improved fishing facilities. That is a very poor example. Actually we only have I think it is two very small projects in this respect and it is only where our own Department of Fisheries or the federal government could not or would not get involved.

Sir, I will be the first to concede that this effort in job creation is not a cure-all for the whole unemployment problem in the Province. But at least it is a positive step in the right direction. By employing social assistance recipients we are striking at the most stubborn aspect of the problem.

MR. NEARY: Where is the money coming from to provide the employment?

MR. BRETT: Sir, there are several distinct advantages to be gained by allocating job creation money to a Social Service Department. I have already mentioned the most important advantage. It is namely the provision of gainful employment to able-bodied social assistance recipients. While this fact alone almost justifies the expenditure, there are a number of beneficial side effects which should not be overlooked. For example, many of those who will be employed will be given hope and incentive from the work experience and will go on from there to other jobs. We know from experience that this is what happens when these people are given a chance.

As a matter of interest we have observed as a result of our employment opportunities programme that approximately one-half of those who participate in these projects move on from there to independence and do not come back on the welfare rolls.

From the beginning of our employment opportunities programme there has been a steady decrease in the number of cases of able-bodied social assistance. For example, in December, 1971 - that is before this government came to power - there were 9,206 able-bodied social assistance cases on our payroll and in the intervening

MR. BRETT:

five years we have cut this in half. For example, in December of 1976 we had a total of 5,196 cases.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BRETT: If I may, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BRETT: This is not supposed to be a debate. I do not want to explain it here but I am sure I will get the opportunity to explain it at a later date. I am not suggesting and neither is anyone over here that we have taken 5,000 people off the welfare roll and that we have never seen them since. This is not what we are saying. But

Mr. Brett:

what we are saying in effect is that we have been responsible for putting at least 5,000, maybe more, people into jobs such as LIP and so on that would never have been there but for our effort.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: For this very reason, that nobody ever went out to try to get these people to work. I am not suggesting that we created the jobs, but I am suggesting that we got them to go to work. That is what I am saying, and this is what we are saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BRETT: Sir, let me digress for a minute to tell you a little -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order! The procedure under Ministerial Statements is being somewhat strained, and the hon. minister should obviously stick to his statement of government policy, and there should really be no interruptions, and any hon. member entitled to speak thereafter of course have to abide by the same rules.

The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: Okay, Sir, let me digress for a minute to tell you a little about our Employment Opportunities Division which was set up in the Department of Social Services when this government took office. The division is small by comparison with some of the big money spending divisions in the department; in fact, it is a money saver. And its mission is the vocational rehabilitation of abled-bodied social assistance recipients. And the House will be interested to know that, as I said before, something like 5,000 recipients have been placed in gainful employment and/or in training and upgrading through the efforts of this particular division. And of course the division works hand-in-glove with the field social workers who refer the people and provide support and encouragement to the man and to the family in keeping them on the job. And in short, Sir, it is a team effort, and a truly worth-while social service.

Let me now mention another advantage in allocating job creation money to social services. Very little of it is spend on administration and heavy equipment. Actually the planning and the oversight of the projects will be carried out by the permanent

Mr. Brett:

staff of my department, mainly by our special project's officers, and we have five of them attached to regional offices across the Province. These special project officers are fully occupied with creating employment opportunities for social assistance recipients. And we also have our own accounting and our own payroll staff to handle this type of work.

Sir, later on in the session I hope to tell the House more about the plans of the department for this kind of endeavour, this special kind of endeavour, during the coming fiscal year. As for the projects, Sir, they will be tabled in the House hopefully tomorrow. I found out today that maybe one or two of them could overlap with LIP, and we were not aware of this when we started. We checked very thoroughly with LIP, because we did not want this to happen. But we found out today that one or two of them may have overlapped and we have to correct that.

Also we have some funds for Labrador. And for obvious reasons the projects have not been named as yet. There are also one or two projects in the East Coast that have not been named. So the list is not actually complete right now, but it should be by tomorrow or at least before Friday, and I will table it in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear. hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: I am not allowed to debate the minister's statement so I shall not, although I must say it is unfair, and I venture to suggest improper, in the best sense of that word, of the minister to try and sneak in a statement that is a form of debate in a procedure where we are not allowed to debate it.

However, I have a few minutes left in the Throne Speech, my talks on the Throne Speech debate, and so I shall have an opportunity to expose some of the fallacies in the minister's statement. I shall deal with it there at some length, because I think his statement, while I accept the words he uses as being correct and

Mr. Roberts:

accurate, of course, his statement is misleading, inaccurate, I cannot say malicious, mischievous I think I am allowed to say within the rules. And I suggest an example of the fact that this 500 job programme we have talked about is no programme at all. All he is doing here is taking 400 people off the social assistance roles and putting them to work, if they get \$100 a week, they only get eighteen weeks work each.

MR. BRETT: Are you against that?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am against any policy that does not represent a proper job creation programme. I will deal with the minister a little later at some length, and then we will have an opportunity to debate it. All I want to say now is that I think his statement, while it is welcome, and any job is a welcome one, that his announcement of programme is incomplete, mischievous, misleading and, I think, it is somewhat cowardly in the parliamentary sense of him to make it as a ministerial statement when he cannot debate it, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the residents of the community of Kippens in the district of Port au Port.

The prayer of the petition is as follows: "We the undersigned residents of the community of Kippens in the district of Port au Port, beg that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador take immediate steps to provide a water and sewer system for the community of Kippens, and furthermore we request that immediate and short term action be taken to alleviate the distress of those families in Kippens who are completely without water at present."

Mr. Speaker, the petition is signed by 486 residents of the area, all, I believe, who are of voting age. The historic community of Kippens is one of the largest communities in the Province at the present time without water or without a sewer system. The community has experienced a rapid growth in the past three years as it borders on the town of Stephenville and has grown in a similar fashion as has Stephenville. It is also a natural growth area and it has suitable land. Many people who have arrived in Bay St. George, newcomers to Bay St. George, and people who lived in Bay St. George before, have moved to this area and have built their homes there. I believe it is certain that the community will continue to grow in the future because it is an area which is admirably suitable to develop in the Stephenville area.

The conditions that people must endure because of the lack of water and sewer in the area is both cruel and tragic. During the past two Summers some residents of the community have had to bring water to their homes by truck from nearby Romaines River. The community is quite a long one and that entails, sometimes, bringing water

MR. HODDER: as much as three miles. Others have spent hundreds and in some cases thousands of dollars drilling artesian wells and have not been able to get any water because of the type of soil and the type of rock in the area. There are other residents of which I have personal experience who are getting their water from a local brook which is situated near an asphalt plant and I have been in homes in the district where people have their wells in the basement and with people living behind them I do fear, Mr. Speaker, that there will be a health problem in the area.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that those conditions can continue to exist in a modern community in this day and age. An engineering study was carried out prior to the last election. I believe it was done by Alexander Engineering.

MR. ROBERTS: Right.

MR. HODDER: But nothing has been done about it since even though there has been pressure from the community in question. I am told by people who know more than I do that the water level in the area has decreased because of new construction and many surface wells. There have been two public meetings recently; one was called by a concerned citizen and that led to this petition. And as well, the public meeting which was held to elect a new council, there were some 200 people there who made their feelings quite clear that they feel as I feel that this is a major step for a community but that they are prepared to do everything that they possibly can to get water and sewer and to co-operate in any way that they can.

The people are upset. They are very upset, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that they are upset and rightly so. I do hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs will hear their plea and I ask that the petition be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition as presented by the member for Port au Port, and I am fully aware that there is a water and sewer problem in Kippens as well as there are in a lot of other communities throughout Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, while we hear a lot about government cutbacks and so on, and we are generally sympathetic with that, but we must remember that there is a serious water situation in many communities in Newfoundland. And Kippens is one of those communities. I have several in my own district and I suspect that there are eight or ten members on the other side who probably have problems in their districts.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: Yesterday, Your Honour ruled and very properly so that under the rules governing the presentation of petitions, that any hon. gentleman must confine his remarks in supporting such petitions to the material allegation contained therein and cannot under any circumstances enter upon any debate. And I do suggest that the hon. gentleman from Lewisporte is doing just that at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman who leads the House on the government side is falling into the error of all House Leaders in trying to restrict debate. My friend from Lewisporte was not entering into debate. He was speaking in support of the petition presented by the gentlemen from Port au Port, and in speaking to the material allegations contained in that petition, which I submit have to do with the desirability and the necessity of providing water and sewer systems to the residents of Kippens, was drawing an analogy. I do not know what point he was attempting to make. He had not the opportunity to tell us before the House Leader arbitrarily and almost arrogantly intervened in an attempt to cut him off and restrict his remarks. My colleague was simply, the gentleman from Lewisporte was simply making an analogy to support

MR. ROBERTS: his support of the material allegations in the petition. And I would say further, Mr. Speaker, that if we are, every time we are to have a petition presented, if we are to have this kind of exhibition by the Government House Leader then, Sir, the entire process of presenting petitions will be immeasurably slowed up. Your Honour made quite a clear ruling yesterday which said that we are not to debate petitions. If there is any debate on a petition, I am sure Your Honour will not hesitate, under Your Honour's general authority and plenary jurisdiction to enforce the rules, and not hesitate to interrupt a member and say, "I will remind the hon. gentleman that debate is not permitted!"

If we are to have these points of order, which are really only brought up by the government House Leader in an attempt to harass people, Sir, All it does is delay the matters of the House, and I would suggest my colleague from Lewisporte was completely in order. He had said nothing that was in the least bit offensive or out of order and he should be allowed to proceed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear !

MR. HICKMAN: If I may respond to the imputation of false and unavowed motives by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, toward the hon. House Leader -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: -may I say without any that this is not a attempt to stifle debate. Rule 97 says clearly " There shall be no debate on a petition" That debate was not made by the government House Leader. And I submit to Your Honour that any hon. gentleman in this House has a duty to call to the attention of the Chair any straying or breach from or breach of the rules. What I, as the government House Leader would like to see is the presentation of the petitions to this House expeditiously, clearly and with very firm and clear reference to the material allegations contained in such petition. That is all that I ask.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear one further submission and then I should be in a position to make a ruling.

MR. ROBERTS: I made no allegations of any faults or unavowed motives in respect to the government House Leader. I made a statement as to what his clear motivation was. I did not say attempting to stifle debate, because if the House Leader would think for a moment, Sir, the whole point of this, if there is a point, is that you may not debate a petition. And for once he should have attempted to stifle debate. I said that he is attempting to harass the hon. gentleman opposite who are doing their duty, and presenting a petition according to the rules. Your Honour yesterday, the first occasion, I guess, that petitions have been presented in this session, made quite a clear and straightforward ruling that said we are not allowed to debate petitions. Well that is fine, we accept that. But, Sir, we are certainly allowed to support a petition according to the rules of this chamber, this House, and in supporting the petition, surely it is not the least bit improper to make an analogy, to refer to the fact that this may not be the only such need in this province. This, Sir, is a practice that is hallowed by tradition, it has been hallowed by the precedents in the House. And all I can say that is if the hon. gentleman opposite does not particularly like the way in which we carry out our duties, as long as they are subject to the rules of the House, Sir, I say to him, "Tough!" And he can go look elsewhere. Let him discipline his own members, let him discipline the Minister of Social Service for abusing the Ministerial Statement before he attempts to lecture us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: There are two matters referred to in argument on this point of order which are quite clear. One is what the rules are with respect to petitions. That is very clear. Standing Order 97, there shall be no debate. Standing Order 92, a member speaking in support must confine himself to a statement of the parties, that is the petitioners, the number of signatures or the material allegations. All of that is clear. It is also clear that any hon. member does have the right and under certain circumstances perhaps a duty to draw to the attention of the Chair his opinion that there has been a breach of order.

With respect to the actual comments of the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) as I recall them, a few minutes have transpired, he was speaking on the request of the people of Kippens for water and the need for a water supply in Kippens and was referring to the fact that there were other areas in the Province as well in various districts which also had such a need. That type of reference I would not rule to be out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman's words would develop a speech criticizing the government's financial policy for not making enough money available for water services or related issues, although related they would not be part of a material allegation of a petition. But to the extent that he did speak, I am not aware of any matters which would be ruled out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did rise to support the petition of the member for Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder) with regard to the request of the people in Kippens and I did refer to similar problems around Newfoundland. And what I was going to do, Mr. Speaker, was make a suggestion to the government ministers, those who are concerned about water and sewer, and that is that I think that during this session we have to talk about water

MR. WHITE: and sewer quite a bit and I think that we should look in terms of getting away from the old system of multi-million dollar water and sewer systems. And it is about time that we looked at some kind of cheaper method and maybe an extension of the Water Services Division which I think is one of the best divisions that has been set up in the Department of Municipal Affairs, and that is basically what I wanted to say.

In supporting the petition on behalf of the people from Kippens, I would like to say that we as a group should put our heads together and see if there is not some other way we can develop water, at least proper water facilities, for people because there is an urgent need for that throughout Newfoundland without getting into the expense of systems that we have seen throughout the years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Well supported. Well supported.

MR. SPEAKER: I presume both hon. gentlemen are rising on the petition presently under consideration? If so I will hear the hon. member for Bay of Islands followed by the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I want to give my full hearted support to the petition presented by the member for Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder), primarily for the reason that I come from a district primarily rural and one of my top priorities has been and will be as long as I am in this hon. House, to have water brought to every home in the district. There are many places in fact in Newfoundland, and even in the Bay of Islands district, where people cannot find a clean sample of water in the summertime. And for that matter throughout the whole year.

So I not only support the petition from the member for Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder) but I also support what the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) said, I think it is time for

MR. WOODROW: us to get away from the multi-million dollar programmes, and get down to something that is, say, modest and something that is going to bring a good water supply to all the people of the Province and I think all of us in this hon. House should be concerned about this, especially those of us who come from the rural areas of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, very briefly I rise to support the petition from the member for Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder) and to certainly agree with the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White), and also our hon. friend opposite.

There seems to be something in this Province that happens from the time you get a piece of raw land and until the time you get water and sewer services into a home, and the former Minister of Municipal Affairs and I have certainly discussed this privately in the past. For example, when the land was bought, raw land at very, very low price for the Newtown in

Mr. Nolan.

in St. John's West, it was bought at a very, very low price. But look what happened in the interim because of the installation of services. Now there are gentlemen of good will and some knowledge on the opposite side of this House who know what I am saying is true, and not only that, but some who have had some personal experience, who have actually worked in certain areas. And I think that it is neglect on our part if we do not apply ourselves to this problem. We are very suspect, very suspect, all of us in this House, because of what happens from the time a developer buys a piece of land, until the time some poor, unfortunate devil moves in and is mortgaged for the rest of his life.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I do believe the hon. gentleman inspeaking on the costs of servicing land, the matter has strayed from the allegation of the petition, which is with reference to the provision of water for Kippens, and by analogy certainly a reference to other places, but really not on the acquisition or servicing of land or the cost of land.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: As one of the spokesmen in this hon. House for Western Newfoundland, it gives me great pleasure, Sir, to support the prayer of the petition presented by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder). The member, Sir, made an excellent presentation. He made a very strong plea on behalf of his constituents who applied their signatures to the petition. And I believe, Sir, that all hon. members of the House, according to the discussion that followed, were impressed with the presentation and the need for this project. We have heard a number of suggestions, Mr. Speaker, and concern probably on the part of members as to how this project and other projects can be financed in these inflationary times. Well, Sir, I have a suggestion to throw out to the members of the hon. House, and that is, Sir, that we have now in this Province for the first time a job creation programme, and

Mr. Neary.

we have the federal job creation programmes, the federal works programme, and the young Canada Works programme, and the federal works programme is now going to be on a year round basis to take the place of LIP. And I do not see, Mr. Speaker, why this Province could not join with the Government of Canada in joint ventures of this kind for installing water and sewerage.- I am not talking about the fisheries - joint ventures in installing water and sewerage, especially drinking water, Sir, in the rural parts of this Province.

And the other point I want to make before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, is that it seems to me that a lot of these requests are coming from Western Newfoundland, which must be obvious to the House that a lot of the communities in Western Newfoundland, in the rural areas and Bay of Islands - my hon. friend just mentioned them - and down in Port au Port, Stephenville, down in my own district, where you have the smaller communities, they have been overshadowed in the last fifteen or twenty years by the larger communities, and I think it is about time now that, if we have any money to spend, if we can do some of these projects, that they should be done in Western Newfoundland and in Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MRS. MACISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) for a water and sewerage system for the community of Kippens. Kippens is a steadily expanding area, and for health reasons, as well as convenience reasons, I feel that this community should have a proper water and sewer system. Water and sewer in this day and age is certainly not a luxury.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. MACISAAC: The people of Kippens and the people of my district, where I have at least twenty-three communities who are hauling water from brooks and streams and wherever possible, I think it is time that this hon. House took a look at the water situation right across the Province. There are very, very few communities that have complete systems. And there are an enormous number of communities

Mrs. MacIssac.

who have no water whatsoever, other than what is hauled, as I said, from brooks, streams and other communities, from council offices who have put a hose outside for the convenience of surrounding communities. And I do not think that in this day and age that this should be considered a luxury. And I fully support the petition presented by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, I have another petition. I think this one has been well supported. If there is nobody else who wishes to speak in respect of the one which my colleague from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) presented, I think enough of us have spoken to indicate the feeling of all of us, Sir. Did the minister wish to speak on that? He has been conspicuous by his absence.

Mr. Speaker, the petition I wish to present is one which is from the citizens of Goose Cove which municipally is known as Goose Cove East. But since there are only one or two families living in Goose Cove West the whole area is now called Goose Cove. It relates to transportation. I am sorry the minister has not returned from Prince Edward Island where he has been apparently achieving great things, we are told. I guess he will be back because I sent him a copy of the petition when I got it eight or ten days ago, and I had hoped he would be able to respond.

But in any event, Sir, let me present the petition. I think it is summed up by the typed portion of it. "We the undersigned residents of Goose Cove are dissatisfied with the snow clearing service on the road between St. Anthony and Goose Cove, especially the road through the community. The road has been impassable for almost two weeks and seven to eight foot snow cuts are making crossings in the community almost impossible. This is especially dangerous for children walking to school. Road conditions of this nature are also interfering with oil delivery services, mail service, telephone and hydro power services and causing many other inconveniences. We would like to see this service improved to the point where these other essential services are not disrupted." - It is signed, Sir, by approximately 150 residents of the community and that would be just about every citizen in Goose Cove of the age of eighteen years or older.

I support the petition, Sir. The particular problem on the day or two in question that led to this petition has been resolved. But

MR. ROBERTS:

the general problem is still there, Sir. We have had a lot of snow in Northern Newfoundland this Winter, much more so than the last few Winters. In fact the last few Winters have really been quite mild, particularly in the sense of snowfall. The snow clearing facilities have been improved. For example, there is now a second snowblower in the area where formally there was only one. Snowblowers are really the essential piece of equipment, Sir, because a bulldozer and the other type of machinery used to clear snow can only push snow a certain height. When you get the types of snowfalls that we have been experiencing in the North these last few weeks, and you get banks of snow seven or eight feet high, then the only alternative is to supply a snowblower which can blow the snow up and over and keep the roads open.

But, Sir, even with the difficulties that are encountered because of the fact we have had additional snowfall, the fact remains, Sir, that the opening of roads and the maintaining of roads in drivable condition is absolutely essential. I do not need to go through all of the reasons. They have been well rehearsed in the House in the past. But let me say that in the type of civilization, the type of life we have today if the road is closed for a day or two or three in a community in Northern Newfoundland or in Southern Labrador it has exactly the same effect as if the roads here in St. John's are closed for a day or two or three. The whole of life is seriously inconvenienced. If it is closed much longer, people experience very great difficulty as well as inconvenience.

One fact which may show the type of snowfall that has been experienced this year, Mr. Speaker, is that the schools in my district - up until the first of January, the Christmas break, had already been closed for more days because of weather than they had in the whole of last Winter or the whole of the Winter before. In fact the schools in St. Anthony are closed again today, Sir, because of the weather conditions.

MR. ROBERTS:

So in presenting the petition I regret the minister is not here to respond to it. The government have made some response but I say, Sir, that the response is not adequate. It is an improvement but it is still not an adequate response and I would hope, Sir, that the government in considering this petition will agree to put still further equipment in the area. It is needed and I think, Sir, it is justified.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the petition presented by the Leader of the Opposition on behalf of his constituents in Goose Cove on the Great Northern Peninsula. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that over the past several weeks members, especially members who represent districts in the Western part of the Province and on the Great Northern Peninsula have received - and my hon. friend, the member for St. Georges (Mrs. MacIsaac) can vouch for this - have received numerous complaints in connection with snow clearing in Western Newfoundland and on the Great Northern Peninsula.

The main reason, Mr. Speaker, for the complaints are the obsolete equipment, the equipment, say, west of Grand Falls that is obsolete and should be taken out to the scrap pile. I have seen some of this equipment, Mr. Speaker. I have seen trucks that are practically rusted out and falling on the ground. They cannot even get them started to go out to put salt on the icy roads. I am seen graders twenty years old. It is a miracle that the operators can keep them moving at all.

MR. NEARY:

I brought this matter up with the Minister of Transportation and Communications on two or three occasions, Sir, and was told by the minister that he was in the process of moving new equipment down the Great Northern Peninsula, in the area that my friend spoke about in the petition, and in Western Newfoundland generally.

But, Sir, the irony of all it all is this, that out in the Western part of the Province where you had the most snow, you have the worst equipment. You have obsolete equipment. And on the East Coast, where you had very little or no snow this Winter, you had all new equipment.

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

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

MR. HICKMAN: On a point of order. The hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) most assuredly is offending against Your Honour's ruling about twenty minutes ago with respect to debate on petitions. This is not at all associated with the petition that is presently before this hon. House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Goose Cove East.

MR. HICKMAN: Which is Goose Cove.

MR. SPEAKER: On this particular point of order, certainly the allegation in the petition related to or concerned the desire, the necessity of keeping the road open in Winter between point A and point B. And any comments in support of the petition must be on the need to keep this road open, and by some comparison, roads by comparison. Certainly a reference to the condition of the machinery which is suppose to accomplish that objective could well be very closely related to the material allegation. But obviously it is not the subject or should not be the subject of the hon. gentleman's full support. Presumably it is supplementary material, something he is making in reference, in passing reference.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour. I might say, Sir, that I had a conversation with a gentleman from my hon. friend's district, from

Mr. Neary:

Goose Cove who told me that, in his opinion, all they did was paint up the equipment and sent it out there to make it look like new equipment, when in actual fact it was obsolete. It should have been scrapped. And, Sir, this situation is typical of what is happening in practically every district West of Grand Falls this past Winter.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: West of Terra Nova, my hon. friend says. But I know once you get outside of Donovans Overpass the equipment, Sir, is hardly fit to put out on the road. And as I said a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, here you have the heavy snowfalls in Western Newfoundland and on the Great Northern Peninsula, obsolete equipment, and on the East Coast in the Avalon Peninsula area where you have no snow or very little snow this Winter, all new equipment. And the minister told me only about ten days ago that he was then in the process of transferring some of the equipment out on the West Coast. Just another example, Sir, of locking the barn door after the horse is stolen.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further petitions?

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, we have a few little goodies to present to the House today. We table the Orders and Regulations of January 31, 1976 to February 9, 1977 from the Department of Finance. We have The Province of Newfoundland Public Accounts for the year ended March 31, 1976, which I am sure will arouse some -

MR. ROBERTS: And the Auditor General's Report.

MR. DOODY: And we have the much awaited Auditor General's Report for -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: - the financial year ended 31 March 1976. I am sure that the government will be applauded and lauded for the promptness in bringing forth, as well as these presented and prepared jointly by

Mr. Doody:

the comptroller and the Auditor General and then presented for the -
persual of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: I hope the Auditor General gets the message.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Are we going to have him in the House again.?

MR. DOODY: No, no, we believe in having the House open.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Are there any further Notices of
Motion?

The hon. member for the Bay of Islands.

MR. L. WOODROW: I have a resolution, Mr. Speaker. It reads as
follows: Whereas the number of trailer courts are continually
increasing throughout the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador;
And whereas many tenants occupying these trailer courts are greatly
dissatisfied; Therefore Be It Resolved that a debate be held involving
every phase of mobile homes, especially in the field of insurance and
the collection of commissions by trailer park owners whether the
person decides to move from the trailer court and thus places his
trailer on the market.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Exploits.

DR. TWOMEY: I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to move the following resolutions:

WHEREAS the Government of Canada has recently concluded an agreement with the Government of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, providing for a twenty-five - seventy-five per cent division of revenues from oil and gas discoveries off the Coast of these respective Provinces;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada has used tactics of pressure and intimidation in an attempt to force the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to accede to this same formula for the division of offshore oil and gas revenue;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House reaffirm this commitment to the principle that one hundred per cent of the revenues from offshore oil and gas should be paid to the Government and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador in order to attain that which is ours;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House view the attempts of the Government of Canada to obtain a percentage of the revenues from oil and gas discoveries off the Coast of this Province as nothing short of an attempt to rob the people of Newfoundland and Labrador of their rightful heritage;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House reaffirm its support of the efforts by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to retain full administrative control over the development of the offshore oil and gas in the waters off our Coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: This land is our land.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further notices of motion.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, could I ask leave of the House to table one further report. It is not a serious one. It is the annual report of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation and one which I missed inadvertently in the rush.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) raised a point that I was not aware of when I gave my undertaking to look into it. That was a question of some layoffs down at Dominion Stores. I think the hon. member named the Company. We were not aware of them yesterday. We had the matter checked out. We met this morning with the gentleman involved. We of course communicated our concern that in the event that Dominion Stores, or indeed any company in this Province has any indication of impending layoffs that Manpower officials should be notified in the event that retraining is or would be helpful or necessary. We were quite disturbed by the fact that that had not been communicated, not only by Dominion Stores but whoever might do that sort of thing.

The hon. member yesterday gave a figure of twelve to fourteen people. As we understand it, the way this information came I would assume is because Dominion Stores talked to their employees and unofficially of course somebody probably approached the hon. member.

The decision has not been made whether these layoffs would indeed take place. If there are layoffs, if there are and the decision has not been taken it would be more like half of the number that the hon. member was told. However, Dominion Stores has indicated that it is prepared to give us a report on it. And again in the meantime it is our intention now, we are in the midst of drafting a letter to Dominion Stores to give our views on it because we feel that any national chain that sets up business in this Province owes a certain responsibility as a corporate citizen to the Province and this government is not at all happy with the movement and the concentration of many of the administrative things belonging to these companies in Halifax. That is a matter of great concern.

So we will communicate that to Dominion Stores. As I say, the

MR. ROUSSEAU: Dominion Stores has given an undertaking to the department that should they decide on the course of action suggested by the hon. member yesterday that he would certainly inform us previous.

MR. SPEAKER: We are on Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier.

He has doubtless heard the announcement, Sir, today by Statistics Canada that the actual number of people unemployed in the Province has risen by 5,000 between the month of December and the month of January, from 24,000 to 29,000, which means by Statistics Canada we now have 29,000 out of work in this Province. The actual number is probably far greater, but in the light of that would the Premier tell us whether the government are going to increase the \$2 million they have allocated to provide jobs?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The answer is, Mr. Speaker, that we obviously do not intend to increase the \$2 million which will just provide a very few of the jobs that we are talking about, 500 and possibly more than that, probably as high as 700. But that was done foreseeing what was going to happen. And I think it might be of note to say, Sir, that the unemployment in Canada has approached virtually nine per cent, which I think is a very serious national thing, and not just a provincial thing. Our unemployment is very serious, as is the unemployment in New Brunswick which has approached virtually fifteen per cent. It is something that nationally we are going to have to have programmes to cope with. We, provincially, are going to have to do everything possible to cope with it. But in the interim, Sir, until such times as the programmes take effect, it is indeed a serious situation and one that we have had before, but I do not think ever more dramatically than at the present time.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, you know, really the experience in New Brunswick and the experience across Canada are of limited concern to the House of Assembly for Newfoundland and Labrador. But may I say to the Premier in growing out of his comment that this 5,000 jump in unemployment in this Province, and of those unemployed, the number unemployed, was - and I think he used this exact word - foreseen, and this led to the 500 job programme -

PREMIER MOORES: I did not say foreseen.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

PREMIER MOORES: I did not say foreseen.

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, did say foreseen. I distinctly heard him, and it struck me as being a very important word and that is what led to the supplementary. In view of the fact that it is foreseen and government's response was a 500 job programme, could the Premier tell us what he foresees for the next few months with respect to the unemployment situation in Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I have no more idea of what the situation will evolve in any more than the Leader of the Opposition would the policy conference for Gander, Mr. Speaker. But the fact is he talks about these things here in this context, and he is making - when I say, foresaw a problem, I certainly did not foresee the figures. I do not think anyone could. But if he looks at the adjusted figures he will find that it is 1,000 less than there was last year. So let us not play games with figures, Mr. Speaker. Let us identify that there is a serious problem, and serious steps have to be taken. But as the Leader of the Opposition has said often before, it depends on which figures you use. If you look at the adjusted figures, it is 1,000 less than this time last year; If you look at the unadjusted, it is 5,000 more. But, you know, you can play games forever with statistics. But the fact is, Sir, that it is a serious problem, and we are cognizant of it, and we will do out utmost to do something about it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Premier if he could tell the House how many joint venture projects have been approved in Newfoundland in this calendar year?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, with joint venture projects as such, there has been one pilot project which was talked about with the Government of Canada, which the Government of Newfoundland was partially responsible for initiating, or responsible, which was in fact with the West Germans and Ocean Harvesters and Fishery Products as the two recipients to this end. But rather than get into it in a very short period like this, I would, Sir, at any time be prepared, if this House is ready, to discuss this in full detail, because I think it is terribly important that the information regarding what the potential is in the future, where we sit now in Newfoundland as far as our resource is concerned, what it is going to be necessary to beef up the inshore fishery to project ourselves

Premier Moores.

into the offshore fishery. I think the knowledge that these decisions must be based on, I think it is terribly important that it get before, not just this House, Sir, but, as I said the other day, I would suggest that the federal government officials, provincial government officials, industry representation, union representation, press representation, this sort of group, sit down informally so that all the figures can be gotten out, and all the facts can be identified. And after that is known, then I think opinions and so on that can help formulate the policy for the future, can be made, and I think that should be done. That meeting by the way is hopefully for the week after next. And any time the House wishes for us to have a debate in the House on the whole subject, I think it is very important that we do so, because I think there is a lot of misinterpretation of what is happening right now.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, and I thank the hon. Premier for the information that he has given the House. But would the hon. Premier indicate whether or not the original 6,000, the pilot project, 6,000 metric tons I think it is, if that has now been increased to 20,000 metric tons to come from the Hamilton Banks?

PREMIER MOORES: To my knowledge,

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the companies were advised that the 6,000 tons had been approved, but that was some time ago. There is nothing officially being confirmed, to my knowledge, yet, and certainly there is absolutely no indication that it be projected into 20,000 tons. As I understand it now, there is some complication about whether so much tonnage should go to Nova Scotia and so much tonnage to Quebec and so much tonnage to here.

MR. NEARY: Of the Canadian quota.

PREMIER MOORES: Of the Canadian quota. But I think, Sir, it is very important, and that is surplus Canadian quota, I should say, I think it is very important to mention that -

MR. NEARY: That is what we will not catch, not surplus, what we will not catch.

PREMIER MOORES: That is surplus to what we will catch, that is right. That is what it is really, and that is where the 20,000 ton figure came from that the Leader of the Opposition referred to yesterday. Well I think, Sir, it is important to say at this time that our position as a government has been that whatever project goes ahead this year should be done with the intention of establishing new technology, and the information for that; training potential for our own people; the expansion of markets for Canadian/Newfoundland fish. It is basic to it to get that knowledge and to start opening up these new avenues is the only reason for any pilot or experimental project. I think it would be wrong at this time to have a commercial venture because I do not think we, nor the Government of Canada, nor the Government of Nova Scotia know enough about it. I think we should handle it very carefully, and this is hopefully the way it will go.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. the Premier indicate to the House if the Province of Newfoundland, the Government of

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland was invited to supply any input into the joint venture projects that have been approved for Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec? If not, would the Premier indicate to the House why Newfoundland was not asked for its opinion, and would the Premier indicate to the House also if the hon. the Premier has had a telephone conversation with Mr. Romeo LeBlanc the hon. Romeo LeBlanc recently in which Mr. LeBlanc took a very arrogant attitude towards this whole matter of joint ventures, took the position that Canada would approve these without consultation, if necessary, with the various provinces that are involved in these joint venture projects?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: That is a very difficult but four-part question, Mr. Speaker. We were not asked to go in, consulted on the Quebec or Nova Scotia potential joint ventures, and I do not think we should have been anymore than we ask Quebec or Nova Scotia to be involved in the Newfoundland ones. These are provincial matters. But regarding the federal government, Sir, we have stated our position as to what we think is the right approach. I have had several conversations with Mr. LeBlanc. They have varied from being very friendly to being, I suppose one could call it, quite difficult. But certainly it is not the time for me to say in definitive terms what the various aspects of those conversations were.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier then satisfied with the co-operation and with the liaison and with the relationship with Mr. LeBlanc and the Government of Canada? Is the Premier satisfied with that relationship at the moment or is there room for improvement and more co-operation on the part of the Government of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, there is always room for improvement. But I think it is fair to say at this time until

PREMIER MOORES: we have heard the official federal government's position our attitude as to what degree of co-operation and respect we should have would depend a great deal on what their final decision is.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the Premier say in view of the fact that this is experimental, and for one year only, is it realistic to suppose that we would learn a lot from this one year experiment that would be useful to us, and that after that one year we could dispense with the Germans or any others in a joint venture project? Is it enough to have one year, learn what we can and then dispose of it and go on our own from there on?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, that is - I am tripping over the Minister of Justice here, Sir, but -

MR. HICKMAN: Everybody else does, why cannot you?

PREMIER MOORES: No, everyone else steps on the Minister of Justice as a rule. If you will excuse me.

No, this is one of the difficult problems with this particular discussion, because there is so much information that one has to make available that it is very difficult to have defined positions. But we are talking about a one year joint venture or experimental project or whatever the case may be. And the reason for that is because -

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is all cod.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, but in a distinct area of fishing and for cod only. The problem is, Sir, that Newfoundland or Canadian boats have never fished those waters extensively, if at all.

PREMIER MOORES:

I think the hon. member for Fortune (Mr. J. Winsor) will vouch for the fact that there are very few Newfoundland trawlers that have ever fished North of Cape Bonavista in the Winter.

That technology has to be acquired. Observers will be on these boats this year. Now whether the ability of our people, the fishermen's union, the Province on a propaganda campaign or an educational campaign or what have you, whether we will be able to get our people to take on that same function is a very debatable point. Whether we should even try is debatable. The options are -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ever?

PREMIER MOORES: Oh, ever yes. But you talked about one year, Sir, at the time. But the options are an increased inshore fishery, which is by far the most economic method of fishing for capital invested and should be encouraged most. You are talking about middle water fishing as they have in Europe or in the UK, which gives more flexibility, less cost than distant water fish. And then you are talking about the bigger ships that go out for forty-five to sixty days.

Now what is the combination of all that that can be maximized best and to the most advantage by Newfoundlanders? It is something that has to be identified. It is not something that certainly has been decided. It is something that, I think, all those who are concerned should be involved in, given all the facts, sit down, work out a plan for the future. A lot of training will be required. A great deal of encouragement and understanding is going to be required. But, as I say, I would much rather have a full debate on it in the House because there is so much to bring out to be discussed.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I ask the Premier where exactly the permission is to be given, if it is given, for the Germans to take this quantity of

MR. SMALLWOOD:

fish whether it be 6,000 or 8,000 or 10,000 tons? I am not -

MR. NEARY: It is 6,000 metric.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Six thousand metric tons, the hon. gentleman says it is. The area from which they are to be permitted to take that, is it the actual Hamilton Banks only, or is it a much larger geographical area that starts on the Southern end somewhere off St. Anthony or even South of that and then goes North to include the Hamilton Banks?

PREMIER MOORES: The area is ICNAF areas primarily, 2GH and 3KL which in fact are from Cape Chidley to Cape St. Mary's. That is Cape St. Mary's off into the Grand Banks just east of the Gullies, east of St. Pierre Bank, off towards the Flemish Cap including the Virgin Rocks, north on the Trench, up and including Hamilton Banks, North as far as Cape Chidley.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Is this a supplementary. I must ask the hon. gentleman whether he is asking a supplementary question?

MR. NEARY: When the hon. the Premier returned from Europe when this deal was made with the West Germans, the hon. Premier indicated publicly to the people of this Province that Newfoundlanders would be on some of these, or Newfoundlanders would have the opportunity to man these boats, to join with the West Germans as crew members on these boats. Was the Premier serious about this or did the Premier make that statement with tongue in cheek?

PREMIER MOORES: No, there was no tongue in cheek at all. The offer was made that any or all of the crew members could be Newfoundlanders. With the short notice of time the union, I think quite rightly, could not mobilize the forces to do it. I think they are getting observers on for this year and working on plans for the future, whether these boats are chartered, whether we build, whether we buy the ships, whatever the mechanism is.

One of the points I think that should be recognized is that in order to catch the European quantity even at the reduced conserved

PREMIER MOORES:

level of fishing, if you know what I mean, at the very lowest level like it is now, even at that level in order to fish that amount if we were catching it all ourselves, it is going to take something between \$700 million and \$1 billion investments in ships alone. - So obviously there has to be a mechanism of chartering, prying, renting, stealing or whatever the case is to get these boats because obviously we cannot do it out of Marystown Shipyard even though we can do some of it. But certainly the big emphasis is going to have to be to get access to the present fishing capacity to be brought here to be operated by our people.

MR. SPEAKER: I will permit an additional supplementary, and then there are some hon. members who are endeavouring to get questions, I presume on different topics. So I think after this supplementary I should recognize them. Then of course the House may wish to revert to the subject. It is difficult to know to what extent to allow supplementaries, because it is difficult to know the matters on which other members wish to ask questions. One can only assume that these are quite important matters and if at all possible they should be given the opportunity to ask them.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think Your Honour is quite right.

This is probably the most important matter to come before the people of this Province in a long time and we are getting some information today and I thank the hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Wait until the debate.

MR. NEARY: Yes I know. I realize that but we are trying to get information before we get into the debate.

The Premier just raised a very interesting point about the ships, the capability to catch the fish and so forth. Now could the Premier confirm or deny that his government are negotiating with foreign nations to acquire, to charter, buy, or lease - well charter or buy I guess -

AN HON. MEMBER: Beg, borrow or steal.

MR. NEARY: - beg, borrow or steal ships that will give Newfoundlanders the capability to catch the fish, and if so would the Premier indicate which countries the government is dealing with and would the Premier also indicate while he is on his feet what plans the government have or the private sector has, to build draggers or trawlers to give Newfoundlanders the - the Newfoundland fishermen, Newfoundland trawlermen the capability to catch the fish, our quota in the 200 mile management zone?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Once again, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult. There is quite a few questions in that one.

MR. NEARY: I had that one for a while; it was supposed to be a supplementary.

PREMIER MOORES: But the fact is, no, we are not negotiating with anyone at the present time. What we are doing at the present time is establishing an inventory of what ships are available in all the countries that fish in the Northwest Atlantic, an inventory of what ships are available so that we will know if a decision has been made after all the facts are on the table, we will know which is the areas to approach to find ship availability.

PREMIER MOORES: And for the information of the House I think it is probably significant that in Great Britain last year one-third of their fleet was retired for scrap because of lack of fishing grounds. This year the second third is being retired for scrap, which means there is only one-third of what was a very large fleet just two years ago, in existence today. I suggest that this will be happening, or the equivalent, in other European countries. I think not that we are buying old boats or this sort of thing but I think it is very important that we have an inventory of exactly what is available if in fact we are going to require it and that will be the decision of a lot of people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That one-third is one-third of the entire fleet.

PREMIER MOORES: Two-thirds of the entire fleet. Incredible.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova indicated that he has a question next, followed by the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. I wonder if the minister can inform the House if the government of this Province, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, has any mechanism of its own to monitor the unemployment in this Province, and I am specifically concerned as to whether or not the minister can identify areas in the Province which are experiencing the highest level of unemployment?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be fair to say we do not have that kind of staff to be able to do that, but we do have a very close relationship with the Federal Department of Manpower and of course their administrative procedures and statistics and figures are always available to us.

We have a small staff down there which is I think built - I

MR. ROUSSEAU: left the department in 1974, in October, and I returned again this past October and in that two years that department, which had just been involved in restructuring, has grown tremendously. I think in the future it will be and I think the Department of Manpower has certainly grown but it has not grown - it has grown through Manpower consulting, that is a sort of definite thing. Right now. From a statistical point of view, we have not reached that perfection yet. We certainly do hope to but as I say we can rely on the Federal Department of Manpower and our limited resources to give us some indication.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. LUSH: Again a question to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. I wonder if the minister has any information related to the character of the unemployment in Newfoundland, that is related to the kinds of occupations that people are unemployed in or educational level, age and that sort of thing.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, sometime in 1974, I believe it was, I asked a very simple question to the Federal Minister of Manpower as to what the profile was of who was unemployed, where were they unemployed and so on and so forth. It was a subject of more discussion and articles but nobody gave me any figures then and I do not think anybody will give me figures now. For example, the UIC list is different than the ones who are listed with Canada Manpower. The people who are listed at Canada Manpower may be listed today, may move out of town and they are listed in two or three different offices.

Mr. Rousseau:

It is an extremely difficult thing to get. I asked for it, as I say, a couple of years ago. You can get some generalities. I found out I think at that time, as I recall, there were about a couple of hundred canners in Gander, you know, people who just put their name down, and very seriously who may have moved out of there into some other area. But we have a lot of difficulty trying to examine a profile. I think they have perfected it to some extent now. Of course, it is all done on the basis of statistics, and random sampling, and addition and multiplication factors involved so it is not really a count of the actual number of people, and I guess you could just interpolate it beyond that. But we would have a very difficult problem trying to identify the total number in respect in which area each one was, and in which job occupation they were able to comply with if there was a job open. But we could get some generality, some interpolations of the figures undoubtedly from Canada Manpower or from UIC.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Bellevue.

MR. W. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier.

Would the Premier inform the House whether or not the Come By Chance Refinery is likely to be re-activated in the very near future? And/or what efforts are government making to re-activate and possibly expand the refinery when it is reopened?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, I have had - and I would thank the hon. member for giving me notice that he was going to ask this question, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that even though there is no clear response, as we understand it, and it is the receiver who is making the basic judgment, there are three groups active at this present time; one being Mr. Shaheen's group who still remain active, another group that is in touch with the receiver, and another group who are represented through Morgan Stanley as another client. Now the British and ourselves are in constant communication as to what is the best thing to do. And I can assure the House, and unfortunately I cannot give any of the details

Premier Moores:

of how these things have progressed, because I genuinely do not know, nor I might suggest do the principals involved. I mean they are all going in their own way to try to bring it to a head as quickly as possible. The receiver is working very hard on it.

And the one thing, I think, that can be pointed out is that another Winter in mothballing will be severe and could cause severe problems. And I think that has to be recognized by the receiver, ourselves, the first mortgagee or whoever. That is all taken into consideration, and hopefully, Mr. Speaker, by early Spring we will be in a position to have a much more definitive answer. And I am only sorry now I cannot give a more definitive answer, but unfortunately I cannot at this time.

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

MR. ROBERTS: A question for the Minister of Public Works. In view of the very serious potential abuses of the Public Tenders Act revealed by the Auditor General, and specific paragraphs which I am sure the minister is familiar with, specific paragraph (96) pages -

AN HON. MEMBER: You got it?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, just got it. The government have apparently had it for a week - page 107 on. Can the minister tell us -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Well it is dated the 31st. of January, that is why I say the government have had it for a week.

MR. PECKFORD: Does it say dated, the day the government got it?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the report is dated -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - the 31st. of January, addressed to the Hon. C. W. Doody, Minister of Finance. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works. In view of the serious and apparently deliberate abuses of the Public Tenders Act, could the minister tell us what steps he has taken, and if he only got the report today the lawyers should be at it today.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, if the report was out today I had a — and the Auditor General of course writes the departments for their views on this sort of thing. A letter was written back, and I had a statement I wanted to give, I did not know the report was going to be given out today. And I will make that statement within the next day or so, it is down in my office. In the meantime, I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that all steps are being taken, the department in consultation with Treasury Board and the Organization and Management Division to attempt to make sure that this sort of thing does not happen again.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Port au Port, followed by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. J. HODDER: A question for the Minister of Social Services. I wonder if he can tell me what criteria was used to decide the areas where the seventy-seven labour intensive projects are to be carried out, concerning the \$2 millions for the employment?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, All of the projects, every single one of them, were thought out, drafted and so on by the special projects officers, the five special projects officers across the Province. As far as I know it was based strictly on the number of people that were receiving assistance in any given area.

MR. HOODER: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. HOODER: Does that mean that where there are large concentrations of social services recipients, they will receive priority?

MR. BRETT: Yes that is exactly true, Sir.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary there, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Would the Minister of Social Assistance —

AN HON. MEMBER: Social Services.

MR. FLIGHT: Could the Minister of Social Services tell the House or spell out where the jobs he referred to are? Where are they located in this Province?

MR. BRETT: I, indicated in my statement, Mr. Speaker, that I would table the list of projects later this week, certainly before Friday.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Finance, Sir. I would like to ask the minister what is going to happen following the termination of the three week shut-down at the Linerboard mill at Stephenville? What will happen following this three week period?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: You know, I honestly cannot answer the question, Sir. I do not know what will happen after the three week shut-down. It has been our hope that the Linerboard mill will not have any shut-downs. But the position out there now is dictated by the marketplace. My understanding from the chairman and the chief executive officer and the president of the company, Mr. Sweeney, that as soon as they get sufficient orders to get the operation going, then the operation will go again. Whether these orders are in place at the present time or not, I have not been informed. I would think that if they were, then I would have been. So, you know, I honestly cannot say. I would hope that the mill will reopen again after three weeks. If they do not have the orders, quite honestly it will not open again. The marketplace is in a desperate state. It has never been worse. It has not improved. And the mill's close down is as a result of the marketplace.

MR. SPEAKER: One supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do I understand the minister correctly then that there are no orders at the moment so there is no indication that the Linerboard mill will reopen after this three week close down? And would the minister also indicate, when he is answering me, if the government have received any proposals to dispose of the Linerboard mill for \$1 to any company across Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: The first question, I will keep a straight face on me, because I know it is a serious question: To the best of my knowledge there are not sufficient orders in place right now to reopen the mill, and to have it activated again. As to whether we have had any offers for \$1 to buy the mill, the answer is, yes. I, myself, my daughter and my son have all thrown in offers, and they have all been turned down. We have not had any serious offers to buy the mill.

MR. NEARY: I am thinking of the Power Corporation of Canada mainly.

MR. DOODY: No, they have not offered us \$1 for the mill, to my knowledge. They had more sense than either I, my daughter or my son.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Ferryland.

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier a question, if I may, concerning the joint ventures. I am curious as to when they speak about 6,000 tons, are we talking about 6,000 tons of fish or fillet? Because my understanding is that this West German ship will be bringing in bone-in, skin-off fillet, and that makes quite a difference to the amount of raw fish that may be taken.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Six thousand tons from the quota. Twenty-four hundred tons of landed product.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Order (1) The adjourned debate on the amendment to the Address in Reply.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe I should quit now.

MR. PECKFORD: That is a good question.

MR. NEARY: Sock it to them.

MR. PECKFORD: That is very valid.

MR. ROBERTS: It is certainly more valid than anything the hon. gentleman from Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) would say, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Roberts.

Let me resume where I was cut off in the debate yesterday when the clock had run out, as it were. Let me begin by extending to the gentleman from Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) an invitation to participate in this debate early on. I understand he has been assigned the enviable task of responding for the government in respect of my remarks

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had occasion on a number of occasions to ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they wish to carry on their little chats, to have them outside. The Premier may not often see his colleagues in the Cabinet, but if the Premier wishes to have chats with them I wonder if he could either have the chats in a very low tone of voice. And indeed anything discussed with the Minister of Tourism should be done in a low tone of voice, or could he leave the chamber, as he had now done. And I would say to the page, I have already three copies of that bill, and the fourth—I thank you very much

While we are at it, Mr. Speaker, as well I wonder if perhaps the pages could be asked not to put papers in front of the member who is speaking. Most of us, Sir, have some notes, and the notes may be improved by reading some of the documents tabled in the House, but, Sir, it does not make things go any easier. Mr. Speaker, as I was saying I hope the gentleman from Green Bay will enter in the debate early on. He obviously has drawn the enviable assignment of replying to my few humble and brief remarks. And I would listen with real interest to what he has to say. And I would say to him, he would be on shortly. I am getting well through the introduction to my speech and shortly will be getting into the major points I wish to make by way of comment upon the Throne Speech. And I would say as well, Sir, that the gentleman from Green Bay, I can write large parts of what he will say now, because I invite him to get up and say I have been negative, and that I am being destructive, and that I am not putting forth positive proposals. And I hope he will say all those things, because of course, Sir, not only is that not correct, even though it may well be his opinion. I would say to him That it is incumbent upon him to govern and upon us to oppose. And if he wishes he may cross the House, I hope he is now about, Sir, to cross the House, to sit as yet another independent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: As one of a number of independents. I am glad there are some members who can resist temptation. From what I hear there are others who cannot. And I may add the Auditor General's Report on a quick look through appears to confirm that, Sir. There will be fertile ground in there for questioning and debate. There are many items in there which appear to be on the verge of illegal as opposed to simply improper. It is surprising how often, just looking it through, consultants were given money under contracts that did not exist or in excess of amounts authorized by contract. The Auditor General being a gentlemen does not name those consultants in most cases, but I would assume there would be questions placed on the Order Paper and that in due course we will get the information so that the House and the people of the province can judge for themselves the merits of the governments actions.

There seem to be an unseemly anxiety on the government's part to aid consultants to balance their balance sheets even if the result was to unbalance the balance sheets of the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Mr. Speaker, when I spoke yesterday I had touched upon some of the major points I would wish to deal with. I had talked at some length about the economy of the province because I believe that is the major matter which must concern us in this session. I had spoken of some of the deficiencies, as I see them, in the economy of the province. And I had said again, as I had said before, that it is the governments duty to produce for the House some proposals and some suggestions as to ways in which our economic situation can be improved.

Now, Sir, I do not propose to stand here and to make a Speech from the Throne or a mini Speech from the Throne, and I do not propose to offer a series of plans right here and now that could be considered the solution to all the problems facing this province today. The government have had twelve months, Sir, since the House last assembled. They have had six or seven months since the House

MR. ROBERTS: last met. There are sixteen or seventeen ministers in the government. They have access to all of the public service, very intelligent who work in the public service, very bright and knowledgeable men and women who are available to assist the ministers. They have the advantages of information from the Government of Canada. They have all of the expertise and knowledge that could possibly be made available to any government. It is their job to produce for the House some plans.

And while I expect we will hear from the gentleman from Green Bay, and I have no doubt the gentleman Grand Falls, probably some others, but they will be the two because they are trying to make their name. We expect they will be getting up and whining and trying to defend themselves by attacking the opposition. And if they want to do that, that is a perfectly proper tactic .

MR. ROBERTS: But I shall say, Sir, and I say now on behalf of us all, that it is a waste of their time, a waste of our time, and a waste of the Province's time because they will not convince us, they cannot convince themselves, and the people of the Province have already judged for themselves the spectacle of a government that after five years in office has produced no plans and is still acting like they are an opposition.

I would like however, Sir, to talk briefly about the fishery. I was just getting into this yesterday and the Minister of Fisheries and I were developing a little bit of a colloquy back and forth. I think that the fishery is something which is very important to the economy of this Province. It is not all that significant perhaps in terms of overall dollars, dollars spent or dollars earned, if you wish, but it is supremely important in terms of the numbers employed in the fishery and in the terms of the impact that those jobs have. Because, of course, they are spread throughout the Province, particularly in the rural areas, and in many of the rural areas the fishery or fishery generated and related jobs are the only really possible source of employment, certainly employment to any significant extent.

Now, Sir, if I were to fault the government for any one area more than any other it would have to be in the fishery, because this government came into office back in the early Winter of 1972, it was in January, 1972 as I recall it, professing great plans for the fishery. In the previous campaign which had been held in October of that year, the Premier went about the Province and made a number of speeches which sounded very good indeed, and I have no doubt were meant to sound very good indeed, speeches in which he said what would be done to develop the fishery. The people, I think, believed that. They wanted to hear this, the people of the Province did, and because the Premier had worked for a number of years in the fish

MR. ROBERTS: business, the family enterprises, the Northeastern Fish enterprise at Harbour Grace, they felt further that he obviously had some expertise. Well I will not say anything about that except that what seems to be so often is not so. But I do want to look at the sorts of promises they made because they have not been kept, nor have we had any explanation as to why they have not been kept or possibly why they cannot be kept. So I ask the Minister of Fisheries when he speaks in this debate, as I hope he will and I am sure he will, to talk for a few minutes - he will have forty-five minutes according to the rules, more if he chooses to put down a motion of nonconfidence, then he gets unlimited time and he will need it, I would think, to explain a motion of nonconfidence coming from a minister, although there is a precedent.

I was reminded the other day by the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) that at one stage the Premier of the Province did second a motion of nonconfidence in his administration, Sir William Lloyd back in 1919 I believe it was. A motion of nonconfidence was made by the opposition side, there seemed to be no seconder so the Premier stood up and seconded it and in due course the motion carried.

But I would invite the Minister of Fisheries to tell us about the government's fishery plan with some specificity - I think I got that correct - with some specific detail. We heard from the Premier back in 1971 about the Dutch auction system, and we heard nothing since. I would like to know whether it is proposed still to implement that and if not, why not? And if the reasons why it is not going to be implemented are as I suspect they are, how does the minister square that with the Premier's public commitment? He was not Premier at that point, he was leader of a party, a man seeking to be Premier, how he squares both positions?

MR. ROBERTS: Because I suspect the reasons why that system to date has not been implemented, and I assume the fact that it has not been implemented is evidence of the fact that it is not going to be implemented, that the evidence of that, or the reasons why were as well known in October of 1971 as they are in February of 1977.

I would also ask the minister please to tell us a little about further processing of fish. Now this is something which has cropped up - perhaps the government Whip could whip away for a moment or two. I will not be long with the Minister of Fisheries and then the gentleman from Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) could have whatever converse he needs to have with the minister - but I would ask the minister to talk to us about the further processing of fish because this is a bit of a hoary perennial. It has been around, I guess, as long as there has been fish. The only one that is more ancient or more widespread is the smoking of salmon, and my friend and colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) last year, I think, laid this one out in some detail and showed what could be done and what had to be done. Of course it is a matter of regret that nothing has been done by the government with respect to the smoking of salmon.

But the further

Mr. Roberts:

processing of fish: Now yesterday, it was yesterday, Sir, I read the words from the Throne Speech, the same words were used in 1972 as in 1977, or almost the same words, certainly the same ideas. Why has nothing been done? I am assuming nothing has been done, and that is a valid assumption. There may be a little that has been done, I think, Fishery Products, in particular, are doing some - 'Pat' are they doing some breeding up at the plant in Burin now and in Marystown?

MR. CANNING: They have been doing it a long time.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. That is just it; they have been doing it for a long time, and they are not doing it as a result of any government programme or any government encouragement. They are doing it because in their view, as a commercial operation, and very shrewd operators indeed the men who run Fishery Products Limited, you know, that there is a dollar to be made in it.

Well, I would like to know what the government intend to do? And the words are here in the Throne Speech. They were here five years past, almost the same words. Nothing has been done by the government. Now, you know, why not is an important question. But that is essentially dealing with the past, and I am not terribly interested in that. What I am interested in is what is going to be done? Are these just more empty words? What specifically can be done? What are the government proposing to do? We export from this Province each year millions and millions and more millions of pounds of fish fillets, many of them go out in the form of five pound blocks or fourteen pound - is it fourteen or sixteen?

AN HON. MEMBER: Sixteen and a half pound blocks.

MR. ROBERTS: Sixteen and a half pound blocks. I thank my - there is an awful lot of expertise in the fishery business over here, in all aspects of the fishery business; men who have run large plants, as my friend from Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor). My friend from Ferryland (Mr. O'Brien) who has built and runs a very successful operation, an example of what can be done by genuine entrepreneurship in the business. My friend from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Canning)

Mr. Roberts:

who has a long experience with the fishery, and with the operation of the fishery business, and others.

But we export millions of pounds of fish, much of it in the form of sixteen and a half pound blocks, some of it in the form of five pound blocks, some of it in the form of IQF, individually quick frozen fillets. What are we going to do for further processing? What do the government propose? Is it just another pipe dream? Or do they have something specific in mind? You can only do so many things with a pound of fish, Mr. Speaker. You get it from the water, and you cut the head off, and you take the gut out, and then you fillet it, and you are left with about a third of the landed weight of the round fish. It varies, the recovery varies significantly from time to time, and from plant to plant, and even, I guess, from worker to worker within a plant. But as a good working average you are left with about a third, and that is the part that we eat. Most of it is edible if it were made into fish protein concentrate. That was the great answer, I suppose, ten or twelve years ago; fish protein concentrate was going to be the answer but it did not work out for one reason or another.

But now what do the government propose to do with that pound of fish? Just what can be done to add labour to it? Can it be breaded, and made into breaded portions? Are they going to make it into fish and chips? You know, just what do they propose to do? And how much additional labour will it produce? Obviously the government has some detailed plans. They must. There are specific words here in the Throne Speech, but they are not specific programmes. Let me say if I can find the words, Mr. Speaker. There are so many words here, and so little information, it is sometimes hard. Well, they do not spring readily to mind, Sir. My indexing system concentrates on the realistic ideas. But anyway, the reprocessing is back in here again, and I would like the minister to tell us specifically what they have in mind, not just the airy-fairy generalities, not the empty

Mr. Roberts:

words or the statements of intention; empty or not, we have had all those. Exactly what do they see?

And I would like him as well to talk to us about the 5,000 jobs in the joint ventures which the Premier promised us following the German trip some months ago. I believe the minister accompanied the Premier on that particular excursion. And while I do not have the press cuttings in front of me, the Premier announced in behalf of the government on the way back that joint ventures could provide 5,000 jobs. I would like for him to talk to us about that.

My understanding of the 6,000 tons which we spoke of, and my friend from Ferryland (Mr. O'Brien) has asked a question which made it clear that, that is

MR. ROBERTS: 2,400 tons of filleted bone-in product that will go ashore in Marystown or Harbour Grace, if the proposal is accepted, and will then be further filleted, and that may provide between 300 and 400 jobs at each plant for three to four months. Now if that is so we are talking of possibly 300 to 400 jobs for six to eight months. If you work that out that is about 400 to 500 jobs for a year, which is one-tenth of the number of jobs which the Premier spoke of in his public statements. And given the fact that that 6,000 tons is one-third of the allowable harvest in the scientific sense of that - the minister shakes his head. 6,000 is near enough to one-third of 20,000 which is the allowable harvest of the Canadian portion reserved for deep sea of that particular Hamilton Banks stock. There may well be other stocks. There are other stocks, but I am speaking of the only stock in respect of which joint venture proposals to my knowledge.

MR. W. CARTER: You are speaking of 1977.

MR. ROBERTS: I am talking of 1977, yes. Yes. Today. Yes. As Lord Keynes used to say, in the long run we will all be dead. So we prefer to speak of the short term. We have to live through 1977 before we approach 1978. We must think of 1978 but we must also be somewhat conscious of 1977.

MR. PECKFORD: Fantastic.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. It is fantastic. And if a minister would only grasp that fact we might be a long ways ahead. If the Minister of Energy could only grasp the fact that before his dreams comes to fruition we are all going to be paying so frightfully much for our energy in this Province that we are going to fry the Minister of Energy, whoever he is, and hang the cost, then he would be further ahead.

Mr. Speaker, we come back to the Minister of Fisheries because I am dealing with some points that I think are very serious

MR. ROBERTS: and very relevant, very much to the point. And I think the minister would agree that, whether he agrees with what I say or not, that these points are matters which must be discussed. So I would like to know what happened to the 5,000 jobs, or more precisely, if the minister still believes we will get them, when we will get them, where we will get them, and how we will get them.

I would like him also to tell us of the government's plans to expand the catching capacity of our fishermen because it is obvious, Sir, that the catching capacity is the key. The real reason we are in this bind over the joint ventures, or I think there is a new term on them now, co-partnerships, the real reason is that we do not have the catching capacity. And yet at the same time paradoxically almost all of our trawlers and draggers are going out and catching far less than they are designed or actual catching capacity. What are they averaging, I ask my friend from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor), a third or a quarter of what they could be taking?

MR. J. WINSOR: Now?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. Forget the quotas, because the quotas do not restrict the amount of fish as much as they say so many trips a month. A quarter, a half on the Banks?

MR. J. WINSOR: Less than a half.

MR. ROBERTS: Less than half. My friend from Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor) says some have been catching next to nothing. So I mean we have a trawler fleet that could be catching two or three times as much as it is catching now. Am I right? Maybe if the fish was there. We will come back to that point. But we have a capacity and yet in the light of that capacity we are talking of joint ventures.

MR. H. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, can I -

MR. ROBERTS: Well of course.

MR. W. CARTER: I thank the hon. member, I do not think he deliberately means to mislead the House but obviously what he is saying is. The present catching efforts is catching about half, I think. I think the average stern dragger is capable of landing 7.5 million pounds of fish a year. They are landing about half that much. We are not talking about the co-operative fishing ventures, Mr. Speaker. We are not talking about ships that would fish in areas that are traditionally fished by our existing fleets. We are talking about co-operative fishing ventures in the ice infested, inaccessible areas, the Northern areas, where these ships would not be capable of fishing at this time of year because they do not have the ice re-enforcing capability.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They certainly would.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, before my friend from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) and my non-parliamentary friend from St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. W. Carter), we may be friends in the personal sense, indeed I hope we are, but in the parliamentary sense we are not now friends, before they get into too much of a debate let me carry on and say that both these gentlemen in their anxiety and desire to dispose of the thing have anticipated points that I was going to make.

MR. ROBERTS:

I must be allowed, subject to the rules, to make them in my own way, to develop the line of argument. Because the gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) of course brought out the fact, as he did today at Question Period, which completely explodes the government's whole case with respect to joint ventures. I mean it is the pin that pricked the balloon of hot air, and the fact that these joint ventures are now, according to the Premier, restricted to the area between Cape St. Mary's in the South and Cape Chidley in the North, which is the whole area that we have ever fished other than along the Southwest Coast and up into the Gulf and then down the Northwest Coast, the whole area we have fished, particularly the deep sea area.

But let me go on, Sir, because as I said we have - and I had drawn no conclusions, I had merely made the statement that we have the paradoxical situation where on the one hand there are stocks that we cannot catch. Now whether we should catch them or not is a matter that must be discussed. But we can agree that we cannot catch those stocks with our present ships. We do not have the ships that are necessary to fish at this time of the year, or in the next month or the month after, in the waters off the Hamilton Banks which is, by the way, the nursery of our fishery.

At the same time we have ships that are not paying their way in the sense they are not catching anything like the fish they are designed to catch or capable of catching and could catch at really no additional cost. I am referring to the trawler fleet, the ninety-five or one hundred ships which supply our fish plants around this Province.

Now, Sir, I think that this question of catching capacity must be at the heart of the whole fishing policy, the whole policy on fisheries. We have talked for years about stocks as if it were the only problem. It is a problem but that is now coming under control. We have a 200-mile limit. It is in force. It is in effect. This year we are using the quotas that have been set by ICNAF. Next year

MR. ROBERTS:

we will be setting our own quotas. They may or may not be different. I mean, I have no way to know that. But next year the quotas will be developed by Canadian officials, Canadian ministers as well, and presumably on the basis of Canadian scientific data. The quotas may or may not be significantly different and of course we do not know whether any or all of any particular quota will be allocated for the foreign fishermen, the foreign fisheries fleets. Indeed I think it can be said that if we do not have the capacity to catch a stock which ought to be caught, then, you know, our case in world public opinion, in the world of international law, is very weak. If we cannot catch it, I suppose we are obligated in the moral sense, in the very real sense as well, to allow some other nations to catch it.

MR. SPEAKER: Did somebody say no? I am sorry. It was somebody out in the gallery.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We could decide to just hold it as a nursery.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) is again anticipating a point I wanted to make because, of course, we could - the question is whether we should or should not catch any particular quota. It is worth looking at the quotas. The information is quite public, but I suspect many hon. gentlemen have not had the opportunity to look at it. If we look at the area to which the Premier adverted today which is ICNAF 2J3KL - that essentially, Mr. Speaker, for those who like myself are not intimately familiar with the ICNAF area, that is the Cape Shore to the Cape St. Mary's. It is our Northeast Coast and our East Coast. And the Southern Shore.

The total quota for this year, the total allowable catch, is 160,000 tons of fish. Now if you want to compare that to other areas, ICNAF area 1 was 31,000, area 2 was 20,000, area 3M - we are coming around the South Coast now, around Cape Race and going West - was 25,000, 3NO was 30,000, 3PS was 32,000. We are getting up, I think, on the St. Pierre Banks are we not now. The 3PS was coming West along the Southwest Coast into the Gulf. 4TVN is 15,000, 4VN is 3,500, 4VSW is 7,000 and then there are three other areas,

MR. ROBERTS:

4,000; 5,000 and 20,000. So in other words that 160,000 tons is possibly - I have not added them up here, Sir - half the total allowable catch within the 200-mile limit this year. And Canada's 70,000 ton allocation is by far and away the largest allocation within that. The other allocations in

MR. ROBERTS: that big area, the 2J 3KL area, Canada - 70,000, Cuba - 1,810, Denmark - 1,690, France - 5,630, the Federal Republic of Germany - 300, the German Democratic Republic - none, Iceland - none, Italy - none, Japan - none, Norway - 800, Poland - 850, Portugal - 5,950, Spain - No, Portugal, I am sorry - Norway - 1,610, Poland - 7,430, Portugal - 21,100, Spain - 16,270, the Soviet Union - 18,880, the United Kingdom - 1,330, the Americans - none, others - 1,200.

So, you know, the 70,000 ton allocation that Canada retains out of that 160,000 tons is larger than any other nation and it is just about half the total. And it is interesting, Sir, when we talk about stocks and we talk about quotas, very often we do not realize just what is involved. What I just read are the allocations that have been made this year for all of the cod stocks, and they are here for all the other species of course in the entire 200 mile limit area, beginning between the Coast of Greenland and Northern Labrador and coming right down around to where our 200 mile limit comes up against what will be shortly the American 200 mile limit.

Now, Sir, as I was saying, the catching effort is at the heart of fisheries policy. We have control of the stocks now and what use we make of them remains to be seen. We hope it is a wise use. We try to make it wise but we have control of the stocks. The question now is what are we going to do to make sure we can catch the fish. There may be arguments over how much fish should be caught, that hon. gentlemen, I know, will be interested to know that that 160,000 tons is about one-quarter of what was regarded two or three years past as the total allowable catch in that 2J 3KL area.

MR. W. CARTER: 600,000 tons.

MR. ROBERTS: It was about 600,000, it is about 160,000 now, it is about one-quarter in round terms. It has been reduced significantly.

MR. W. CARTER: 180 next year.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the minister tells me it is 180 next year. I have no way to know. I mean I do not have access to that sort of knowledge. What I want to know is what plans the government have to fit our fishermen to take that fish. Because, Sir, it seems to me that the answer to that question has in it the answer to the whole policy on the joint venture idea, and has in it the whole answer to the future of the fishery, particularly the Northeast Coast fishery. And this is the big fishery in employment terms, the inshore fishery, the deep sea fishery, the fishery which begins essentially here at St. John's. I suppose we could go to Catalina really, a year round plant, thanks to the Smallwood Administration providing the ships that went in there.

MR. BRETT: I beg your pardon.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Trinity North may beg all he wants, but I can assure him, and the records will support me, that the Smallwood Administration arranged with Fishery Products the finance arrangements to allow the three extra trawlers to go in.

MR. BRETT: Into Catalina.

MR. ROBERTS: Into Catalina, yes of course we did.

MR. BRETT: The first ship, what about the other four?

MR. ROBERTS: Those who go - the pioneers are the ones who count. The plant had to be shown to be economical and to show it could work year round.

MR. BRETT: Poppycock.

MR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that beginning at Catalina we get into the year round plants, coming around going up to Port aux Basques.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The plant down in Catalina does not go like that.

MR. ROBERTS: Well sure it does, yes. Sure it does, yes. Yes. Of course they can. Of course they can. We will come to that in due course. I am quite happy to debate anytime we wish the government's record on Lab-Linerboard. We can talk about that. We can talk about fishery gear scandals, too. You know and the minister's record in Rural Development. We can talk about a lot of things if the minister wants.

Now let me come back to the fishery, Mr. Speaker. Let me come back to the fishery. Because the year round fishery is very important, but so is the inshore fishery and this stock is not only of value to the offshore fishery but it is of - not just of value to the inshore fishery, it is the survival of the inshore fishery. And I want to know from the minister what plans he has to fit our fishermen to get those stocks. I do not want him to blame Ottawa. As I said yesterday, the minister served in Ottawa for six or seven years as a Member of Parliament and he came back here allegedly because he could do nothing in Ottawa and now that he gets here he has a tendency to blame everything on Ottawa. Well that is the reason why, you know, he gets nowhere, or gets so little done. Let him be a little more positive, a little more forthcoming and let him tell us exactly what they propose to do with respect to the catching effort. How are

MR. ROBERTS: we are going to get more longliners, more inshore boats, because the inshore boat still has, and the minister I think, will admit this, a very real future. The longliner is important but it is not the only answer. What are we going to do as well to replace our trawler fleet and to acquire the trawler capacity that is necessary to catch whatever we should catch? Furthermore I would like to hear the minister, Sir, while we are on this subject of taking the fish stocks of the North East Coast, I would like to have him say specifically what he thinks we can take from the allocations. The seventy thousand tons that we have been allotted up in that area, the Hamilton Banks Fishery, that great mother stock, the nursery of all our fishery, what does he think we should take, we can take?

Scientists say we can take seventy thousand. Fifty thousand has been allocated to the inshore fishery on a more or less arbitrary basis. I believe it is related to the amount that has been caught the last few years. But it is purely arbitrary. I think we could increase the inshore fishery very significantly, and I would like to hear the minister tell us what he thinks we can take and should take from that stock. And the question is of great importance, Sir, and great urgency. While we are on joint ventures, Sir, or growing out of what I said about the need to increase the catching capacity, could the minister tell us exactly where this government stands on joint ventures?

Because every time a question is asked in the House or a statement is made or the Premier makes a speech- I do not think the minister has made a speech on it. I have not come across it or have not heard of it if he has -every time this happens we get another different slant on it. So will the minister quite categorical tell us where we stand, what he proposes. I understand that the minister and the Premier have at one stage asked Ottawa to approve proposals for twenty thousand tons. Well the minister says no and I must accept his word. But my sources are just as accurate because they were at the meeting. I was not at

MR. ROBERTS: the meeting. Well, the minister was but the people who told me this were, and all I want is the minister to stand when his turn comes and to do something he has not done: To state categorically exactly what is proposed.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like the government to tell us where and how long they think any joint venture should last. Are we going for a one year period? Are we going for a longer period? What are we going to do to make sure we get the maximum returns from it? Just where do we stand? I could list question after question. The significant point though is where- this government has given us next to no information on what could be one of the either most promising, there are those who believe that, I am not one of them, or one of the most threatening, which I think is the camp I am coming into, developments ever to affect our fishery. After a long, long time the idea that Canada should take control of her stocks out to the 200 mile limit has been accepted and made law, and policy has now founded on.

Here we are into it, into this new era and what are we talking of? More than anything else we are talking of asking the people from outside Canada to come in and catch our fish. Mr. Speaker, I very much hope the government will deal with that and the minister will give us a full explanation. There are two or maybe three, at least two motions on the Order Paper, private members motions, one of which should be called fairly early because it is No. 2, The gentleman from LaPoile. He takes a position or suggests a position. Mine is further down. It takes a different position. I would suggest we get all the facts before we take a position for or against the joint ventures. But I must say the more I hear about them, the less I like. And I think I reflect the views of my colleagues.

MR. CARTER: I do not want to interrupt the hon. member.

MR. ROBERTS: Well then do not. Mr. Speaker, if the hon gentleman does not want to interrupt me, let him not interrupt me.

MR. CARTER: Obviously, Mr. Speaker -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have the right to speak, subject to the rules of the House.

MR. CARTER: You want to know the facts.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants to make a speech then let him make a speech. He stood up earlier to ask a question, he said. And all he did was to get off a three or four minute speech, which made more sense than many of the minister's speeches. I am desperately anxious to know the facts. The minister, Mr. Speaker, the minister has had months, he has had months and trips to Germany and everywhere else to work out some facts and to make them public. He has not made them public. Indeed one would almost think that he has been ordered into silence by the Premier. And now he wants to interrupt the one chance I get.

Mr. Roberts.

So I say that the minister should make a statement. If he wants to make it as a ministerial statement, let him. If he wants to speak in the debate, let him; but let him not attempt in-guise of asking a question to interrupt the few minutes at my disposal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn briefly, because that is all it really requires, to deal with the hon. gentleman from Trinity North (Mr. Brett), who earlier today made a ministerial statement, and in my view abused the privilege, because he knew that he could not be challenged on debate. He knows you cannot debate a ministerial statement. It is improper, and it is against the rules. But he made a statement, significantly not tabling a copy of it.

MR. BRETT: I did table a copy of it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the minister indicates that he did table a copy. I apologize to him. All I will say is that it has gotten no further than the table of the House, because the pages for one reason or another have not brought it any further than the table of the House. Indeed, perhaps, the gentleman who is at the table, if there is a copy of the statement, could let me have a copy of it, or if the minister had one, because I wish to refer to some points the minister made, and I would just as soon quote him accurately if I am to quote him at all.

Mr. Speaker, the thrust of the minister's statement dealt, of course, with the government's programme, or part of the government's \$2 million programme, the Band Aid. And I want to refer specifically to one or two statements the minister made, and then we can go on from there.

Now I am perplexed by the minister's statistics. The minister said on page 3 of his statement that in December 1971 - before the present administration came to power - there were 9,206

Mr. Roberts.

able-bodied social assistance cases on our payroll. However, in the intervening five years we have practically cut this caseload in half. For example, in December, 1976 there were only 5,196 able-bodied social assistance cases on the payroll." And then he goes on, "These are facts which cannot be refuted."

Now I do not pretend to refute the minister on facts which he says cannot be refuted, but he says, "In December, 1976 there were only 5,196 able-bodied social assistance cases." His office refused to reveal the figures to our staff when we called, and yet the - I am going to make sure that I have apples and apples here - government's own statistics, as put out - the date is actually January 21, 1977 - the flash sheet by the Central Statistical Services Planning and Priorities Secretariat, Executive Council show that the number of people - and it is for November, it is the last month made public - heads of families and/or single persons in receipt of short-term basic social assistance were 10,441, which is an increase of 14.7 per cent from the number, the same category receiving assistance in the same month the year before. And over the year we have had an increase of 10 per cent from January to November inclusive. Now I do not have the December figures, because the minister's officials declined to release them to the press. The word I got was to the press or to the House of Assembly.

But I am unable to understand why in November, 1976 we had 10,441 people, heads of families and/or single persons - this might be 30,000 or 40,000 or 50,000 people but we are talking units, and a unit is a head of a family or a single person in receipt of short-term basic social assistance - how it can be 10,441 in November, 1976 and only 5,196 in December, 1976. And I am assuming that able-bodied social assistance cases are essentially the same as heads of families and/or single persons in receipt of short-term basic

Mr. Roberts.

social assistance. Now if the minister would like to speak to that, I would gladly yield only for a second on the understanding that I can resume my remarks. But I am genuinely perplexed at that, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: If the hon. member would yield, Mr. Speaker, yes, I can explain that very clearly. First of all there was a decrease in the month of December,

MR. BRETT:

I do not know the exact number, probably attributable to the fact that fishermen qualified for unemployment insurance in December of this year for the first time. But the difference in the figures, Mr. Speaker, are - the number that I have given here - are the families of one or more who are actually in receipt of, say, food, clothing, shelter, the whole thing. Whereas there are quite a number - for example, we have people who are getting, say, drugs alone. We have people who are getting just transportation, just one aspect of welfare like that. And these are not included in this figure here. But the number of families who are actually in receipt of able-bodied assistance in whole -

MR. PECKFORD: Who are totally dependant on the government.

MR. BRETT: Totally - that is the word I was looking for. Thank you, hon. member - totally dependant on the government at the end of December was actually the number that I gave, 5,196.

But if you take the whole thing into consideration, as the hon. member was saying, people who are getting drugs alone, people who are getting rent alone and so on and so on, we will come up with a larger figure. But the total number is the number that I have given here.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman. Of course under the rules of the House I accept his explanation. But I find it passing strange because in my experience - I was minister of the old Welfare Department for the better part of twelve months - it is just not so that half the people receiving short-term basic social assistance are receiving only the supplementary forms of assistance. I just find that passing strange.

MR. MUPPHY: What about the unwed mothers.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I realize there are unmarried mothers. Of course there are unmarried mothers. Many of those are long-term because of course the -

MR. YOUNG: They are not able-bodied, though.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not think the hon. gentleman is saying that -

MR. ROBERTS:

well many unmarried mothers are able-bodied. Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody would maintain that there are 5,000 unmarried mothers in this Province receiving short-term assistance in the month of December.

But, you know, it is something that the minister perhaps should give us a little more on because I can bite the apple another way, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe the minister's figures. I think he is being honest but I do not think he is being completely frank. I have here government tables actually from the statistics books that are put out showing short-term social assistance for the month of March. But I am comparing apples and apples. The minister choose December. Unfortunately I do not have the figures for December here. But I have the ones for March.

The number of able-bodied cases assisted in March, 1971 by electoral districts and occupation of family head. I dragged these out because quite frankly I was rather deeply struck by the minister when he claimed and he boasted to have cut able-bodied social relief by fifty per cent over five years because it squares with nothing that I know or nothing that I have heard. Those of us who deal with constituents, you know, it just does not wash.

In March, 1971 there were 6,592 people receiving able-bodied assistance. Okay. And I could give the minister a breakdown by district or by occupation. In Marcy, 1972 it had dropped somewhat to 6,349, a miniscule drop but a drop nonetheless. In 1973 it had dropped to 4,882. In 1974 to 3,788 and in 1975 to 4682. And I do not have those particular statistics for March, 1976 but all I will say is they show no such decrease as the minister has talked of. They show at most 6,500 to 4,600 from 1971 to 1975, the same month. So the minister's statement is just - I am not allowed to call it incorrect and I do not believe the minister meant to mislead - but it is extremely misleading.

I called it mischievous. I am told it should be mischievous and I am glad that I am brought up on this. I do not think it is anything

MR. ROBERTS:

like the kind of candid and frank statement we have a right to expect from a minister giving details of an important programme. I think the minister has got to explain it, Sir. I appreciate his intervention. But, you know, I could be convinced but it is going to take some convincing to convince me that more than or approximately one-half of the people getting assistance on a short-term basis, basically an order issued from an individual office as opposed to a check coming from St. John's - I think that is the basic distinction these days - that more than half or approximately half of those are not receiving - you know, are not the unemployed employables as opposed to unemployed unemployables. I just quite frankly

Mr. Roberts:

think that the minister's statements are incorrect, and the statistical evidence which we can gather at this point certainly indicates it. We have not cut in half, I wish the Heavens we had the number of people getting social assistance in this Province.

You know, indeed if Your Honour wants to know what has happened, look at just four years, or three years, the average number getting short term social assistance, the average number of heads of families or single able-bodied was 6,500, 6,600 in 1974, 7,100 in 1975, 9,000 in 1976, these are on averages. We do not have an average for 1977, of course, but it is 10,500 in the first month of 1977.

So in that light, Sir, the government's programme becomes even less. It is not even a decent Band-Aid. What the minister told us in his statement today was the government -

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the social aspects?

MR. ROBERTS: I will come to the social aspects. The minister told us today that the government proposed to take, I think, he talked of about 400 people on the social assistance projects, I am sorry, on social assistance, and in effect put them to work. Now remember an important distinction between this monstrosity of a programme and something like LIP or Canada Works. The basic philosophy behind LIP or Canada Works and - and by the way if the minister wants an illustration of the need, let me give him this one. The minister up in Ottawa today, Mr. Cullen, announced that they have received a lot of applications for Canada Works in this Province. The applications they have received total, the requests that have come in total \$31 million. These are projects that groups and individuals throughout the Province conceived, put on paper, sent in. That is six times the money they have allocated. They have allocated \$5 million which is two and a half times, 250 per cent as much as the government here.

MR. PECKFORD: Forty times the budget.

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe forty times as much, I do not know what it is. This \$2 million is two-tenths of one per cent of the government's budget.

MR. RIDEOUT: A billion dollar budget.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not what the government have wasted on Gull Island. The minister has wasted more than \$2 million on Gull Island this year. My God, every time I go down to get my mail I see twenty or thirty cars with Hydro? Hydro have an employee, Mr. Speaker, who goes out every morning, he tells me, and starts the cars down there, a man who gets out and warms up their cars. I go and get my mail at Philip Place, is it? that is where my post box is located, and you see fifteen or twenty or thirty or forty Hydro cars. They have wasted \$2 million in Hydro alone, the minister's own department. The CFLCo jet must cost half of that a year, sking people around on shopping trips to Montreal, and all the other marvelous things it does.

MR. FLIGHT: All-terrain vehicles all over the place.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, all-terrain - you cannot get into the hunting areas in Central Newfoundland, I am told, for all-terrain vehicles with Hydro stamped on them.

Mr. Speaker, to come back, because I am talking something serious and the Minister of Mines and Energy should stay out of that kind of discussion, he is not equipped to get into it, the point I am making is that this government have brought together a programme that does not say to people around the Island and throughout Labrador send us your ideas and we will evaluate them, and we will go for the ones we can up to the limit of the money we have available. Instead what they have done is some geniuses the minister and his colleagues, had decided they are going to pick projects and pick people, not locally initiated, no local initiative, it is a St. John's initiative, and 400 men and women throughout this Province are going to get their orders, obviously, and the order is off you go to work on the project. And

Mr. Roberts:

the minister told us-- now what are they going to do when they work?
The minister told us, the figure is in here somewhere, Sir, or is it?
Yes, \$702,000 allocated to the Department of Social Services. Now,
Sir, he also told us there would be - I have to look to find the
figures - 400 jobs at \$702,000, and that is about \$1,600 or \$1,700
a job. My arithmetic I think is pretty accurate, \$1,700, \$1,750,
400 for \$702,000. Now the minimum wage in this Province is \$100
a week, that is the minimum wage.

AN HON. MEMBER: The LIP wage is \$130.

MR. ROBERTS: The LIP wage that has been so justly decried, or
Canada Works, is \$115, is it not?

AN HON. MEMBER: LIP is \$130.

MR. ROBERTS: LIP is \$130.

MR. ROBERTS: So let us assume those people are sent to work for the minimum wage. They will get seventeen weeks work. Now we are getting to the real heart of this project. This is what this government have done. One-third of the total expenditure, now heavens knows tomorrow we will have another minister pop up and maybe two or three, because it is Private Members' Day, and they would like to try to restrict debate there, but we will have a minister pop up and read the statement that somebody has written out for him as the minister did today.

We are talking 400 jobs at seventeen weeks each at \$100 each. That is this government's response to the 10,441 people who are on short term basic social assistance and even the minister claims that 5,200 of those -

MR. FLIGHT: Shameful.

MR. ROBERTS: - 5,200 of those are able-bodied. And, Mr. Sneaker, we are not going to have a local initiative. We are going to go back to the old days where you were told to work for your relief. That is what this government are talking of, not local initiatives, not Canada Works -

PREMIER MOORES: If possible, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, if possible, the Premier says, Well his colleague has found the way to do it, work for relief. We will have another Road DeLuxe or another Indian Meal Line. The Indian Meal Line, I am told, got its name because the men who were forced to work on it were paid in Indian meal. The Road DeLuxe.

MR. NEARY: We have one over on Bell Island the Wac Road.

MR. ROBERTS: What do they call it?

MR. NEARY: The Wac Road.

MR. ROBERTS: The Wac Road.

MR. NEARY: It was named after Wac -

MR. ROBERTS: Wac was the word for dole. Well now that is the

MR. ROBERTS: achievement of this government, to put us back forty years.

MR. FLIGHT: That is typical.

MR. ROBERTS: Now the minister talks about social value and he pretends—or maybe he believes, I do not think he pretends—he believes that somehow it is socially valuable to take a man who is on short term assistance because he has no other means of support, that is basically the condition for getting it, and put him to work, forcing him to work no doubt, not on projects that have any local value, but projects which the minister has dreamed up, or his officials have dreamed up. Now I say to the minister that he can talk as he wants, he can boast as he wants, he can accuse me of making partisan politics if he wants to; but if he has any concern at all for these people, and nobody thinks he has unlimited funds at his disposal as the minister, that he will say to these people, the people in the Province, "All right, let us work out some projects along the LIP line." If you want to talk of social values, \$700,000, four hundred people getting by his definition getting \$1,700 each. That is about half what they get on the LIP projects on the average, and I suppose though what is really in the minister's mind if the truth be known, was that these people at least would get their unemployment insurance contributions because the real reason that able-bodied assistance is down by whatever number it is down is of course the unemployment insurance roles have swollen dramatically. That is the real reason why. And when this government talk and boast it is not any policy they have done. It is not any policy they have done.

I am not happy that unemployment insurance is the largest industry we have or that there are 40,000 or 50,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians today drawing UIC. I am not happy about that at all. And I am not happy that 10,441 heads of families and single able-bodied men were in receipt of short-term social assistance during the month of

MR. ROBERTS: December last. The minister will probably say I am happy and if he does I will think less of him. It will reveal the depths to which a man will descend. But I say the only reason why there has been any drop is that the unemployment insurance roles have swollen dramatically, that there are far more people getting unemployment insurance and they are getting it for far longer. So one change alone that they made last Spring, the extension of the fishermen from, was it fifteen weeks to twenty-four weeks? the fishermen's benefits gone, that extra nine weeks will take hundreds and hundreds of men off the minister's welfare roles.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister brings in his statesmanly boast. Well I say, Sir, he should be ashamed of it. I say that if that is the best the minister can do he should get out and let somebody else take it over. I mean, I thought some of his predecessors were pretty bad.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. FLIGHT: You cannot ignore it.

MR. ROBERTS: But if that is the best this minister can do, Sir, let him go back to the drawing board.

MR. FLIGHT: You cannot ignore it.

MR. ROBERTS: That is not a programme. This government can do better than that. Any government can do better than that. Lay off the executive assistants and you would get a couple of million dollars. It would be no trouble at all. If you want a couple of million dollars, lay off the assistants to the Premier who have been hired for one reason or another.

MR. FLIGHT: Secretaries to the assistants.

MR. ROBERTS: You know, and all of that, then if the government want to do something they ask for restraint. Let us see a little restraint on the government. The questions are on the Order Paper today about the government travel, the ministers' travel.

Mr. Roberts.

We will see now. We will see if those questions are answered, how many ministers have lashed out how much on travel. We will see about restraint. The Minister of Justice's executive assistant, \$2,400 according to the Auditor General for political business in Grand Bank, back and forth to Grand Bank - \$2,400.

MR. CANNING: That is restraint.

MR. ROBERTS: And that is restraint. That would have put, on the minister's standard, one and one-half men to work instead of going down. And as it was the minister only barely scraped in. He got about thirty-nine per cent of the vote. Twenty-four hundred dollars spent.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Clean.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister.

Well the Auditor General was quite pertinent in that remark. He says, "It is certainly improperly appropriated. It may have been improperly spent." Twenty-four hundred dollars for an executive assistant to go to the minister's - he boasted of it. You know, the minister does not visit his district himself so he sends his assistant down - pretty poor. And they talk of restraint. They talk of restraint. And we see the meaning of restraint when we come to the minister's statements. If they want to put the people of this Province to work, Sir, they can do better than that. If they want positive programmes and a positive response from this House, let them bring in some positive initiatives. If that is what the minister has come up with in a year, if that is what the minister has come up with in a year since last he dealt with this matter in the House, it is pretty poor; misleading figures, figures which by no definition can be considered correct. It is shameful, Sir. It is disgraceful. People of this Province deserve better than that.

The Auditor General's Report I would commend.

MR. HICKMAN: Mine work full-time.

MR. ROBERTS: That is more than the minister does, more than the average minister.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General's Report I would commend to all hon. gentlemen, because it has in it some of the most appalling examples of mis-application of government funds that I have ever seen. Our old friend Mr. George McLean crops up, and several new versions of consultants crop up. And in due course the registry tomorrow morning will be occupied exclusively by M.H.A.'s and research people looking into the names of some of these companies that have managed to find a way to get public money without going through the formalities. We will be having a look at the Public Tender Act. It is obvious now that the Public Works Department has deliberately been trying to get around the Public Tender Act. I will be very interested to hear whatever comments the gentleman from St. John's East chooses to make on it, because he sponsored that legislation in the House. Indeed left the Cabinet over what he believed, and I believe believed correctly, to be an attempt to subvert that act. And I am sure he is reading with great interest now the relevant portion. It is a very simple device they found, Sir, very simple. The act requires public tenders on everything over \$15,000. So all they do - they do not award a contract of more than \$15,000. They award twelve contracts of \$12,000 each for a \$144,000 project. And the Auditor General has blown it. He has exposed it now. He has done his duty as a servant of this House. He has made his report. It is public now. We will have the opportunity to debate it. We will see what answer, if any, the government can make. And we will see what the Minister of Public Works is doing about it. He was not minister at the time. He was not responsible ministerially, but he has inherited the mess, and we will see what he is doing. And they are going to get the lawyers in now to see if the act has been broken.

MR. R. MOORES: The minister does not believe in public tenders.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister has just about told us that he does not believe in public tenders. But that is okay, because nobody believes in the

Mr. Roberts.

minister. So it is Even Steven.

But, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister of Public Works, he has got the onus on him now. He did not create it. He did not preside over it. But he is there now, and he is responsible now, and he has got to tell the House exactly what he is going to do, and there should be an early and a complete ministerial statement from the Minister of Public Works, a very early and a very complete statement as to exactly what he is going to do. Who has been punished? Who was guilty? Obviously somebody was. An act passed by this House - and it happened time and time again. It cannot be considered an accident. It is obviously a deliberate and concerted effort to get around the provisions of the Public Tender Act.

MR. ROWE: Page 111.

MR. ROBERTS: Page 111 - was it? Oh, yes, 107, yes, yes, such as things are. I am on page 110.

District Vocational Schools, St. Anthony, six separate work orders for \$16,000. The Heavy Equipment School at Stephenville, four work orders, \$19,000. LeMarchant Road building, three work orders, \$34,000. Building 1170, Pleasantville, \$23,000, six work orders. Prison camp, \$16,000, three work orders.

MR. NEARY: I guess they are ready for when they go out to the prison camp.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS:

The Auditor General also says, "During the year 1975-1976, 643 work orders were issued to company B." He has not given us the name of company B but in due course we shall find out." Of these, 496 were issued after the job was completely and subsequent to the invoice date." That is a fine way to do business now. After the job is completely, after you send your invoices we will issue a work order. Fifty were issued undated.

Company C which the Auditor General notes is related to company B - and these two companies have benefited from the public trust to the extent of \$1.5 million in the fiscal year, 1975-1976. In the case of company C work performed at one building with a value of \$30,503 was considered one job in the billings of the company but was covered by sixteen work orders issued by the department.

And the Auditor General goes on in a masterpiece of understatement and says, "In my opinion tenders should have been called for this job as required by the Public Tender Act." And he is being very charitable. During the year 1975-1976 485 work orders were issued to company C. Of these 212 were issued after the job was completed and subsequent to the date of the invoice. Now what a way to run a department!

AN HON. MEMBER: He has not been here since the House opened.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister was not the department minister.

MR. NEARY: No wonder they bounced the other fellow.

MR. ROBERTS: Well now we know the real reason, I guess, why the gentleman for St. Barbe (Mr. Maynard) was given a quick, horizontal promotion and the member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) was brought back into the department where he had served with some distinction for a number of years.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has not been in the House so far. I expect he is out of Cabinet.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman for St. Barbe (Mr. Maynard), I do not know why he is not in the House. I suspect he is still in the Cabinet

MR. ROBERTS:

We have not heard that he is not. But in any event there are lots of these lovely things which should be discussed and will be.

Mr. Speaker, there are one or two other things I would like to deal with and so I will mention growing out of the Throne Speech. I would like to say a word or two about the election expenses legislation, and I say these with apologies to Mr. Jamieson of Open Line who does not think it is important. I think it is important. I think it is very important that the government bring in whatever legislation they want to bring in, intend to bring in and make it public early on. I say that with some pardonable cynicism because to begin with we were promised the whole thing last year and of course it never surfaced. Then at the same time we all remember the redistribution proceeding, one of the most shameful acts every undertaken by a government. The Minister of Justice made a solemn assurance that never again would a redistribution be done on a partisan thing, and then spoke and voted for the most shamefully partisan redistribution ever carried out in this Province.

So I would hope that we would see the election expense legislation early and that it will be examined thoroughly and impartially. I believe there is nothing that is more important than ensuring that the members who get to the House of Assembly get here in the best possible route. I think that members on both sides will agree with me that the present system which has gone on for several hundred years and which is not unique to this Province, while it may have served well in the past is not adequate in this day and age. It is time we had legislation governing strictly the expenditure that is incurred for election purposes, requiring the source of contributions to be disclosed publicly so the people can judge for themselves, limiting rigorously the types of expenditures which can be incurred and generally cleaning up the whole sordid mess which political financing in this Province today represents.

AN HON. MEMBER: Retroactive.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, retroactive if we wish. I would think too, Sir, that the government might look at what the government, the Tory government by the way, of Ontario does and that is allow an income tax rebate just as the Government of Canada do in respect of contributions to political parties. Then that might encourage individuals throughout the Province to contribute to the party of their choice.

You know, I brought in a motion a couple of years ago about public financing -

MR. PECKFORD: Did you say corporations contribute?

MR. ROBERTS: No, I said individuals but corporations can too up to the limit of \$100, is it not, or whatever it is. The Income Tax Act provisions apply equally to a corporation.

MR. DOODY: One hundred dollars is already down.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the minister and I may well want to discuss the amounts but \$100 I think because you get the maximum percentage return. What is the maximum? \$1,100 under the federal act? I think it is \$1,100 in respect of which you can get any tax relief at all. But it does apply to corporations.

MR. WHITE: The same in Ontario.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Lewisporte (Mr. White) tells me the Ontario rule, Ontario law is exactly the same and so you get the contribution on - I do not think it is on both sides - but it is certainly on either side or for a contribution to a provincial party.

MR. ROBERTS: And hopefully we will never again see the sort of shameful, sordid way in which the present government's party raised money during the 1975 election. If they want to have a royal commission we could have a lovely one on that, a lovely one on that, on how they raised money.

And the phone calls were made about targets, and the people who got phone calls, the business people who got phone calls saying, "This is blank-blank, calling, and I am calling in respect of a contribution for our party" - naming the party, not the Liberal Party I hasten to say - and saying here is the target, and the target was an astronomical sum. And I say to the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), that he may well have heard of these things. I know he took no part of it but he may well have heard of it. Many of his friends around St. John's, I suspect, have mentioned it to him. I am sure the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), has heard of some of these.

MR. NEARY: I have.

MR. ROBERTS: Sordid! Sordid transactions went on. Close, close to blackmail, and I do not know if they were carried out -

MR. NEARY: You would not think two of these hon. gentlemen would have the nerve to sit over there. They come out trying to be Simon White, or Lilly White and Simon Pure and they continue to sit over there. They participate in the blood money, the under-the-table deals, and there they are sitting over there the two of them. They will get up now and condemn their own administration.

MR. HICKEY: What about the hon. gentleman?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, let not the Minister of Tourism, who has a whole section of the Auditor General's Report just for himself, a whole section on the maladministration down in that department under the minister's ministerial supervision,

MR. ROBERTS: not to mention his conduct of the game laws and other wildlife, let the Minister of Tourism not be heard from on this point.

MR. HICKEY: I gave advance notice last year -

MR. ROBERTS: The minister gave advance notice that he would be wildlife - that he would live wild?

MR. FLIGHT: He would be wild.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister gave advance notice that he would be subject to the sort of things in here? In that case the minister should get the blank out as quickly as possible and hang his head in shame. The most he can do is plead not guilty by reason of ignorance. That is the best he can hope for from the court of public opinion, the very best. A minister, Mr. Speaker, who has to send out a memorandum to his officials -

MR. HICKEY: If I did that I would have a lot of friends on the other side.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the minister would have more friends than he has on his own side, I can tell him. Mr. Speaker, a minister who has to send a memorandum out to his officials complaining. "The proper line of access to me is through the director to the assistant deputy to the deputy and then you may on bended knee approach the minister." Then when it gets in the newspaper, has to launch an internal enquiry of some dimensions to find out how it got there. It got there from the minister to the deputy minister to the assistant deputy minister to the director to the assistant director to the man on the street who got hold of it.

MR. HICKEY: That is pretty heavy.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it is heavy stuff but it is fitting for the minister. And the trouble, Mr. Speaker, you see it is ten to six. I wonder if the government House Leader and the Whip - are we sitting? Are we going to sit this evening?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: The government are doing their very best to get the session speeded up and over with. That is fine! I am in good voice and I have a great deal left to say.

Now to come back to election expenses. I would hope that whichever minister is given the chore of, the delightful chore of speaking in reply to me will give us some categorical assumption - assertion, I am sorry - that we will get this legislation in this session, that it will be meaningful legislation. We are going to be very much on our guard. We have had experience with hon. gentlemen opposite and we just do not believe them, we just find them not to be men of their words in matters of this sort.

MR. FLIGHT: How can we?

MR. ROBERTS: "How can we", say my colleagues, and we cannot.

MR. STRACHAN: The hon. the Minister of Tourism is mad.

MR. RIDEOUT: Not after the Auditor General's Report.

MR. ROBERTS: My colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) says the Minsiter of Tourism is mad. He is also angry.

Mr. Speaker, the fact I am speaking on is the election expenses legislation which is of great importance. We want to see it early in this session and I think it is of significant public value that the process by which members are elected to this House should be exposed ruthlessly and rigorously so that the people of this Province will know exactly how parties are financed, where the money comes from and how it is spent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: I think that is of very great importance. I still feel that the government, the public chest should finance large portions of election expenses as they do in Canada, as they

MR. ROBERTS: do in Quebec. The Presidential election in the United States last Fall, in which Mr. Carter was elected over Mr. Ford, was conducted entirely on public funds.

Did the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) say something?

MR. J. CARTER: That is good for the Carters.

MR. ROBERTS: For the carters? Well I may say, Mr. Speaker, with all deference to my dear friend from St. John's North, it is nice to see one Carter who has made it somewhere.

MR. DOODY: . From peanuts to savoury.

MR. ROBERTS: From peanuts to savoury. They have it locked in. Mr. Speaker,

MR. ROBERTS: Let us hear it for the Carters! I could say to the hon. gentleman we would hear it over here, but it is no accident that he is keeping his back to the wall on his side of the House, I can tell you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the government to bring in at an early date the legislation of which they speak to reform the Election Act. It is obvious, and I am not commenting on any particular case now before the courts, but it is obvious that the Election Act is seriously deficient in its provisions. It is very obvious that many people who are not lawfully entitled to vote under the Act are voting. I said lawfully entitled to vote under the Act.' I think they are in most cases entitled to vote, but the fact remains the rules are so technical, they are so imprecise, they are so inaccurate, they are so incapable of being diligently and correctly applied that it is time we had a look at whether we can devise a better set of rules. And I would hope that the government will bring in some legislation in this session to that effect.

Now, Sir, let me say a word or two about - I just had this Quebec question and I have mashed, I put by it, Joe Clarke and Morgan! Because we are all fascinated I know to see that the Minister of Transportation for this Province, and I guess he is still minister, although I imagine the Premier will have a word or two with him when he gets back. The Minister of Transportation has seen fit to express publicly a view that the National Leader of his party, Mr. Clarke, should perhaps rethink a statement which Mr. Clarke made, and I guess this grew out of the same set of facts which were reflected in yesterday's edition of The Evening Telegram where it announced that Mr. Biron Rodrigue the Union Nationale Leader in Quebec Province, it still is a province, the Union Nationale Leader had got a better reception at a P.C. banquet than had the National Leader of that party. But, Sir, this matter is of some importance, because the crisis which confronts Canada today, if crisis is not too strong a word, the crisis is a very real one.

Mr. Roberts:

And obviously if it is not resolved to the satisfaction of all the parties concerned, and I do not mean political parties, I mean individual groups, parties, the people of Quebec, the people of the other provinces of Canada then we have a very, very potentially serious problem, because none of us, Sir, wants to see Canada become less than she is today, and if the Province of Quebec, the people of Quebec are to leave Confederation and go their separate way then it is pathetically and perfectly obvious that the Canada we know, and the Canada we love will not be the Canada in which we live. It will be a much lesser country. It will have, I believe, particularly serious effects for our Province, Newfoundland and Labrador. We have a border, the only border we have, the only land border we have we share with Quebec, and we have very, very serious problems as neighbours in getting along with the Province of Quebec. We are now suing that government or their Hydro Corporation in the Courts with respect to the Churchill Falls deal.

My friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) raised a matter yesterday in the House and got a very spurious, and almost insulting reply from the minister, a reply which was not warranted.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is calling it 6:00 o'clock.

MR. ROBERTS: I move the adjournment of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded, or it has been moved that this House now adjourn. Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour "Aye".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Let us have a division on it, Mr. Speaker. There are three of us who stood, and that is sufficient to call in the members, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the House divide.

DIVISION:

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The motion is that this House do now adjourn. Those in favour of the motion please rise. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hodder, Mrs. MacIsaac, Mr. Canning, Mr. Strachan, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Simmons, Mr. White and the hon. Mr. Smallwood, Mr. Lush, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Flight, Mr. Rideout, Captain Winsor, Mr. Rowe, Mr. McNeil, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Neary.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against the motion please rise. The hon. the Premier, the hon. Minister of Tourism, the hon. Minister of Health, the hon. the Minister of Social Services, the hon. the Minister of Rural and Industrial Development, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, the hon. the Minister of Justice, the hon. the Minister of Finance, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the hon. Dr. Farrell, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, the hon. the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, the hon. the Minister of Education, Dr. Collins, Mr. Young, Dr. Twomey, Mr. Goudie, Mr. Windsor, Mr. Cross, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Carter, Mr. Woodrow, Mr. Winsor. and Mr. Marshall.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

It being six o'clock I leave the Chair until eight this evening.

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

House of Assembly

For the period:

8:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.

February 8, 1977

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Before adjourning the Leader of the Opposition was speaking on the amendment to the Address in Reply.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have just about finished my remarks, all will be delighted to hear. But in view of the fact that the government House Leader, who apparently has yet to learn that in making the House work the carrot works better than the stick -

MR. DOODY: Whatever the donkey prefers.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I was waiting for that because I would rather be a full donkey, Sir, than the rear half of the donkey that I see looking at me on the other side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has obviously supped well but not wisely. Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I am about finished what I wish to say. There are two or three other subjects that I would like to touch upon. Before we rose for the supper recess I had begun to say a few words about the Quebec situation because, as with any citizen of this Province, I am very deeply concerned, and I think as with any citizen of Canada, we must be concerned with the situation which has arisen and will develop as a result of the election of a party to the government of Quebec that is avowed and dedicated to the cause of separating Quebec, of taking Quebec out of the Confederation.

I was saying a word or two in praise - it is not often I find cause to praise the Minister of Transportation - but I was saying a word or two in praise of him because I believe that something which he said or is reported to have said yesterday in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, where he has been three days at a one day meeting, was worthy of praise. That is his statement calling upon the Leader of the Opposition at Ottawa, Mr. Clark, the member for the district of High

MR. ROBERTS:

River in Alberta, to repudiate entirely and completely the policy of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada, namely of welcoming separatist support.

MR. H. COLLINS: What has that got to do with this Province?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it has more to do with the 200-mile limit than the Minister of Health has to do with the Department of Health. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health, Sir, has left behind him in the various portfolios from which he has been removed by the Premier from time to time - and he has other portfolios from which he will be removed, including his current one - has left behind him, Sir, a record which is not merely one of failure to grapple imaginatively or even ably with the problems confronting that portfolio, but after the gear replacement, Sir, we are seeing a minister who is responsible for one of the great scandals of our time.

MR. RIDEOUT: Listen to the truth now, listen to the truth.

MR. ROBERTS: Because if the truth was known, Mr. Speaker, the present Minister of Health while he was Minister of Fisheries was told by his officials, was warned -

AN HON. MEMBER: He was not.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes he was. He was warned by them that the programme which he had developed and sponsored as a minister, and for which he was responsible as a minister was open to grave abuse and that they suspected there was such abuse. Those memoranda, Sir, are in the files, I am quite certain, of the Department of Fisheries. If ever the minister had the courage to ask for an independent and impartial investigation, those memoranda and the papers and the warnings would be revealed and he too would be revealed. Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Now he is trying to make everybody toothless in the Province.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Health, Sir, the Minister of Health has added significantly to the woes of this administration and has yet to add a jot or a tittle or an iota, to quote his former departed

MR. ROBERTS:

leader, Mr. Crosbie, a jot, a tittle or an iota -

MR. DOODY: A giant among the pigmies.

MR. ROBERTS: Right, the giant among the pigmies. Mr. John
Crosbie, whatever he is, whatever he was, or whatever he will be,

MR. ROBERTS: when he sat as a member of the administration opposite was certainly the giant among pigmies. But now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying with respect to the Minister of Health, he has added considerably to the woes and not a jot or not a whit or a tittle to the welfare, the well being of any department he has graced, or of the Province. And I would say to him, Sir, that if he wishes to interrupt me I would be more than happy to deal with him on his own terms. I regret I cannot deal with him fully on his own terms. But I shall try to deal with him on his own terms as best I can. If he on the other hand can control his impatience, and control whatever it is has led him into this particular interjection at this time, then I would think, Sir, that all would be better, including in particular the Minister of Health.

Now as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I was making the point, the Minister of Transportation for this Province has made what I think is a very good statement, and I merely want to repeat it, to emphasize it and to draw it to the attention of the House that the hon. gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), and I am no particular admirer of that hon. gentleman's, not in his conduct of his ministerial office. But I do feel, Sir, that when he repudiated Mr. Clarke and called on Mr. Clarke to repudiate completely the PC policy, and I say to the hon. gentleman opposite, one of whom will very shortly rise to speak even if he cannot rise to the occasion, that he should say clearly whether the administration of which he is a part, which is a Progressive Conservative Administration, a Tory Administration, supports the statement of Mr. Clarke who has, through his organizers, welcomed separatist support, a man who apparently is willing to do anything within the law, anything within the bounds of the criminal code and the law, anything that will result in him trying to win a seat or two when the by-elections that are to be called to fill the vacant

MR. ROBERTS: seats in the House of Commons in the Province of Quebec, to whether this government agrees with that view or not. I think it is an entirely fair thing for them to say, Sir, particularly in view of the fact the hon. gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), a man who enjoys the full and complete confidence of the Premier, the Minister of Justice particularly in his role as Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, the other members of the Cabinet, has made the statement, or is reported to have made it, he did not make it in my hearing but he has made it, reported to have made it, and I believe in fact did make it.

This is a very serious matter. The Minister of Health, who has left us once again, doubtless for only a brief time unfortunately -

MR. DOODY: He is gone to check on the flower gardens.

MR. ROBERTS: He may well have gone to check on a lot of things. But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health asks what it has to do with this Province. Well I say, Sir, it has a lot more to do with this Province than, "An Act To Amend The Legislative Disabilities Act," "An Act To Amend The Memorial University Act," "An Act To Amend The Statutes Act," "An Act To Establish The Newfoundland Statistics Agency," "An Act To Amend The Maintenance Orders Enforcement Act," and this one, Sir, is of great crucial importance, the Minister of Health has doubtless been up for weeks working on this particular legislative reform, "An Act To Change The Corporate Name Of The Society Of The Industrial Accountants of Newfoundland," "An Act To Amend The Attachment Of Wages Act," and this is one that the Minister of Finance is interested in, "An Act To Amend The Petty Trespass Act."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if they ask, that is the Order Paper. That is the legislation which this government have put before this House to date. The only thing in it of any significance is a bill

MR. ROBERTS: to make it legal for the gentleman from Exploits
(Mr. Twomey) to sit in the House and yet to continue to work
for the government as a medical practitioner. That is about

Mr. Roberts.

the only thing of any importance in that whole piece of legislation. the whole bundle of legislation. And the Minister of Health asks what is important about holding together the country of which we are a part? Does not the Minister of Health realize that we are Canadians, that our interests do not stop just at the Cabot Straits? It is true we are elected to be the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. DOODY: No, they stop at the Labrador border.

MR. ROBERTS: We are elected to be the Government of -

MR. DOODY: Remember -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance has been dining, as I said, well but not wisely, let him restrain himself as best he can. I realize it is a difficult job for him, but let him try to restrain himself, Sir. Let him try. Let him be the master of his fate and exchequer!

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the subject of the future of the Confederation of Canada is not one that I find very amusing. I am a Canadian as are all of us, and I am terribly concerned about the future of this country, and about the role which we, as legislators in one of the ten provinces of Canada, as men and women who are interested in the future of Canada, not just in the future of our own Province - of course, we are interested in that. We are interested in that primarily and importantly - but we are also interested in the future of Canada. And when I see the leader of one of the national parties of Canada welcoming separatist support, welcoming the support of a party that is openly and avowedly devoted to destroying Canada as we know it, I think it is fair to ask whether those in this Province, who follow him, as do the hon. gentlemen opposite, agree with him on that point or not. Let them stand and state straightforwardly and manfully, either they do or they do not. The Minister of Transportation, who whatever his failings is not a gentleman to mince words, the Minister of Transportation has taken his stand, manfully, openly and proudly. And I say, Sir, he has taken the right stand. And I call on all opposite who are

Mr. Roberts.

Tories, Progressive Conservatives - I have always considered Tory an honourable name. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to feel that it is a term of opprobrium or shame -but let them make it quite clear that on this issue, at least, Mr. Clarke may go his own separate way. But I happen to feel, Sir, that the future of Canada is worth fighting for, and I happen to feel, Sir, that the way to fight it is to take it on head on, and let the people of Quebec and the people of Canada decide in the right and proper way, at the ballot box.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And Mr. Clarke presumably feels the same way, I hope he does, but then why does he say that we would welcome separatist support? They may be desperate to win some by-elections, Sir. They may win the general election. I do not think that matters very much in the long-term as long as Canada survives. We have had Tory Governments before. My old mentor, a good friend of my friend from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), the hon. Mr. Pickersgill used to say that the Tory Government is a good thing every generation or so, and that is historically what we have had in Canada. Whether the pattern is repeated or not I know not. But let us make sure we have a Canada, and this sort of anti-Confederate stand taken by a vote grubber, by a group of men who will do anything to try to win some seats, anything. And I say there are some boundaries that even men searching for office should not overstep.

Mr. Speaker, I said earlier, on Opening Day, that I would like to see a full debate early in this session on the Lower Churchill, and the whole Churchill project. I think it is significant that there is so little in the Throne Speech with respect to the power project. I do not suppose I need to go over it in detail. We are all intimately familiar with it. We are all very much aware of the situation. The Minister of Finance two or three days ago had tabled the warrants, and I think there were about \$75 million or \$80 million in there for the

Mr. Roberts.

Churchill, unauthorized. Well, when I say unauthorized; unprovided for in the estimates. Seventy-five millions, have now been authorized now by the appropriate procedure, and I have no doubt that in due course it will be embodied in the Supplementary Supply legislation which will be laid before us.

Mr. Roberts:

Mr. Speaker, that is the price we have paid for the government's folly. They will attempt to blame it on the Government of Quebec, and I repeat, as I said before, that the Government of Quebec, and I do not know whether the present government will repeat the stand taken by their predecessors, but their predecessors acted in my view shamefully, improperly, wrongly, against the spirit of Confederation, and I believe truly against their own best interests too in the long run. Whether Mr. Levesque and his colleagues who now form the government will take the same position, I do not know. I hope they change their mind. I think if they are the least bit concerned with the future of Quebec, forget the future of Canada because we know their views on that, they will change their position completely, and allow that great development to go ahead on a basis that would be to the mutual benefit of all the people concerned. They are obviously not going to let it go ahead, if it is only to our benefit, just as we are not going to let it go ahead if it is only to their benefit.

The court action, I suppose I am not allowed to talk out, because it is a matter that is before the courts of the land. I suppose I am allowed to say two or three things without breaching the sub judice rules, Sir. First of all, it should be repeated that the action on which the government, of its section, of the legislation which the government have relied is a section that was put in by the legislation sponsored by my friend from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) when he led the administration of this Province, the government of this Province, that section, I believe, was in the 1961 legislation, I hope it proves strong enough. It is certainly open to interpretation. But I believe the interpretation which we favour, we, the people of this Province, is a correct one.

And I think it should be said too that and perhaps the Attorney General would have some comment on this in due course, I do not think

Mr. Roberts:

it is improper in any way, it will be two or three years I am told before the courts arrive at a resolution of the issues laid before them. The writ was issued, I believe, in September, I do not have it in front of me now, and here it is February and all we are so far is we are into the preliminary legal skirmishing, motions respecting jurisdiction are going to be argued, motions as to status of parties, motions as to whether or not the Attorney General was a fit witness, whether he could be subpoenaed. I believe Hydro Quebec wish to invite him to appear, to take the stand and subject himself to examination and to cross-examination, and the court, I believe, has ruled that the Attorney General is spared.

MR. HICKMAN: Not Justice Goodridge.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Justice Goodridge did not agree with the request of Hydro Quebec. I do not know whether that will be appealed or not. But I am told that it could easily be two or three years before this issue is resolved by the courts, if in fact it is resolved, because the courts will doubtless render a decision in due course, but I think all of us are familiar with the situation where the courts may render decisions that may not in themselves solve the problems.

I am glad to see that the Minister of Mines and Energy and his colleagues have revived the so-called Anglo-Saxon route, another idea which the much maligned gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) first brought forward in the mid-1960s. I do not know whether it is desirable now to do it. Perhaps when the minister speaks could tell us. I recall looking at the Preece Cardew Report, not being able to understand the technical aspects of it of course, but looking at it back in the mid-1960s when it was done, as I recall it it indicated then that even at that stage in the technology the project was technologically feasible, even though the economics were very undesirable at that point, but since then a great deal has happened in the world of economics, as well as the world of technology. It may very well be

Mr. Roberts:

that the project is not only technologically very much more feasible today, but economically it is becoming desirable.

Even so, Sir,

MR. SMALLWOOD: The price of the power delivered by that route all the way to New York would have been about 4 mils.

MR. ROBERTS: That was in the mid-1960s.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Preece Cardew and Rider Report.

MR. ROBERTS: In those days that was expensive power.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was high power.

MR. ROBERTS: Today it is a bargain, an incredible bargain today. The government are even talking just across the Straits, or they were talking - I do not know what the figure is now - 22 mil, 24 mil, 26 mil, 30 mil power delivered here on the Island from the Lower Churchill. And 4 mil power in the mid-1960s was considered too expensive, and that was why of course eventually the deal was entered into, a deal with Hydro Quebec which has turned out to be incredibly and very irrationally one-sided.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, let it be recorded - and I do not think this is a particularly new point but I think it is one worth stressing - that even if the Anglo-Saxon route proves feasible in an economic sense as opposed to merely the technological, but let it be recorded, Sir, that that in itself is not a solution to our problems because, as I think the Premier said on opening day - I think I heard him say this or if not I heard him say it somewhere else, it is right and good that he should say it - "No better to be in the hands of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island than it is in the hands of Quebec." We have got to be masters of our own destiny. Therefore the real question which the government must deal with is how can we use that power here in this Province, particularly in Labrador and then on the Island where that too is necessary and desirable.

Let me say as well, Sir, talking of the Lower Churchill, that there was nothing that happened between the time the government brought the Upper Churchill project and the rights to the Lower Churchill and the impasse with Quebec, nothing which in any way was not foreseeable when the government lashed out \$160 millions in an investment that in a monetary sense at least has turned out to be a very, very bad one, a point which the hon. gentleman's predecessor, Mr. Crosbie, had to admit here in the House during the last session. Those shares, Sir, will never pay for themselves. The money which we have borrowed to purchase those shares, the \$155 million, \$160 million is more than we will earn in the extra revenues which we get as a result of increasing our shareholding in the Upper Churchill, CFLCo Limited, from -

AN HON. MEMBER: Not true.

MR. ROBERTS: It is true. Mr. Crosbie admitted it in the House, Sir. He admitted it. The hon. gentleman opposite can go back to Hansard. We had quite a long technical argument.

MR. DOODY: We cannot answer for what he said.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the hon. gentleman may not answer for what he said. The point is that the fifty-seven -

MR. DOODY: Wrong, as usual.

MR. ROBERTS: Well if I am wrong I invite the minister to table the figures because the government have been noticeably reluctant to make public any information about this and a number of other things.

Mr. Speaker, the point as of a year ago - I do not know what has happened in the last year because, of course, the government have given us no information at all except a cheap, shoddy attempt at some fourth class emotionalism. I will come back to that. But the fifty-seven per cent share interest in the CFLCo firm which is what we purchased together with the rights to the Lower Churchill for a total of about \$160 million in 1974, the extra dividends which accrue to us as a result of that will not pay, will not amortize that debt, will not pay the interest and repay the principle. Now that was the situation a year past. It may have changed. I do not know. But I do know that here -

MR. NEARY: The agreement has not changed.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the dividends may have gone up. They may be more than they forecast. But the information which Mr. Crosbie - we dragged it out of him. It was like pulling teeth from a man who would not open his mouth, a very difficult job. We got it out of him finally and he had to come to the conclusion that the shares in themselves would not pay for itself.

MR. DOODY: Are you saying Mr. Crosbie is a man who would not open his mouth?

MR. ROBERTS: No, I would never accuse Mr. Crosbie of not opening his mouth. All that I would say was getting information out of him was a little like getting teeth out of a man who would not open his mouth. No, no! Nobody who sat in this House - my Heavens! the index to Hansard is in two parts, John Crosbie and the rest. I mean he was loquacious -

MR. DOODY: The rest is not relevant -

MR. ROBERTS: Well the minister should not include only his own speeches when he condemns all the speeches. Mr. Speaker, the fact

MR. ROBERTS:

remains that the Upper Churchill has proven to be a very bad deal financially. But more than that, Sir, there was done on the people of this Province by this government - shall I be relatively gentle and call it a monumental injustice, some sort of a con job. Because when the government came to this House asked for and received unanimous support there was no mention by the government - there was mention by this side - no mention by the government of the possibility of the predicament into which they got themselves, a predicament which was fully foreseeable even if it was not predictable.

You can look through the Hansards, Mr. Speaker, and you will find no statement by any spokesman for the government saying that if we are not able for any reason to get this project going on the Lower Churchill and given the fact that we still need power here on the Island of Newfoundland for our own domestic purposes we will have to go to Quebec to get additional power from the Upper Churchill to enable us to justify the cost of running a line across Labrador and across the Straits of Belle Isle and into the Island of Newfoundland. No mention at all and yet, Sir, a perfectly foreseeable fact. A number of my colleagues adverted to it and asked the question and were told, "Oh no possibility at all." Financing was all set, that the moment the government got their hands on the Churchill shares it was practically a guaranteed thing that the Lower Churchill would go full steam ahead. The

MR. ROBERTS: con job was continued, the charade went on. Right up through the period of the election the Premier taking helicopters down to the Straits of Belle Island to Savage Cove and across into Point Amour, near Forteau and that ridiculous charade blowing off the few tons of gravel or whatever it was, and the then Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Leo Barry, we have nearly as many Ministers of Energy, Sir, as we have had Ministers of Fisheries. But by and large they have been better men.

But, Mr. Speaker, the then Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Leo Barry, saying with indignant wrath that of course the project was going full speed ahead, that contracts were let, and how could anybody dare suggest that it would not go full speed ahead until the electricity came flowing out at Deer Lake, wherever the interconnection with the Island grid was. Now it turns out, Sir, that here we are, here we are, we have got \$250 millions socked into it, not earning even the interest on it, let alone the principle, \$250 million in a Province that is strapped for borrowing ability, a Province whose Premier publicly now is going around and saying that several Provinces are going to go bankrupt if the Bank of Canada does not step in, and obviously including his own Province in it. He stood here on Opening Day and said, the Minister of Finance shakes his head. He was not here. Let him have a look at the Hansard.

MR. RIDEOUT: He should read Hansard.

MR. DOODY: I cannot see where he said we were going to go bankrupt.

MR. ROBERTS: No, he did not say - he said we would be going bankrupt, and he did not name this Province either. He talked of three or four but there can be no doubt he meant this Province among the others because members opposite have often said, and it is truthful, that our financial position as a Province is the weakest of the ten Provinces in Canada and that is not something in which anybody takes pride, nor is it something which is particularly

MR. ROBERTS: new, that Baa, little one rating which Moody has assigned to us has been that way, as far as I know, since 1949, possibly before that. The little one is important. It is not quite as nice though as being A or Aa or Aaa, but Baa little one is better than Baa no little one.

MR. DOODY: No disgrace to be poor, is it?

MR. ROBERTS: Well it may not be any disgrace to be poor, Sir, but it certainly is a relevant fact. We now have \$250 million socked into Churchill, not earning anything. We are locked in a court battle with Quebec. We are being forced to turn to thermal sources for our energy, very expensive energy, and all of this as a result of a situation which was eminently foreseeable, even back in 1974. There have been no new factors. The agreements which were in force in 1974, those agreements were as public then as they are now. The facts were as well known as they are now. The whole House voted in favour of it. I guess the whole of the Province would have voted in favour of it if they had been asked too. I guess the whole country did.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It would have been won again.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), I think he said so at the time, stood against it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And so he tells me, so did Andrew Crosbie.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is two, and that leaves five hundred and sixty-odd thousand.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who was right?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), and I may disagree on this point. I am not sure who was right. I do know that the - I think the whole of the Province would have solidly endorsed that position.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I agree.

MR. ROBERTS: And that does not make it right. It merely is a statement of

MR. ROBERTS: public opinion at the time. But the government, Sir, pooh poohed any statements from this side, any questions. We were denounced as being disloyal, traitors, or corporate creatures or what have you and yet today, Sir, we are in a pretty picture. We have to turn to thermal for our energy, very expensive and with every prospect it will become immensely more expensive. We are seeing that already and in domestic hydro rates, electric rates which are going up steadily and rapidly. We are going to see another one - is it fifteen or twenty per cent this year? Do you have a figure? Fifteen or twenty per cent more on Light and Power this year at least and that is fifteen and twenty per cent on a bill which by and large is fifty or sixty per cent greater per kilowatt hour than it was a year or two ago.

MR. DOODY: Would that have changed if we did not take over the Churchill?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. We would not have spent \$250 million. The government could have used money for some other purpose. Sure.

MR. DOODY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No. No. Maybe our taxes would not be quite as high. Maybe the Minister of Finance would not-

MR. DOODY: You are getting into -

MR. ROBERTS: - maybe the Minister of Finance would not have had to bring in an honest budget as opposed to the dishonest one which his predecessor brought in increasing taxes savagely and he may have to do it again. He may have to do it. I do not know. I hope he does not. I am sure he does not want to but he may have to again. And one of the reasons why is that we are being drained by \$250 million in perfectly useless expenditures from which we are getting no return and with little immediate prospect of any return.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMONS: And true, and true.

Mr. Roberts.

And if those are Liberal economics, Mr. Speaker, I would rather have Liberal economics than Tory economics. And the hon. Minister of Justice who is so wise now, I should point out, was in the Cabinet, and indeed he is the only survivor now other than the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) who was leader of the administration. The Minister of Justice is the only survivor of that Cabinet. He is the only one left now in the House of Assembly. Many of the men are still alive. But now that Mr. Crosbie has bestrode elsewhere, the Minister of Justice is the one sole remanant, the last survivor.

MR. DOODY: A giant among pygmies.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, no, I would not call him that. But I would certainly would not call him a pygmy among giants, not seeing the hon. gentleman opposite. But I would think he is, even with Mr. Crosbie gone - and now that the Minister of Justice can blossom forth in the full light of day. I am talking about the hon. gentleman blossoming forth.

MR. NOLAN: He does not know.

MR. ROBERTS: And it is about time the hon. gentleman blossomed forth.

MR. NOLAN: He is on his way to the bench.

MR. ROBERTS: No. The problem is he is not on his way to the bench. That is his whole difficulty.

MR. NOLAN: I did not say what bench.

MR. ROBERTS: There have been six or seven or eight men summoned to the bench in this Province, and lightening has struck all around him. It struck law partners. It struck his deputy minister, but it has not yet struck him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point out the Lower Churchill is that the government have led us in to a very difficult situation. They can blame Quebec, and Quebec certainly must assume a fair share of the blame, although I doubt very much if the National Assembly of

Mr. Roberts.

Quebec or any member of it is the least bit concerned about that. My question is, what are they going to do? What policy have they now other than the present sterile policy? What are they going to do. When the Minister of Mines and Energy speaks after he has finished his efforts to flay me, which I have no doubt he will try with great gusto, let him deal with this as well, because the administration of which he is a part has entered into some sort of conspiracy of silence with respect to the Lower Churchill project, has said little, and has revealed even less.

MR. STRACHAN: "He was going to go ahead," the Premier said.

"He was going to go ahead," he said, "before Christmas."

MR. FLIGHT: He was going to go ahead, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Did the minister say he was going to go ahead before Christmas ?

MR. STRACHAN: No, the Premier did.

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier said, "He was going to go ahead before Christmas." But nobody believes the Premier any more.

MR. DOODY: No! No! No!

MR. ROBERTS: No, I am serious. Nobody does. Sure, it is quite true.

MR. DOODY: No! No! No!

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier also said, "We would never have a partisan redistribution in this Province."

MR. DOODY: You will have to read the election returns.

MR. ROBERTS: I have been reading the election returns very faithfully. The gentleman from Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) blew the gambit on the election returns on Opening Day when he revealed the most shameful example of electoral bribery. I mean the hon. gentleman for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross), in terms of public money spent to elect him, is the most expensive member this country ever had, and he stood here on Opening Day and boasted of it. And then spoke with great eloquence

Mr. Roberts.

of the community of Greenspond. It is a marvelous community and fine people they are in Greenspond. He has not spoken of them since since I pointed out that they have the wisdom, the great wisdom in Greenspond to reject the hon. gentleman, and to vote very heavily for his opponent, Mr. Paul Thoms.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me, since I have said what I can usefully say to the Lower Churchill on this point, let me deal with this question of the by-elections, because I do have a little note here. And my note consists mainly of the hon. gentleman from Bonavista North's (Mr. Cross) name, together with an exclamation point. Because of all the performances I have seen - the hon. gentleman for Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe) agonized very publicly a fortnight or so ago as to whether or not he would join those opposite, or whether he would stay on this side of the House, and the point of his agonizing was, what could best help his district, and he very genuinely, and I think mistakenly, but very genuinely wondered whether he could do more for his district by joining hon. gentlemen opposite. It is a very legitimate concern, a very genuine concern. I can tell him what he should have done if that is his sole criterion. Resign! Let the government have a by-election, and then we will see whatever they want in Port de Grave. What was it that the hon. gentleman for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) boasted on election day? You would almost forget the fact that for four years, from 1972 to 1976 the Tories did nothing, nothing at all for Bonavista North. And I venture to wager that what was done last Summer is all that will be done, and we will stand by that when a year or two comes, and we will see then who boats. But meanwhile I say to the hon. gentleman that he has got here clearly and openly. It was not a close election. It was 200 or 300 votes in the difference between himself

MR. ROBERTS: and his opponent, the candidate for our party, Mr. Thoms, clear cut. But he stood on opening day and whether he knew it or not, whether he knew it or not he revealed exactly what the by-election was about.

The Minister of Finance talks about election returns. The Premier said, "The issue of the election is to back this government against Quebec." Of all the hokey malarkey!

MR. R. MOORES: This land is our land.

MR. ROBERTS: But let it be recorded that on that issue the government only got forty-five out of every hundred votes cast. A lot of votes, but by the Premier's own standards he has been repudiated. Let the Premier sleep on that one and let us try to explain that away. Meanwhile, let the gentleman from Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) maintain a decent silence. He got here according to the law he did not get here according to the morality.

MR. DOODY: That is an insult to the electorate.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not an insult to the electorate. If I had been in Bonavista North I might have voted the same too.

MR. R. MOORES: Down there passing out hundred dollar bills for bingo games, what is that?

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

I recommend to all hon. gentlemen that they remain silent while the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is speaking.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir. The hon. the Minister of Finance may think it is an insult to the electorate, I say, Sir, that what the hon. gentleman said on opening day is an insult to the electorate, to the House and to the people of this Province. He should be heartily ashamed of himself. He got here on his own steam and I do not take that away from him. I do not take it away at all but let him read the words in Hansard and let him hang his head.

MR. ROBERTS: And I say we will see what is being done. We will see when the blueberry factory opens up and the hon. gentleman from Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) will be there and perhaps the hon. gentleman from Gander (Mr. H. Collins) will be there to help him. We will see when the blueberry factory opens and all the other promises that were made. We will see too - he had the good grace to say the roads were paved mostly thanks to Ottawa - we will see too what work the Government of this Province does this year and next year and the year after in Bonavista North, and the hon. gentleman knows too.

I have heard from some of the hon. gentleman's constituents since the election, I have heard from a great number of them, and we will see. We will see.

The hon. the gentleman from Bonavista North (Mr. Cross), Sir, gave a full explanation of exactly what happened in the by-election and anybody who doubted, anybody who wondered what happened as to why the Tory candidate was elected in Bonavista North need only listen to the hon. gentleman from Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) who was the Tory candidate in that election.

MR. ROWE: Makes Duplessis look like a Sunday School teacher.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) says it makes Duplessis look like a Sunday School teacher. It was the most shameful, blatant and arrogant example I have ever seen. The government candidate, the government candidate, so much for democracy, the government candidate, and then that same hon. gentleman stands up on opening day - and I do not think he knew what he was doing - boasted of it. I say, Sir, let him maintain a decent silence. Let him speak for the needs of his people but let him not reveal the shameful and disgraceful and disgusting tactics by which he and his party secured his election to this House of Assembly.

MR. ROBERTS: I say nothing of that order of the gentleman from Exploits (Dr. Twomey), Sir. Because although there may have been some of that quasi chicanery in his election, he was not part of it, he did not know of it, he was not aware of what the Point Leamington town council were told by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. FLIGHT: Or Cottrell's Cove.

MR. ROBERTS: Or Cottrell's Cove. Nor he was not part of the paving in Glovers Harbour the day of the election. He benefited from it but I do not think he benefited with his knowledge and I say, Sir, that the hon. gentleman from Exploits (Dr. Twomey) has added far more to this House in his brief time in it than has the gentleman from Bonavista North (Mr. Cross).

Mr. Speaker, there is a very real danger confronting this Province today, and the by-elections last Summer, I think, gave a good indication of what it could be, and that is emotionalism. Now I believe as we all must in emotion as a valid part of human life. Emotions can be the factors that move men and women and often can be the very most important, the very heavy factors, the very significant factors moving men and women. But I say, Sir, that emotionalism cannot be allowed to rein unbridled, that it is no substitute for reason and that reason must form the basis for our approach to public affairs. I

MR. ROBERTS:

sometimes worry very much that the Premier and the government of this Province will fall prey to the sort of cheap, easy, shoddy emotionalism which they made the basis of their appeal to the electorate last Summer. This land is our land, a marvellous folk song and Woody Guthrie wrote it, one of the great songs. This land is our land, a cheap, shoddy slogan and nothing to do with the issue and the election. If it did the Premier should immediately go to His Honour and resign because the people of Newfoundland in those three districts repudiated him, fifty-five against forty-five four, repudiated by his standards and won two of the three by-elections. The third is before Her Majesty's judges for determination. But emotionalism is not substitute for reasons, passion is no substitute for intelligence.

At this time in this Province we cannot afford to let our hearts rule our heads. We must, Sir -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not forget liberalism.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I do not forget liberalism, Sir, and the more I see of Tories the more I am glad I am a Liberal. So do the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: I will take any five years of the Liberal administration and the five we have had from the Tories, any five years, and stack them up year for year. And the people of this Province are immeasurably better off than the sterile, empty policy. Everything is gone up, Sir, unemployment, cost of living, the debt, taxes, everything, salaries. Now we are being told to restrain, restrain by a government that lives high in a style that the monarchs of ancient Asia could not even dream of emulating, private aircraft, unlimited travel around and the best hotel suites in the world. That is the style of these men. It is only a few dollars perhaps out of the billion but so is the \$2 million the two measly millions they have scrounged up for the 29,000 who are unemployed today and all the rest who are unemployed but do not show up in the figures.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, the refuge to emotionalism - they say that patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel. That may or may not be true. Patriotism is a noble emotion. Mr. Speaker, a resort to emotionalism by the government of this Province would not serve the people nor the Province well. I sometimes think this government may slip into it as the refuge from their troubles. They do not know how to deal with the problems confronting them. They do not know how to come to grips with the issues, what steps they should take. They believed when they were over here that they would be able to master the reigns of government and drive the team of government to make it produce. All they have seen in three or four or five years is increasing frustration. They have lost their ablest men. The gentleman for St. John's East whatever I may feel of his views, an able man. The gentleman for St. John's West who he then was, Mr. Crosbie; the gentleman for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), three of the ablest men in the administration left for one reason or another. The men who have entered cannot hold a candle to those men in ability. That is not taking away from the gentleman for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) or the gentleman for Humber Valley (Mr. House) to say they cannot hold a candle in ability. They try. They do their best. They believe their motives are sincere. Sure. But, Sir, I sometimes fear that emotionalism may become the policy of this government.

I can see it now, a vicious, blinding attack against Ottawa, a vicious, blinding attack against Quebec, anything to try to whip up emotion and enthusiasm and get back into office. I hope I am wrong. But hon. gentlemen opposite, Sir, have fallen prey already to this. The campaign last Summer in those by-elections which was a concerted and clever campaign saw at least \$100,000 spent by the government in an effort to try to elect three candidates, two of whom were elected. I am not talking of public funds, there were millions of that. But I am talking of party funds, donations from various sources with whom they do business or who hope to do business with them. At

MR. ROBERTS:

least \$100,000. That is not counting public funds at all. It was no credit, Sir, to their party or their Province, that kind of campaign.

There are issues. Let them be debated and let the people rule. Let the people decide. Mr. Speaker, emotion is no substitute for policy. If I have said nothing else in the things I have said in the last day or so that anybody opposite paid any attention to, I say to them they should pay heed to that. Because I see the danger there. This Province faces very perilous times. We are in difficulty with the power policy. Our financial position is a very, very desperate one. I do not know whether we are bankrupt or not. I do not think we are. There are those with experience who feel that we are.

Mr. Roberts:

But we are in a very difficult position I can see no way out of it. The unemployment and underemployment continues to rise, our resources remain undeveloped, and expedient after expedient has tried and does not work. We have had immense sums from the Government of Canada yet our cry is that we do not get enough. Maybe we should have more. But there is more and more coming in. The only thing keeping this Province today in very many ways as I demonstrated earlier is the federal funds. We get those because we are Canadians. Then there is a threat to Canada. And these, Sir, are all issues which should engage the public men and women of this Province, not just cheap, shoddy, third-class emotionalism, not just an attempt to try to whip up some public hysteria. That is not serving the people of this Province, Sir. It may serve some narrow electoral gains in the short term, it may, it may well. But, Sir, it will not serve this Province, it will not serve the people of this Province and it will not serve the government that brings it about.

Mr. Speaker, the government have asked for the strength. And I say, Sir, before they get any response from the people of this Province, before they get her, they ask for restraint and for sacrifice, they will have to show some evidence of restraint themselves. They will have to see an end to the highest living government, Sir, this country has ever seen. They will have to show an end to the sort of hypocrisy we saw last Summer. We are in an age, I say this to the gentleman from Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) again, when community after community had water and sewer projects called off, Little Catalina the council resigned. Down in my friend from Lewisporte district (Mr. White) and throughout the Province projects cancelled. And he stands up and boasts, we got three or four. Sure they did. If they had asked for thirty or forty they would have got them in an effort to try and win the election. But if the government expect them to respond to a call for sacrifice it must begin with the government. Let them begin, Sir. Let them begin by showing some restraint. Let them begin

Mr. Roberts:

Sir. Let them begin by showing some restraint. Let them begin by showing some evidence that there is a problem and they are prepared to provide leadership. Let them not expect, Sir, that all the sacrifice and all the restraint is to be made by everybody except the members of Her Majesty's government in and for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

They will get response from the people of this Province if they provide leadership. If they can come before this House with some plans, with some ideas, with some programmes, not 500 jobs, not driving 400 people off the welfare rolls to work for dole. They will have to do better than that, they will have to do better than third-class emotionalism. Let them produce some plans for the fisheries, for the forests. Let them show what we are going to do about the lack of economic wood in this Province. What we are going to do about the spruce budworm infestation. Let them show what can be done to develop our economy.

They talk of jobs, but when we go to look the jobs are not there. And let them show what can be done. Let them show what can be done to help private industry to develop this Province, and to help the public enterprise to intervene where it properly should. We have heard all this talk again and again and again, in Throne Speech after Throne Speech after Throne Speech. Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough.

It is shameful that the Premier today said, admitted in Question Period that he does not know what is going to evolve in the way of employment in this Province in the next few months. In the name of all that is sacred, what have all of these high priced planners and statisticians and economists and technicians and technologists have been doing. We have a Priorities and Planning Secretariat, Sir, that is large enough for the Government of Canada. What have they

Mr. Roberts:

done? Where is the evidence? Where are the targets? Where are the strategies? Where are the goals? Where are the aims and ambitions of this government? They are not in that document, Sir. Everything in there we have heard before. We do not believe it any more. We were prepared to believe it for the first time. When first they had announced the gear insurance programme for fishermen, we were prepared to believe that. Great. Terrific thing. Fishermen need it. But after five long years, in disaster after disaster there is no fisherman in Newfoundland and Labrador tonight who is going to believe this government are going to bring in a gear insurance programme. They will believe it when it comes, if it ever comes.

We have heard the talk about reprocessing of fish. We have heard the talk about development of rural areas. And we have

MR. ROBERTS: seen the Highways depots here and in Grand Falls and elsewhere chock a block with equipment, and the letters from the hon. gentleman from Exploits district (Dr. Twomey), the people who were given loans and all it did was put them into bankruptcy and lose whatever they had. Everyone of us has had experience with this Rural Development programme which is a great idea but it has been administered for selfish, partisan ends and has not worked. It has not even produced jobs on those terms.

Mr. Speaker, the government does not know what they are doing. They do not know where they are going. They do not know where they want to go. They came into office five years ago with high hopes and with higher expectations. They had built the people of this Province to fever pitch. The Liberal Administration had been in office a long time and it had wrought miracles. Governments grow old, Sir. It had grown old and the economic miracles had run down and stopped and the world entered into a difficult economic era and Canada entered into a difficult economic era. And North America entered into a difficult economic era and things began to slow down. And then we saw a campaign calculated, determined, a campaign of personal vilification of the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), who was then the Premier. And it took place in this House night after night and day after day. Some of the hon. gentlemen opposite took part in it. It went on and on and on. And all that together, all of that together, Sir, eventually when the new White Galahad, the new white knight was Sir Galahad and his knights in shining armour came, put them into office with a terrific expression of public support. Terrific. And I believe, Sir, that those men believed they could bring about the things they promised. I do not think they lied. I do not think they set out to mislead or to twist or to lead people astray. I think they believed it. I think they felt they could do all these things, that somehow the

MR. ROBERTS: gospel of planning and priorities would make two blades of grass grow where only one grew before. That somehow if we only had a plan or two or another priority there would be jobs for all and that the public revenue of the Province would produce enough so that we could have our public services without being crushed by taxation. They are believed. They genuinely believed it. And they have been in office for five years now, Sir, and that is time enough. And they have produced their political will and testament and I would it were a last will and testament because they failed completely and utterly. The hopes are shattered, Sir. The expectations are dissipated and throughout this Province, Sir, people are disillusioned, disheartened, disgusted. Everywhere in this Province.

People today have lost faith in this government and the ability of this government to deal with the problems of this Province. I think, Sir, they feel this government has given up and based on the Throne Speech I think they are right. This government is not a government of men with vim and vigour and ideas and vitality that says, "Let us at the problems and we will solve them." This government is a government of tired old men, some of whom may be very young in years, but tired and worn out, perplexed, disillusioned, disheartened.

Mr. John Crosbie spoke for many of them when he gave us his doom and gloom speech here in the House. He could not see any way out of it and he was the smartest of them all, the brightest of them all, the hardest working of them all. And he gave up in despair, went off to try his luck elsewhere, to see if he could save Canada since he could not save Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. FLIGHT: He could not take it anymore.

MR. ROBERTS: The people of this Province, Sir, are looking for leadership and they are looking to the government. They are looking for a government with ideas and courage and plans and visions, not a

MR. ROBERTS: government that achieves everything because we all know that no government can do everything and not a government that does not make mistakes. Nobody expects a government that does not make mistakes. People will forgive mistakes willingly and readily and happily if the government that makes those mistakes is trying and is dealing with the problems of the country and is coming to grips with them and saying, "All right, there is what we have and there is what we want and there is what we have got to get there and here is what we are going to do." But where is the manifesto? Where is the programme of action? It is not in this document. Where is it? Where is it? We have had five years, who wants another five of what we have had? So when the hon. gentleman from Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) gets up and attempts to rebut me, and we will see we have had a Minister of Mines and Energy who is a school boy debater. We have had a Minister of Mines and Energy who is a university debater. Now we will see just what level of debate the hon. gentleman of Mines and Energy, the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) has now. Let him give us the programme or let him tell us where it is.

I have read all their speeches. Probably I am the only man in the House who has read every speech the Premier made. And that includes the Premier himself. I have read them all. There is no plan. I have read the budget speeches, the throne speeches and let them not say where is our great plan. When we are the government we shall govern, until then we are not going to pretend to be the government, we are the Opposition. The people of this Province sent us here to be the Opposition and we shall do the best we can to oppose. And when we are the government we shall govern and we will govern with vision and ideas and vigour and energy, not a group of men who have given up in despair, who do not know what to do or how to do it or

MR. ROBERTS: where to go or where they want to go or even where they are.

Mr. Speaker, we have had five wasted years, five years of blasted hopes and five years of empty promises. You look at those five PC years and who would want another five years like it. We will not have it. Mr. Speaker, I plead with this government to measure up to their responsibilities because they are the government, not for the next five years, thank Heavens, the next two or three or four at most. I plead with them to measure up to their responsibilities. They are the government. Let them govern but until they show they can govern, Sir, I for one shall vote for that amendment to the Throne Speech and I ask every one of my colleagues to do the same. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition was cluing up his talk I thought to myself, what would different kinds of people say if they were to examine that rather windy, without too much depth speech that the Leader of the Opposition just gave. And I thought back to my teaching days and asked myself if I took that speech and gave it to a class, an English class to mull over I would say the Leader of the Opposition would get an E or an E minus, perhaps an F, just on fair style, the lack of imagination in his style. I am sure he would fail miserably. But that is not really important whether the style is not - the gentleman normally speaks extemporaneously and cannot be expected, not even of a man of the great experiences in Parliament or the House of Assembly that the Leader of the Opposition has to be that fluent, to be that cognisant of grammar

MR. PECKFORD:

So it really does not matter whether or not the Leader of the Opposition would fail on those grounds, grounds of English. So we will forget that, Mr. Speaker. That is not really important. So we give it to a group of people who know something about economics and we ask them to analyse the speech. Once again, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition would be very embarrassed I am sure to find that in all that he has said, for all the hours that he has spoken, he has himself as a leader in this Province, as one of the leaders in this House, failed to provide facts, figures, scenarios if you want, economic scenarios on Rural Development, on Industrial Development or on Fisheries policy. If you go through to the political scientist even and ask him, I am sure it would come back again with a resounding negative response.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, all of this empty rhetoric by the Leader of the Opposition in the last few days, what he has failed to do and which I thought very confidently when he got up he would do, was to systematically address himself to some of the real problems in this Province. He has even left out some of the major issues that were both covered in the Speech from the Throne and which everybody around the Province agrees are major issues. He left some of the ones that he did mention that were major for the last ten or fifteen minutes of his speech, talking about Labrador power and the development of that, talking about the Upper Churchill. Priorities, Mr. Speaker? Unbelievable!

Before I get into some of the Leader of the Opposition's remarks which are pertinent to this debate, let me first of all try to put in perspective where this administration and myself personally feel this Province is at the present moment. We have heard over the past several weeks, we have heard since the House opened, about where this Province is economically, where it is in relation to unemployment. It is interesting to note that the Conference Board of Canada in its predictions for 1977 on real domestic growth in the various provinces of Canada, does

MR. PECKFORD:

not project the same kind of doom that we have been hearing from a lot of people.

Prince Edward Island according to the Conference Board is supposed to have a real domestic growth in 1977 of 3.4 per cent. Nova Scotia is supposed to have a real domestic growth in 1977 of 3.8 per cent. Quebec is supposed to have a real domestic growth in 1977 of 4.2 per cent. Manitoba, almost a have province, is supposed to have a real domestic growth of 4.1 per cent. Saskatchewan is supposed to have a real domestic growth of 3 per cent. And that is a have province. Newfoundland, well we are going to have a negative real domestic growth, are we? Surely we cannot compare with Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island even or Quebec or Saskatchewan or Manitoba. The Conference Board of Canada tells in its release that Newfoundland's real domestic growth in 1977, Mr. Speaker, is 4.3 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: What about the Economic Council of Canada's contradiction?

MR. PECKFORD: 4.3 per cent!

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell us who this Conference Board is.

MR. PECKFORD: Well now I will have to go back to my economics class again, Mr. Speaker. I just suggest to the hon. member that if he is interested in finding out about the Conference Board I will be glad to see him tomorrow and explain to him the workings of that very important board which does a great job in trying to project into the future, in the near future, real domestic growth in the country.

So there is one group of experts who are saying that this Province will have a domestic growth which is above and equal to many of the almost have and some have not provinces in Canada. Alberta's real domestic growth in 1977 is 5.2 per cent. New Brunswick is 5 per cent. Quebec, 4.2 per cent. Ontario, the great province of Ontario, that have province, 4.2 per cent, and Newfoundland 4.3 per cent.

MR. PECKFORD: so to indicate, as many people have done in the last while, that there is this creeping malaise around of attitude by a lot of people that this Province has nowhere to go but down. Well I do not accept that and neither does a lot of the so-called experts in this country accept that.

We had in 1976 a positive growth rate in this Province. Personal income grew by 16 per cent in Newfoundland in 1976. What did it grow nationally? By 13 per cent. 16 per cent personal income grew by in 1976, real income grew by 5 to 6 per cent, if you do not like the previous figure. Real income grew by 5 to 6 per cent in this Province last year, 1976.

Residential investment in the Province, which is a good indicator, it is always used by economists all across Canada, residential investment was up 21 per cent thanks to C.M.H.C. I agree, a lot of it, a lot of it also due to our part some of it 25 per cent money, some of it 10 per cent money, most of it 25 per cent money.

Housing starts were up in 1976. Although there were not in the urban centres they were in the rural centres. And there is a significant point, Mr. Speaker, that we have in this Province now almost a negative increase, if you will, in the urban centres but a very strong, positive increase in the rural centres. And what does that say about this government's intention to keep rural Newfoundland alive?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT - in rural housing

MR. PECKFORD: It does not have to do with rural housing. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, now that the hon. member mentions a rural housing programme, it was this administration after the programme got started and was to be wiped out -

AN HON. MEMBER: No Ottawa money in that.

MR. PECKFORD: there is, 75/25. But we were the only Province in Canada to succeed, Nova Scotia and Mr. Regan

MR. PECKFORD: included, to keep that programme alive and to have it accelerated, the rural housing programme. Manitoba and Saskatchewan and some of the other provinces have been pretty angry at Mr. Terron and other people in C.M.H.C. for allowing this kind of programme to continue. It was only about two years ago that the great Liberal Government in Ottawa tried to eliminate that programme and eliminated it effectively - and I can give you the correspondence to show it - they eliminated it for about forty-eight hours when they saw it was just about impossible and it was necessary for me and a couple of my other colleagues to get on the phone to Mr. Terron to tell him that he could not do it.

But that is a positive sign in this Province that we can have residential starts in rural Newfoundland outmatching housing starts in the urban centres. And it is even more significant, Mr. Speaker, when one considers that a lot of the rental project in the urban centres contribute in a large measure towards the overall housing start percentage that is reflected in Statistics Canada's figures.

MR. R. MOORES: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. PECKFORD: No not right now, Mr. Speaker. And even with all the doom and gloom about investment and the fact that we believe, as do I am sure hon. members on the other side, that there is not enough private capital coming into this Province to do the kinds of things that need to be done or otherwise government has to go in whole hog, even considering that investment overall in Newfoundland in 1976 was up by 7 per cent. In a time of restraint, in a time of infaltion there was a positive increase, 7 per cent increase in investment, private investment in this Province in 1976.

AN HON. MEMBER: We still have nowhere to go but up.

MR. PECKFORD: The pulp and paper industry for all

MR. PECKFORD: its problems, they are going to be showing a 15 per cent increase in 1976. Very important to the economy of this Province. The pulp and paper industry was up 15 per cent.

 Fish landings were up this year. Nothing to do with government but it is a good indicator.

 Mineral output was up by 37 per cent in dollar terms. So, Mr. Speaker, when one talks about the problems facing this Province economically, and they are great, one must take it with some degree of balance. One of the greatest problems every country faces, and always will face no matter how prosperous or how great, is the attitude of its people and the attitude of its people is very often reflected by the attitude of its leaders. When

Mr. Peckford.

some of those leaders continue to advocate a position which puts this Province down day after day. It can only be detrimental in a sociological way on a lot of people in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: So when one talks about development, when one talks about where this Province is, nobody is naive enough to put their head in the sand and say and go from the premise that we are all right, and the move from there. We always go from the premise that this Island, that this Province, Newfoundland and Labrador, has always had a very rough history. And it is from that premise you must go. If you do not, you got your head in the sand. And it is from that premise I go. I say nothing, Mr. Speaker, about that we have problems with this or that or something else. We do. But we must do it on balance, and we must always, after balancing off all the factors, and recognizing that there is still a problem here in many of our sectors of our economy, we must also apply ourselves to finding answers to those questions, and devising policies that will be in the best interests of this Province.

Tourism: "We have done nothing in the resource sector," says the Leader of the Opposition, and says other people in the last two or three years. We have not put more emphasis on resource development like we said we would three or four years ago. Why then, Mr. Speaker, have we spent \$10 million more on tourism in 1976-1977 than we did in 1973-1974? Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that we have spent \$430,000 on incentive grants in rural development when in 1973-1974 we only spent \$15,000? Yes, why is it, Mr. Speaker, that mineral development in this Province in 1976-1977 showed \$1,322,000 whilst in 1973-1974 it was only \$343,000, almost a \$1 million increase just in mineral development. And then there are those people who continue to say that this administration has not realigned its priorities in line with what it has said.

Mr. Peckford.

Fisheries incentives and assistance: In 1973-1974 \$700,000. This is resource development, Mr. Speaker. What was it this year? It was \$1,275,000. Is that an increase in resource development, Mr. Speaker? Fisheries capital works, from \$4 million to \$7.8 million. Residential construction, which we have gone after on capital, from \$2.8 million to \$10 million which are just about all the year around jobs. Forest access roads, which we have been high on, what were we spending on forest access roads? That is part of our resource policy to open up those timber stands that are over-matured or bug infested, and to get at them or to do thinning. What was the increase on forest access roads in 1973-1974 to 1976-1977? From \$700,000 to \$5 million.

MR. RIDEOUT: What happened to the DREE agreement to offset that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: Exactly.

MR. RIDEOUT: Tell us about it.

MR. PECKFORD: No problem.

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has not learned that as long as he has been in the House now, he better got back to his constituents.

Agriculture: From the Agriculture Loan Board how many loans have we put out over the last little while? Between April 1, 1971 and December 31, 1976 - let us cover that area - 733 loans, totalling \$2.6 million had been made to farmers for the purchase of far equipment and livestock, for the construction of farm buildings and the development of land

MR. PECKFORD:

which was under the DFREE agreement. Between April 1, 1973 and December 31, 1976 grants totalling \$2.1 million were issued to 340 farmers, ninety of whom were beginners. They were used for land development, farm buildings, construction and equipment purchase. Yet we hear people from the Opposition trying to make the statement which is completely false that this government has not tried to realign its priorities to resource based industry. That is our whole policy. That is our aim and that is what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, that is not an easy thing to do when you have a salary bill as the Minister of Finance will be eager to point out out of your \$1 billion of close to \$400 million, just the salary bill alone. You take out all the built in costs that you have in government and see how much money you have to play around with then you will see how difficult it is to realign your priorities. So over that short period of time we have increased, tripled, quadrupled, sometimes even more than that the number of funds being channelled into resource programmes. It will be clearly seen how our priorities have realigned that way.

Then we must also not forget that we cannot lose the balance. We cannot go to the stage where the petitions that are presented every day for water and sewer are ignored. We must provide capital very often 100 per cent to communities for water and sewer facilities. We must continue to upgrade and pave transportation systems. It is up to all the members of this House when they are supporting those petitions to be cognizant of the fact that when they do so they are running the risk of asking government to take money from resource development to put into social development.

It is an easy job for the Opposition to always support everything. But when it comes down to the fine point of having to make those critical decisions between water and sewer and more money for rural development, that is when the crunch comes.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Green Bay? Lots of water and sewer in Green Bay.

MR. PECKFORD: There are many places in Green Bay that do not have water and sewer systems. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there is one place in Green Bay that has a small water system that cost this government for twenty-five homes about \$11,000 because we went to that community, the Department of Social Services went to that community and the community leaders there said, "We do not want any more money from government. What we will do is we will take these gentlemen here in this community who have been offered jobs before but did not take them because they had to drive twenty miles to get home at night and we shall put them to work putting in that water line." And that is what they succeeded in doing. That is the kind of water systems they have in Green Bay.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do the same thing in -

PREMIER MOORES: Why do you not do it, you are the member.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the comments today by the Leader of the Opposition as they related to the Minister of Social Service's statement and especially the figures and the way the Leader of the Opposition tried to twist those figures, is absolutely and totally shameful. He knew what he was doing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. We are listening with great interest to what the member has to say. But he cannot under the rules of the House make statements like, "Try to twist", and thereby assign motives to a member of this House. I believe he ought to withdraw and continue his performance without assigning motives to members of the House.

MR. PECKFORD: No problem, Mr. Speaker. It has been withdrawn.

The Minister of Social Services today made this statement which is a valid statement on which the Opposition cannot deny that in 1971, December, there were 9,206 heads of households who were totally dependent upon social assistance for their existence. In December, 1976 there were 5,196 heads of households who were totally dependent upon social assistance for their existence. That tells me something, Mr. Speaker. Add to that that for all the doom and gloom that was

MR. PECKFORD:

been preached over the last five or six months, the fact that the unemployment rate for 1976 on the average for the year in 1976 was lower than it was on the average for 1975, put those two figures together, one, that we have been able as a government to provide ways and means for individuals not to be totally dependent upon government for their existence and to cut that figure almost in half in five years with the fact that on the average the unemployment rate in this Province was down in 1976 from what it was in 1975 which is irrefutable, which is a fact that is put out by

Mr. Peckford:

Statistics Canada. It leads me to believe that this Province is not in the kind of condition that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to prove here by his speech today and yesterday. The facts just do not bear him out.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: There are depressed areas in the Province. I spoke, Mr. Speaker, talking about jobs to a contractor yesterday afternoon who told me that he was looking for loggers, that is in my own constituency, and that he was having difficulty getting loggers. Now that is not a depressed area obviously. Most of the loggers are either working for one of the companies or whatever. But obviously there has to be depressed areas, and there has to be active areas. At this point in time, that one happens to be a pretty active area. And so now he has to go to look for people from Canada Manpower to try to get them on the road.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have as a government over the last three or four years attempted to realign our priorities, to put more of government funds into resource departments, to put them into programmes that will assist people where they happen to live, whether it is in Trout River or Englee or Burgeo or Grey River or wherever it happens to be. And it has been for the most part successful. And when one talks about the rural development programme which is one of the major successes of this administration. And I asked the people in DREE the other day to tell me what their success rate was like. And if anybody has had the opportunity as a member, let alone as the applicant, to go through the process of applying to DREE for some assistance for an industry will know what I am talking about by the time you get through the whole red tape, and the whole thing a year or two later, and finally get your assistance. There is a good chance you are not going to fail, because you have been through the ropes so badly that if you still want the money you are almost a sure bet of succeeding or you are going to give it up before you get

Mr. Peckford:

that far. And their failure rate is 38 per cent, 38 per cent is the failure rate for DREE sponsored projects.

Right now in rural development we are looking at around 40 per cent to 38 per cent failure rate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the rate for the whole of Canada.

MR. PECKFORD: They did not break it down into the - I do not know if that was the Atlantic region or whether it was for the whole of Canada. I think it was for the Atlantic region. And we are looking at in our programme, and the government's programme at around the same failure rate. That is not too bad, Mr. Speaker, when we can almost equal DREE with fifty times less red tape than DREE puts in the way.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we are criticized for that. How many people would the hon. member for - what is he the member for? - Eastport area -

AN HON. MEMBER: Terra Nova

MR. PECKFORD: - for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) - there is a project out there that is moving along very well from rural development from a \$15,000 loan that was given to him to employ several people. There happens to be a real good one. There happens to be in Green Bay district that one there where right now today because of \$10,000 that was given in 1973. That man, it says here, it is thirty-eight, I know he has more than thirty-eight on his payroll today, \$10,000. Would the member who represents Sterhenville (Mr. McNeil) turn down - would he agitate for this loan as a member or would he say to the people who applied for this, get lost, when he provided four or five jobs over there for an industry? Would the hon. member from Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor) for a loan of \$15,000 to provide seasonal employment for about thirty people? I guess St. Georges, Heatherton there was a very successful project started out there through rural development of

MR. PECKFORD: about seven or eight jobs, another one in St. Georges, sixteen. This is the partisan programme that this government has instituted. And if you come to any district that I have been able to look over and a lot of the members on the other side will see there is no partisanship, there are more loans in districts other than government districts or just as many as there are in government districts.

L'Anse-au-Clair, Labrador, what district would that be in? It cannot be in the Strait of Belle Isle. It cannot be. No, another seven jobs.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: 1,000.

MR. PECKFORD: Conception Bay South, another one, fifteen or twenty jobs.

MR. ROWE: Is that the whole list?

MR. PECKFORD: That is the Minister of Rural Development. You will have to talk to him about that. Southport, Bellevue, another one, Baie Verte - White Bay - fifteen or twenty jobs in Roddickton. There is a couple of more in Baie Verte - White Bay too in Baie Verte that I happen to know about, people I know. And on it goes.

This is the programme that has been tried to look as if it has done little for this Province when in actual fact when you look at the figures and you look at the jobs created, when you look at the success and failure rate as it relates to even something like DREE, that great department of DREE, with all their bureaucrats, with all their red tape, with all their screening devices we come off just as good as they do with very little red tape and providing people jobs where they happen to live, keeping their own communities alive where they happen to be. As the Premier said on opening day, it is not gradiose, it is not a refinery, it is not an aluminum plant but I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, it has helped a lot of very small communities thrive in this Province over the last four or five years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. PECKFORD: And you go and ask any of the people who work there and they will tell you.

Mr. Speaker, that is why this Party is still in power, for all the musings because they - for all their musings on the other side, Mr. Speaker, they have failed to recognize one significant thing about the people of this Province and that is that when it comes right down to it the people of this Province want to earn a living nearby if you will. And they do not want to earn a living necessarily as a very experienced pipe fitter, or a very experienced, very skilled trade, if they can fish, if they can operate their saw mill near where they happen to live.

Two very prosperous areas that the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) can vouch for, in my own constituency that I know well where they have done it, almost totally without any government assistance even, just by pulling themselves up by their boot straps. Who would deny Little Bay Islands the kind of employment that they have out there from their crab plant, from a little tiny barrell factory, from a little herring plant that they were getting involved in? Who would deny the kind of employment that now exists in Triton in the district of Green Bay from total private enterprise and from people who want to work and who have, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of interest, in the last two or three Springs around March or April had three and four jobs, one man, and had to decide which one he was to take. And it is that kind of local initiative, it has nothing to do with the programme. It is that kind of local initiative, that kind of wanting to be part of where they were born and their grandparents were born. It is that kind of system that has to be a part of any system that is brought into this Province and you can have all your plants and in the same way it is related to the inshore fishery. If we ever lose the inshore fishery we have lost not

MR. PECKFORD: only a certain dimension to the character of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders, we have lost great economic potential that existed, that was there.

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

Feeling as I do and I am sure every knowledgeable Newfoundlander does, a tremendous amount of sympathy for the viewpoint that the minister is expressing now. You might almost say the undying wish of so many thousands of Newfoundlanders to do the work they are accustomed to, that they know, that they understand, and that they can do perhaps better than anybody can do anywhere, that being the case is it not also a fact that in tens of thousands in number other Newfoundlanders, graduates of the university, of the various trade schools throughout the Province, of the

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Fisheries College, of the technical college and so on and so on, tens and tens of thousands. Do the same observations apply to them or is it not necessary for them as distinct from the other large number, that a more sophisticated kind of industry shall come into existence and that that cannot happen in every locality, you know, the 800 or 900 settlements stretching along 6,000 miles of coastline where the rural type of industry can be but where the urban type or the more industrialized type cannot be? Would the minister address himself to that with at least the same amount of sympathy with which I asked the question as an honest and sincere approach to what is a Newfoundland problem?

MR. PECKFOPD: Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware that there are a number of dimensions to the old subject that I am now addressing myself to. One other dimension is the one that the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) has now presented to me. I can only say to him right now this, that I agree that there are many university graduates, trades college graduates, College of Fisheries graduates, high school graduates who are going to have to have job opportunities in this Province, and they are going to be job opportunities which are far more sophisticated than the kinds of job opportunities I am talking about now. But not in every case if one analyses it.

If we can get the kind of fishery that we need, well you just might need a guy, you will need a person who is an engineer, who is a navigational expert in mid water. And you can bring your graduate right back to that community. I know of quite a few who have gone to the Fisheries College who have gone back to their own community and have been far better fishermen because of their stay in the Fisheries College. You can do the same thing, to a lesser extent, with the tradesmen that come out.

But still there is and there must be always a balanced approach again to how we develop this Province. Therefore we must be very careful that when we do so, as I said earlier, with another mine or some industry that can set in, either co-working or some other type

MR. PECKFORD:

of industry that is more attuned to that area, that these people, these tradesmen can get jobs there. But it must be done that way.

You take a herring plant for example. The herring plant in Triton right now, there has to be a couple of engineers or an engineer. There is an engineer on staff. I know him, who works there on the machinery, the boilers and so on. Well there is hopefully - I do not know if he went to college or not, to any of the colleges - well there is an opportunity for him. A lot of the young men who are now fishing were either to trades college or to the Fisheries College. So if we can develop some kind of manufacturing or processing in the fishery to take up some of these graduates so much the better. That is the way we have to go.

On the university front -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would there not probably be at this very moment hundreds of young men who are radio and television set technicians. There must be hundreds around the Province. And must there not also be in all probability many, many hundreds of others of a not scientific but not highly technological, but more than an ordinary handyman type of mechanic or mechanical type of worker? And must there not be an increasing number of such openings and opportunities?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, I agree. But it is a very interesting thing to do a profile on the trades college for the last few years because most of the young people that I know - and I have known hundreds and hundreds, taught hundreds and hundreds and a lot of others as well whom I know fairly well who have by the high schools guiding those students as they came out of school into trades that were available at the time. You will find a fair number of the graduates now that are finishing up either a year course or two year course or three year course at the trades college or at some of the trades schools having jobs before they are actually finished. There is a pretty high

Mr. Peckford.

success rate on placement of those people into job opportunities even before they are right ready to graduate. So there has been, through the educational system, a fair job done on the guidance programme which allows the teachers and the trades college to divert, if you will, these students into the kinds of trades that will provide a job for them right after. There is a fair amount of that.

So, Mr. Speaker, to get back to my point relating to rural development. So as we talk about the fishery, and the good future and the potential that that holds for the next five to ten years, with proper development, it will help to buoy up even more the rural parts of the Province that this administration has been so set on keeping in place. And if we lose that kind of dimension to our overall economic strategy then we are going to have lost a whole lot. That is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that we must not, at the same time, through our hydro resources, through our mineral resources, through our forest resources, try to develop them as well and provide job opportunities for those other kinds of individuals who are going to have that kind of training. But the only condition that I would place on that, and that this administration has placed, that it must be the kind of development that is going to give some meaningful return to this Province. And it saddens me to think of the kind of situation that we are presently faced with as it relates to the agreement on the Makkovik and the Kitt's Michlen uranium deposits, the kind of agreement that was entered into back in 1955 as it relates to that, and how obsolete those kinds of conditions are in relation to 1976 terms in trying to develop a mineral resource, because they are not very good conditions. And so that, therefore, we must be very careful that as we try to develop our mineral resource and identify new ore deposits, and our forestry resource - well, not so much our agricultural resource, because it is here, and most of the people who are going to be exploiting it are Newfoundlander - that we cannot allow -

Mr. Peckford.

and if the time comes when private enterprise say pretty boldly to the Newfoundland Government of whatever day it happens to be in 1980, as perhaps one can say now, some of the companies off Labrador, that fine, we are not -

MR. RIDEOUT: The Straits?

MR. PECKFORD: No, I am talking about offshore.

- we are not interested in Newfoundland because we cannot get the kinds of tax concessions, etc., etc., to make it economic for us to come in, as they say it, well then the Province of Newfoundland is going to have to say, "No." Because it will not be in the long-term best interests of the Province to do so. And we must be very careful on the kinds of conditions we set down so that we get some benefit, which is normal for governments to get. In 1976 -

MR. STRACHAN: Or more than normal.

MR. PECKFORD: Or more than normal, depending. But that is the kind of thing that governments have to be very careful with, and it is no problem. And any minister here on the front benches could easily vouch for this. There is no problem - as almost anyone in the Province should know - there is no problem to create jobs in Newfoundland today. There is no problem to reduce 29,000 down to 15,000. There is no problem.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who said that?

MR. PECKFORD: I am saying it. There is no problem to create 10,000 or 15,000 jobs in the next year if government wants to do it, but at what cost? You can create the jobs.

MR. NEARY: What are they?

MR. PECKFORD: At what cost are we willing to pay for those possibly long-term jobs with very long-term things gone down the drain for this Province?

Mr. Peckford:

And that is the question. The question is not the business of creating employment or not. The question that must be addressed, and that is when you get into the details, that is when you get into just more than airy-fairy things or criticizing the kind of unemployment rate or the lack of jobs or the lack of something else, when you get right into it and you have to decide as a government at what cost, and looking at our past makes us all the more conscious of that. So therefore one has to be careful, and one has to try to devise mechanisms that will still attract private capital, but still provide a fair return for the people of the Province. So that therefore you are being private enterprise orientated but yet not to the point where you are going to give so many concessions that it is no longer feasible. As we saw, for example, on the Lower Churchill back early in the history of this administration, where private enterprise were eager to develop the Lower Churchill. But the question had to be asked at that time, at what cost?

MR. HICKMAN: And for whose benefit?

MR. PECKFORD: For whose benefit?

And it was felt by the administration at that time that the cost, the sacrifices, the concessions that had to be given where too great to allow it to go ahead under the auspices of that company who were interested in doing it. But the tax concessions they wanted, the kinds of terms they wanted, all the power to go West. So that is the important question.

AN HON. MEMBER: The same thing applies for the oil and gas.

MR. PECKFORD: And the same thing applies for oil and gas, which I will come to later, and talk about.

So therefore it is disappointing, absolutely disappointing when one looks at the highlights of the Leader of the Opposition's speech on Wednesday in his response to the Speech from the Throne. And when he says, "We have heard about the fisheries in other Speeches from the Throne." I say, Thank God we have heard about the fisheries

Mr. Peckford:

three or four times in every Speech from the Throne. Because that is one of the areas that we have to keep harping on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: If the Leader of the Opposition is going to criticize this administration for mentioning the fisheries in every Speech from the Throne that we ever have anything to do with, fine, Mr. Speaker, fine, let us hear more criticism like that,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: because that is the kind of priority we have to give. And whoever heard of a -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: We are talking talk about burning your Mercedes, Mr. Speaker, burn your Mercedes. There are two jobs for every man.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, this is all talk.

PREMIER MOORES: The jobs are there, are they not?

AN. HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) slouch (inaudible)

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, could I have silence from the other side?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman would like to be heard in silence.

MR. PECKFORD: There is another hon. member standing up in the doorway who is interrupting me.

MR. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy was also being interrupted by his leader, one of his leaders, the Premier on some very unparliamentary language. I do not think that I should have to be the brunt of that kind of language, if he wants to use it on people that is fine, but I do not intend to be one of them, and he should withdraw it.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, if I may before the House Leader takes over, I never made any comment about any man who was in his seat in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SIMMONS: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Premier can be as smart as he wants to about this. He was heard by a number of people to use some very unparliamentary language which is unbecoming of him or any member of this House, and he should be asked to withdraw without any smart remarks or qualifications.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: This is not smart remarks or anything else. It is a very simple fundamental rule of this House that if an hon. gentleman is not sitting in his seat he has no rights, no right to be heard, no right to be seen or anything else. My strong recollection is that the hon. gentleman from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) was standing in the door, leaning against the door, and was therefore not in this House. And if he is not in this House he is entitled to no more protection than any other hon. person in the galleries or anywhere else in the surrounding area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: Well he needs protection at all times, but that is not the point.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I did not seek any particular protection. I rose on a matter affecting the privileges of the House, not a matter of personal privilege. It is a matter affecting the privileges of the House when one member of this House is allowed to use in reference to anybody whether another member of the House or not the kind of language I heard, and he should be asked to withdraw it. If he were a man he would have withdrawn it by now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, if the word, I said something about the word 'slouch'. I do not think I referred to any particular member, but apparently, Sir, one member seems to have adopted the responsibility of being guilty of it.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, I think my colleague has made a good point. It is not necessarily whether the member is sitting in the House is the point but -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who said it was that anyway?

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, could I be heard on the point of order please. But it is what the rest of us sitting in the House have to subject ourselves to. And it is mainly not as much the word 'slouch' as the prefix to that word that the hon. Premier used.

PREMIER MOORES: What was that?

MR. RIDEOUT: Do you want to repeat it? I would not say it in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I move the previous question.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. gentleman was serious. If he was, I would have to put the motion but I presume he was not.

The point of order, actually the term I heard was 'slouch'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

There are a couple of points here. Obviously no unparliamentary language can be addressed to any other member. Now one point made during the submissions on this point of order, and that was that an hon. member who is not in his seat cannot be heard, that is obviously valid. I do not think however that not being in one's seat alters what may or may not be said about an hon. member. If an hon. member is not in his seat he has no right to speak. But I do not think his not being in his seat or indeed not even being in the legislature affects the consideration that is his due.

Now the term itself - and there are numerous references in Beauchesne and in May which will say that - there is no list of what is parliamentary or what is not parliamentary. Frequently it depends upon how it was said and all of the circumstances leading up to it. To the best of my knowledge the word was not attributed to any member.

MR. SPEAKER:

It was said. If however it was attributed to any member then I would ask that it be withdrawn.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I did not use the word 'slouchness'. I used just the individual word 'slouch'. There was obviously an appeal from a person who thought he had been identified as such. But since that time my friend, the house leader here, has forgiven me for having referred to him as such. In his case I most certainly withdraw it.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend a few moments commenting upon some of the major points that the Leader of the Opposition had to say about the Speech from the Throne which led to his amendment which reads, "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."

I have indicated already, Mr. Speaker, some steps that the government has taken to realign its finances in line with pouring more money into resource departments to try to combat unemployment and to try to when it does create jobs that it create ones that are more permanent in the resource sector rather than to try to alleviate on a very temporary basis the business of providing jobs in the more social programmes that the government and all governments have to put money into.

But what really struck me about the Leader of the Opposition's speech both on Wednesday and since that time was his attempt to try to downgrade, to try to indicate that the temporary employment programme, job creation programme that was announced in the Throne Speech was a measly \$2 million.

MR. PECKFORD: This is the hon. gentleman who talks about doubling our debt, this is the hon. gentleman who says that we are borrowing too much and spending too much in one breath and who can turn around almost in the same breath and talk about a measly \$2 million. This is what one would call, Mr. Speaker, in the most polite way possible, very, very inconsistent. The hon. Leader of the Opposition cannot have his cake and eat it too. We are either spending too much money or we are not spending too much money. We are either providing additional money for job creation which is respectable or we are not. And if the Leader of the Opposition can go on from that to indicate that the \$2 million is measly in the sense of how much money Ottawa pours into temporary employment programmes he better take a look again at the kind of government we have in Ottawa and the money that it can generate and the kind of government we have in Newfoundland and the kind of money it can generate because when the Leader of the Opposition tries to pretend by saying that the federal government has put into LIP programmes ten and a half times or whatever the amount of money that we are putting in our temporary employment programme he is dead right. The only problem is, Mr. Speaker, he does not go on to say that the Liberal Government in Ottawa has forty times the budget that they do in this Province and if they have forty times the budget and therefore he wants to make those kind of comparisons let us have forty times \$2 million in our LIP programme and forty times two will give us a lot more money into LIP than is presently the case by the federal government. So his argument on both scores just from a pure logic point of view as it relates to on the one hand saying we are spending too much and then saying a measly \$2 million does not stand the light of day, neither does his so-called argument that Ottawa is pouring ten and a half times of money into this Province in LIP temporary programmes.

And to go further, Mr. Speaker, on the business of LIP.

MR. PECKFORD: I do not think anybody in this Province who has had experience with a lot of the LIP programmes would say that they have a very high success rate in the sense of their permanency to a lot of the communities. I know personally of many, many projects, a lot of water and sewer projects that were started in the dead of Winter when there were four or five feet of snow on the ground, where there was money lashed out from Ottawa for programmes. For example one that was turned down by this government a couple of years ago for farmers to cut a trail across a high piece of country so that they were going to run their cattle across there a few years later. \$20,000 or \$30,000 which was a total, an absolute waste of money. They cut a few logs away from a so-called trail and stayed on the LIP programme for a few weeks and then were able to draw unemployment.

So the whole concept of LIP as most provinces have argued with the federal government for the last three or four years is totally wrong. It is not planned. It is not organized. It is only where you have a very good community leader or leaders who are able to put together a very sound project that you will get the kinds of results for the kind of money spent. So the whole concept of LIP is wrong. That if the federal government is serious about trying to create jobs and trying to make their programme more permanent as they say they are going to do under Canada Works a far better alternative for the federal government to look at is to sit down with the provinces and say here is the way the pie is going to be cut because the population or whatever. And together, between them, as we do on subsidiary agreements, establish and work up the kinds of programmes that will lead to permanent employment in this country. That is the way that the federal government - if they are lashing out hundreds of millions of dollars and there is a very high failure rate on the kind of projects and six times out of ten to be reasonable and to try to be fair on what I am saying, at least

MR. PECKFORD: six times out of ten many of those projects have not got enough money to complete them and then the community leaders are forced to turn around and go to the provincial government who has not allocated money for LIP to try to get it finished and almost every one of the ministry who in those kinds of departments are hard put to try to find the monies to satisfy the Auditor General, to satisfy criticisms on the media from over there a week or so later, to try to provide the kinds of funds to get that project completed. Because who can live with a half town hall or who can live with a half fire hall with a fire truck on order? Who can live with a water system that freezes up for six months of the year and

Mr. Peckford.

so that if the federal government are serious about employment programmes in this country, if they are really serious about it, then they will sit down with the provinces, and work out those programmes and hopefully that there would be some kind of split towards the resource sector and to put fifty per cent or sixty per cent or whatever the cut is into resource, and the remaining forty per cent into social so that we do not get it out of balance the other way and have it all in resource. That is the kind of thing that manpower ministers have met on many occasions with the federal ministers, and put those kinds of proposals before the federal government for consultation on LIP programmes, on these temporary employment programmes. Everybody in the Province recognizes now that the job creation programme that we announced - and we make no bones about it - we know that it is a Band-aid programme in the sense of temporary employment. But it is not the kind of Band-aid programme that the federal government has come out with. We are trying to identify as a government because we are asked to lead. The Leader of the Opposition asked us to lead, and so we lead, and we do not say that we are going to permit every man and his dog in the Province to submit applications for some kind of project that they want to do in their particular community or region.

The Minister of Forestry and his officials know the kind of thinning programme that has to go on near Glenwood or near Deer Lake, which might provide twenty jobs for the next ten or fifteen weeks, which will do something permanent for the economy of this Province. What is wrong with that? It is a lot better than the ad hoc approach that is done now under LIP. I make no apologies to the Leader of the Opposition that we are going to identify, as a government, the programmes that we are going to initiate under this job creation programme. I make no apologies for that, that we did not have every member in the House of Assembly running around to this minister

Mr. Peckford.

or that minister with thirty or forty applications from his constituency and approve this one and do not approve that one. That is not the way that temporary or permanent employment programmes should operate. And I say with the kind of finances that this government has, we have done a fair job on providing \$2 million for three or four months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: Do not give me that kind of foolishness, silliness from a leader of the House who should know better, that this kind of programme, that \$2 million is measley. Two million dollars is not measley in my terms, and I do not think it will be for a lot of the people of this Province who it will provide jobs for. And do not either, Mr. Speaker - let the Leader of the Opposition re-examine his thinking as it relates to the welfare recipients in this Province, and in relation to the job creations that the Minister of Social Services announced today to try to provide job opportunities, to get some people who are chronically unemployed back into the labour force. I hope some day in the near future that the Minister of Social Services will relate a couple of stories that he told his colleagues in Cabinet just some time ago -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: - about a gentleman who came to him, and who had not been working for five or ten years or more, seventeen years and who through a work activity project, through the Minister of Social Services, got back into the labour force, and is now working full-time. And he makes a mockery, the Leader of the Opposition tries to make a mockery of a government who is trying to provide employment opportunities for people so that they can work for their living, able-bodied people who can work for a living, that government is eager to try to give these people some dignity, to put them back into the labour force, to feel that they are contributing to something, and not always taking something out. And the leader of the Opposi-

Mr. Peckford.

is going to attack that kind of programme. Surely, the Liberal Opposition, the rest of the members on that side of the House, are not going to condone that kind of attitude by a political leader of this Province, when we have succeeded in four or five years or so to reduce the people getting able-bodied assistance by 4,00 or 5,000 heads of households. And now we are trying to take a four or five pronged approach to a temporary employment programme. One, to provide those people, who are able-bodied and who are just taking out of the government, and requesting that they put something, some small measure of work back in; that

MR. PECKFORD:

we take other people who are unemployed in the regions and put them to work on a fishery project which will have permanent value or a forestry project which will have permanent value or a tourism project to do with parks or whatever it happens to be to provide some permanent value, that that is a worth while endeavour and that the process is far better that way. If we are here to lead as a government, if we are supposed to know and identify what kinds of projects the forestry needs to do or the other department needs to do, is it not far better to do it that way than to try to provide the other process of thousands and thousands of applications which would cost a whole lot of money to administer.

The Leader of the Opposition talks about saving money. Is this not one way to save money and yet provide jobs? His whole logic is wrong. I would stand up anywhere in this Province and support and defend in a positive manner that kind of job creation programme with all its measly \$2 million, with all its measly three or four month or five month duration. It still is an attempt by the administration to provide some temporary employment opportunities in regions, mind you, in regions where unemployment is extremely high. That is not LIP. I know of areas of this Province that have LIP projects. Talk about politics, Mr. Speaker, talk about politics! We want to change - the methodology changed that is all.

MR. WHITE: Five thousand jobs - \$2 million.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes provide the jobs but provide the -

PREMIER MOOPES: What 5,000?

MR. WHITE: Going to fix it this year, 5,000 jobs.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is their philosophy about development.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not against as I tried to point out -

MR. WHITE: (Inaudible)

MR. PECKFORD: I am sorry. The member for Lewisporte has difficulty comprehending what I am trying to say. That is his problem not mine. I am trying to say that there is nothing wrong, there is something very

MP. PECKFORD:

good about the federal government because it is primarily their responsibility in the first instance. There is nothing wrong with the federal government providing funds to try to create employment opportunities in this nation. What I argue with is the means by which they do it and that there is a far more sensible, reasonable approach to be taken that will create more permanent employment in this Province and not through LIP.

Everybody can tell you of examples where LIP projects were approved in one community with an unemployment rate of ten per cent and the next community that had an application in with an unemployment rate of twenty per cent - the one with ten per cent or five per cent or whatever it happened to be, just using examples, got approved. There were no priorities as it related to unemployment. So all I am trying to say is that there is a far better way of handling the business of unemployment and the federal government's involvement if they are serious about unemployment. We are willing to participate in that new approach or initiative.

Unfortunately one comes up with a great - you can get on the more philosophical plane and wonder out loud where this leads us down the road as it relates to private enterprises involvement or government's involvement and how you balance that off. But perhaps we are too far down the road anyway into a quasi social system to back up now from it. But it is a good argument or a good debate for anybody to engage in I would say.

So the Leader of the Opposition's comments about a measly \$2 million cannot bear the light of logic nor can they bear the light of his relationship that he tried to make between that and all that the federal government is trying to put in. He goes on - he starts off his address on Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, "It is hard to point, Sir, to any constructive action this government have taken in the last five years of development of our economy or to create jobs." He goes on, "Employment has never been higher in numbers or in absolute terms. Very careful, very careful that he did not fall into the trap of saying

MR. PECKFORD:

that in percentage terms which is the only way that you can really measure on an equitable basis the amount of unemployment or employment in the country. That unemployment rate was down in 1976 over 1975. His whole speech, his whole tenor, his whole attitude, his whole tone of the speech. And he goes on and he pays lip service to Labrador. I do not know how the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) can sit there and listen to it, the lip service that the Leader of the Opposition tried to play to Labrador.

In Labrador the problem is exemplified but this speech made little reference to Labrador

Mr. Peckford.

very, very LIP service to Labrador, and talks about Labrador Resources Advisory Council, which the government happens to be funding as an outlet for individuals and leaders in that area to present their views to government. It is a very worth-while exercise, a good democratic exercise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, just listen to the logic of this in talking about this. This is what you call pure and unadulterated Liberal thinking, because you never come down anywhere. You just sit somewhere in between. "But I suspect, Sir, that this government are now running significant deficit on current account this year." But may be they are not. There you go. One sentence. Pretty suspecting that there is a current account deficit. Next sentence, "Maybe they are not." Third sentence - a great climax - "I confess I do not know." Now that is the kind of stating your case, of putting it down, on both sides or in the middle. That is the kind of logic that the Leader of the Opposition uses. Just issue some innuendo, then come back a few ways from it, and then say, "Well, he really does not know."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, is there not any way to get these people to be quiet? I could not even chat with my colleague yesterday when the leader was speaking.

MR. ROBERTS: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) is interrupting the House, and really we cannot have that, Sir, under the rules of the House.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is smart aleck. Tell him to tighten his tie.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The general rule is that any hon. member has the right to be heard in silence. If in the judgement of the Chair he seems

Mr. Speaker.

to permit or allow certain interruptions, then obviously the Chair does not enforce that with strict rigidity. If he communicates his intention to have that rule enforced in its complete rigidity, then the Chair will do so. But it will depend upon the hon. gentleman speaking to inform the Chair what his intention is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak while other people on the other side are speaking. Could I have some silence, Sir, please?

MR. SPEAKER: It is now obvious that the hon. gentleman wishes the enforcement of his right to be heard in silence which will henceforth be enforced.

The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, just to give another example of the kind of logic, the kind of taking sides that the Leader of the Opposition glories in. He talks about the Linerboard mill, and in one breath he talks about how abysmally bad it is. And one would be led to the conclusion that the Leader of the Opposition must have wanted the present administration to close down the Linerboard and throw all those people out of work, that this is terrible. We should not have an industry in existence, because this is just a terrible drain on the economy. We wipe out all the jobs over in Stephenville, all the contractors around the Province. That is what one would be led to believe. But then when you go on to his next sentence, he says, "Well, you know, it is bad, but it was a fait accompli when the previous administration took over, but then yet it is still infinitely worse." And so he moves from the position of saying or almost saying that it should not be open to a position saying, well, I guess, well perhaps it should be to another one saying, well then perhaps it should not be. And we still do not know where the leader of the opposition or the Liberal Party

Mr. Peckford.

or the Liberal Opposition stands on a major issue like the Labrador Linerboard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: Well, where do they stand on that very important issue? Are they in favour of this government trying to keep it open and to try to use other alternatives

MR. PECKFORD: our what? Our government? Where this government stands on Labrador Linerboard?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. PECKFORD: It is quite obvious that this government stood when it took over the Labrador Linerboard -

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible)

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak while the hon. -

MR. SIMMONS: - The Premier wants to hear it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I will have to ask all hon. gentlemen, apart from the hon. minister who is recognized, to remain silent.

MR. PECKFORD: We stood at trying to keep the Labrador Linerboard open obviously and tried to make it work and provide the kinds of jobs there that have been provided over the last few years. And now we find that the market conditions did not improve when they were supposed to improve, when there were indications that they were going to improve and you had conflicting reports on markets and now we are at a position where we were not ready to say die. That we still said there might be some hope for Linerboard and so we have attracted, the Premier has single-handedly attracted very knowledgeable people in the industry to put their heads together and to come up with viable alternatives, whether in fact it would have to close, whether we can do something in converting it to make it work better and have a more viable market, whether we will leave it as it is or whatever, the four or five alternatives that this new advisory board has to look at. And I think that is a very responsible position to take rather than take the doom and gloom aspect and close it down and close it out, let us get experts in the field from a variety of companies with some other outside input to decide on whether it is -

That is where we stand on Linerboard. We still hold out hope for that area economically and for that industry and we will not, only as a very last resort see that industry phase down and

MR. PECKFORD: close out. That is our policy. We even, talking about Labrador, we kept the woods industry going in Goose Bay for a long while for Labrador Linerboard when it was extremely uneconomic to do so to provide employment opportunities for the people in the Goose Bay - Happy Valley area. But it was \$90 a cord wood, or \$100 a cord wood that we could not afford but it was done for the sake of the economic depression that would result if we did not in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and the same can be said of keeping the Linerboard Mill open as long as we have for the economic viability of Stepienville and the Bay St. George area. And although you can criticize it on - an accountant can criticize it on the books, there are very few people in this hon. House will criticize it on any other grounds.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. PECKFORD: And that is where Linerboard stands and that is where this government stands on Linerboard.

Very, very interesting, Mr. Speaker, in the two speeches that the Leader of the Opposition gave when he talked about the forestry, and he talked about the spruce bud worm and not waiting until Rome burns. Now I do not know - here is another example, here is the third brilliant example, classic example of the way the Leader of the Opposition works when he works. Maybe they are not sure and nobody expects them to have all the answers but how long if I can mix the metaphors, do we fiddle while Rome burns? Now it would be good, Mr. Speaker, to have a number of people outside this hon. House examine that very short paragraph to determine what is the Leader of the Opposition saying? Is he saying that we should spray? Or is he saying we should not spray? Or is he saying we should spray one day and not spray the next, just in case the first day you were wrong?

MR. DOODY: To spray or not to spray.

MR. PECKFORD: Where does the Leader of the Opposition, he has addressed himself to the problem, he has brought up the problem

MR. PECKFORD: of the spruce bud worm. He realizes that there is a problem. Maybe they are not sure and nobody expects them to have all the answers but how long if I can mix the metaphor do we fiddle while Rome burns?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is correct.

MR. PECKFORD: And he went on later in his speech in the last couple of days to indicate the government does not know where it is going and want a statement on the spruce bud worm. It has been pretty clear government's policy on the spruce bud worm. There is no clear answer as to what the effects of massive spraying on our forests will do environmentally, both to the woods themselves, to the vegetation, to people and all the rest of it. So because there is no conclusive evidence as to the environmental damage that might be done the government has decided against a massive spraying programme for 1977. They have said that they will continue to investigate with the State of Maine, the Province of New Brunswick, with Quebec and with Nova Scotia and with the research laboratories that are doing work on alternate means of combating the spruce bud worm and that we hope that within the year 1978 that better alternate means which are less environmentally hazardous can be developed so that we can correct the bud worm in 1978 if it still is increasing at the same rate as it has for the last five years. That is the government's position on the bud worm.

Meanwhile because it

MR. PECKFORD:

is a very serious problem to one of our major industries. We shall ourselves, as a government, in very isolated areas of the Province do some experimental spraying with the chemical that is now available and assess how that chemical reacts to the particular and unique vegetation found on this Island. With that kind of information plus what we will get from the other provinces and the other scientists, we will then re-examine with all the new evidence that we got ourselves and from them what we will do in 1978. That is a pretty clear and precise statement of policy by the government as it relates to the spruce budworm. And if the Leader of the Opposition did not know what it was and had to ask the other day it was only because he has not been doing his job and has not been listening to ministers or to the media who report many of those major statements.

MR. NEARY: When did we get the infestation of spruce budworm in this Province?

MR. DOODY: Right after the last Liberal leadership convention.

MR. NEARY: No, it was in 1972. It came the same year that the government changed and the Tories took over. That is when we got the spruce budworm, 1972.

MR. PECKFORD: I do not know what we can say about Nova Scotia.

The only positive - and here was where the Leader of the Opposition really fell afoul. He is in bad territory when he talks about the forest industry. He is in bad territory when he talks about the fishing industry. Where is he in good territory? There are a number of areas. Health! He is very good at health, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition is excellent at health. He likes to pride himself on being one of the better health ministers since 1949. But he is good at health. Very poor at fisheries, knows very little about it. Very poor at forestry. And I have noticed him over the years on the forest industry.

MR. PECKFORD:

He talked after he left the spruce budworm about - you know we had a great idea back there in 1971 or 1970 about this commercial forest corporation, fantastic idea. We never put it into fruition. We never put it into action. We thought about it a lot, Mr. Speaker. Oh did we ever. We had bull sessions, had almost a thinkers conference on the Commercial Forest Corporation. But it never came to anything. It was a wonderful idea that was in somebody's mind around the time that the previous administration was kicked out of office by the people on this side of the House. It was not such a bad idea. It is a lot better than any idea the present government have implemented. All they have done now is recognized after five years we have a problem on a forest policy. That is absolutely untrue.

In 1974 if I am not mistaken we instituted, put a bill through this House for a whole new forest management policy relating to how we were going to regulate the forest industry. We have hired forest officers, have done inventory and so on. And, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report contrary to the kind of information given by the Leader of the Opposition all but three units covering Crown lands are staffed and the management plans will be in effect. In other words, government has because it can do that expeditiously, arranged all the Province into management units and where only Crown land is involved we are on stream for almost all the Crown land units and are now administering that annual allowable cut and the rest of the policy, reforestation, thinning and this kind of thing to ensure that that specific block will always have a cut on it. That is part of the forest policy that was passed through this House in 1974.

Certain units cover company lands and companies have presented management plans for those units. It is hoped that we can - and here again we need more staff - get more staff to oversee these units this year. All staffed Crown units have drawn up management plans and will enforce them. On company units the plans are drawn up by the company approved by the Forestry Department and the administration of the plan is done by the company but overseen by the Forestry people. There are right now ongoing negotiations with the

Mr. Peckford:

and there are right now on-going negotiations with the companies regarding putting into effect of these management plans as it relates to their land. As I understand it one of the companies are very co-operative on that whole management group, and another of the companies there is some difficulty.

But the whole point of the exercise for the last two or three minutes, Mr. Speaker, was to try to indicate to the Leader of the Opposition because he obviously does not know that there is a very sound, positive policy on forest management in this Province that will stand up to anything in British Columbia, Northern Saskatchewan, Ontario or New Brunswick.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: And to indicate as the Leader of the Opposition has done that he was unaware of any forest policies. There is a programme. There is a policy. This is what we have said we will do, that if the annual allowable cut is not cut off a unit then the company will have to be taxed on that allowable cut, or if the company wishes the company must allow somebody else who is not part of the company to go in and cut. That has already happened.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that has already happened. I know of instances in this Province where a company has allowed private contractors to go in on forest land to cut knowing full well that if they did not the taxation provision would come into effect over the next year, and they would not be looking very nice in the eyes of a lot of the people in that area, and who worked for them. And they have allowed it, not on one contractor, several contractors to go in on company land and cut 5,000, 10,000, 15,000 cords of wood off of their limits, not for their mill.

MR. FLIGHT: Name one on the price limits.

MR. PECKFORD: Name one on the price lists. Mr. Max Goudie Springdale.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: So that is, you know, you talk where is our policy. That is there for any hon. member or any citizen of this Province to read. That is a very sound forest policy. That is where we stand on that. I did not hear the Leader of the Opposition when he talked about forestry and the lack of a policy that has been in place for two or three years. I never heard him talk about the sawmill industry and our attempts to revive that industry, which has a lot of promise if handled properly. There are a lot of problems there that have to be ironed out that are not easy. But we have provided incentives, we have provided a mechanism to buy some of their lumber last year, to hold it for them until the market improved. When you are talking about 300 or 400 sawmills, how many employees directly and indirectly does that involve. I had never heard the Leader of the Opposition mention a word about the sawmilling industry, as the former member for the area, especially in the Roddickton area, that he was a member for one time. You think that he would have a very good grasp of the sawmilling industry. That that is an important element in the whole forestry mill of this administration. And that we have tried to come to grips with the sawmilling industry, and are continuing to do that. And there are problems and there are ups and downs in that business when housing goes down and other construction activities goes down, and to get quality lumber, to get a stamped lumber, to get lumber that contractors who are building under CMHC can buy and use. That is a problem in there quality, the proper qualities so that the right kind of lumber is produced for a very big market, which is still big as I related about the residential construction earlier. There is a big market for lumber right in the Province right now, but it has to have high quality, and we have to try and encourage through incentives or whatever means sawmill operators to elevate the quality of their product so that it can be sold to contractors who are building homes through CMHC or NLHC or whoever. And that is the problem, one that we

Mr. Peckford:

have tried to address, and one that we are continuing to deal with daily. That is a forest policy.

We have no policies, and we have no programmes. What about our mineral policy? What about our mineral policy of changing the whole concept of providing acreage to mineral companies,

MR. PECKFORD:

and to individuals to one, away from the concession system and more into the claim staking one, to give small operators and medium sized operators and big operators a chance to go in and cause a rush. For example it is unheard of - I suppose nobody has ever heard of this. Only about three or four weeks ago there was a real rush on acreage down on the Great Northern Peninsula on a certain area. There was a real rush by big companies, small companies, individuals who are prospectors and so on on a given piece of property, a large rush because it was opened up. We have opened up thousands and thousands of acres of mineral land in this Province over the last two or three years, thousands of acres, that have allowed a lot more competition in the marketplace between companies who will bargain over acreage and who will go out and try to be there the next morning before the next one so they can drive the stake down. That is an important policy of this government that we have implemented from start, that we have started, that we have brought in.

And increasing the mineral development sphere of the Department of Mines and Energy from 300,000 to 1.2 million in three years to try to identify areas to provide. And what we are doing in the mineral industry, that is not well known. Anybody who wants to find out the kind of information that is available on any given property in the Province, just come over to my office some day and I will show you and it will astound you, the kind of work that is being done.

But here is a good example of the way an economy should work, if you can get each segment of the economy to work like the mineral industry. The government provides maps of the geological formations that are in the area. The government has gone in and done some seismic work, done other ground sampling work and produced three or four different reports on the old geological formations, on seismic work and other things. All that information is pooled together on that piece of property and is available to the companies. The companies come in, take all that information, go away with it, analyse

MR. PECKFORD:

it, get their geologists to analyse it, go over it, identify something that looks promising. Then the company takes over in its turn and goes in and does its own seismic, does some drilling, identifies a find and starts a mine hopefully. But there is the process.

It is a good example of government providing the flexibility or the incentive, better said, to private enterprise to come in and do some work without having to give away half their soul to do so. That is what I call a good kind of policy. Now we are hoping also that in the more remote areas to get into some map staking where we have accurate maps. So providing a whole series of maps from which companies can stake which are very - I do not know what the scale is but it will be a big map for a very small area.

Then thirdly, we were able to sign a subsidiary agreement under DREE and we have gone in four or five years - the last agreement which expired last year was for a total of \$2 million. The new agreement that my hon. friend, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs was able to negotiate is \$12 million, six times what the previous one was. A good, good agreement providing additional money, additional jobs to do more identification.

MR. DOODY: Who signed that, the giant or the pigmy?

MR. PECKFORD: That is one of the giants signed that, a very good agreement. This is in place. We have revamped the Mineral Act and the Quarry Materials Act and regulations have been drawn up and they will be published, a whole new ball game as it relates to mineral development in the Province that we have been able to do over the last three or four years.

Now we are trying to develop a mineral acreage tax to try to get at, for want of a better phrase, the companies who have large acreage for a long period of time or into perpetuity and to indicate to these companies that the government, "Sirs, company X we would like very much for you to either do more exploration on that property

MR. PECKFORD:

that you have left lying there for the last five or ten years. Otherwise, we will tax you in the hopes that by taxing you you will relinquish the acreage so that a whole bunch of other companies who are dying to get at it will go in and spend dollars on exploration to take a look at what is there.

MR. PECKFORD: and that is in the process and it will be put before the House in this session. That is a mineral policy that we have, that we have total control over. We do not have total control over IOC and Wabush and agreements that were signed years ago that we are locked into, that we have to try to renegotiate firstly. We are accused of breaking contracts already on a number of fronts of this administration that we thought were in the public interest. So we have to be careful how we move but on new agreements, on new policies that we have some control over we have developed fairly sound and sensible ones in the mineral industry, in the forest industry, two major sectors of the economy that were able to provide new, fresh, creative legislation and policies that were not there before that are totally the creation of this administration, which are good, sound, sensible and ask anybody in the mineral industry, ask anybody in the forest industry and they will tell you that that is reasonable policies, that is a reasonable programme that we are trying to get off the ground.

So why then would the Leader of the Opposition try to indicate that there is no forest policy when there is a very dynamic mineral policy that this government is now having developed and which will become law in this session of the House. So this is crazy, crazy, foolish comments. You know and talking about our forest policy and how we are able to get into all these forest access roads and almost I suppose they are in almost every district in the Province except I suppose in Twillingate. On Twillingate Island I do not know if there are any access roads on to New World Island, I do not suppose there is, but nearby in Birchy Bay, Boyd's Cove area there is, Port Albert, there would be some. What a great achievement that was and that agreement I think runs out this year, that forestry agreement, in the latter part of this year which will have to be renegotiated and I only hope that my hon. friend can put up six times the amount of money that we had in the

MR. PECKFORD: that we had in the old agreement, the same as he has done with the mineral agreement.

AN HON. MEMBER: It will be done.

MR. PECKFORD: It will be done. Mr. Speaker, one other point on the forest industry. The Leader of the Opposition indicated that the government said a number of years ago that we were going to try to do something with our birch. He made a particular note of mentioning that, that we were going to do something with our birch and that this was never done. For the consultation, for the information of the hon. Leader of the Opposition may I suggest to him that there was something done about the birch at that time when government said there was. There was a shipment of birch sent to Norway from this Province to examine and the companies that were interested in that birch got a contractor in this Province to cut some birch for him and it was sent over. Those private companies in Scandinavia said at that time that the birch was not acceptable for the kind of product and the kind of machines that they had because they wanted larger trees, larger logs and they wanted trees birch logs that were straight, that did not have so many crooks in them as a lot of our white birch.

The other problem on birch the stands are very scattered, and it is difficult to know where to place any kind of even an industry that could employ twenty or thirty people where you are still accessible after six months to sizeable stands of birch to make it commercially viable for that industry to grow and to expand and to stay for a number of years. That is one of the big problems. Our birch, although there is lots of it, it is very scattered, spotty, a lot of it, hundreds of thousands of cords I am told but the problem is that it is scattered all over a lot of difficult terrain as well as easy terrain, number one and number two that the kind of birch it is, because of our climate or soil and all the rest of it that it is very twisty and it does not make for easy manufacturing into the saws and other machines that are needed for that kind of industry. But

Mr. Peckford.

I wanted to clear the point for the Leader of the Opposition that something was done to birch, because I was very intimately involved with it at the time, because I thought it was a great idea to get that shipment of birch, to see whether in fact we could provide any jobs out of that kind of undertaking. I do not know if the new fellow on the scene now, who is doing some work in Labrador, is. I understand that he is looking at birch as well. Mr. Van Becke, is it? But whether or not that is of any consequence I do not know. But the Leader of the Opposition was wrong when he said, nothing was done on that matter.

Now another very important topic that was dealt with, and which I would like to deal with also - the Leader of the Opposition dealt with some time on, but not that great - is the whole business of the economy, the imbalance between our services versus our resources, that perennial problem that, I suppose, is going to be Newfoundland's fate for some time to come. And he just barely touched the surface of it. He really did not get into it in any great way. But I think it is a very important question. And when the Leader of the Opposition brought it up, I was reminded of a very recent speech by a gentleman who gave the second MacPharland lecture by Mr. Alfred Powys, President of the Mining Association of Canada.

MR. ROBERTS: That was MacPharland?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes.

And here is what I would like, Mr. Speaker, to read into the record, just what he had to say, because they are rather timely comments that bear directly on the whole business of the government involvement in the economy, how it affects its own. In recent years we have also been living through a trend of growing government involvement in and control of all sectors of our economy. Of course, we have got to recognize

Mr. Peckford.

that this is a very strong private enterprise man speaking. Well a few people would argue that the private sector should be completely unregulated. This process has quite simply gone too far, and is now extremely costly in terms of national productivity and efficiency. At the same time we have inundated by a flood of new and ambitious social goals and programmes. Education, health, environment, housing, urban improvement, regional disparities, income redistribution, culture, bilingualism, native rights and consumerism are only a partial list of our current preoccupations. In themselves the objectives are generally desirable, but we have not assigned priorities. We have tried to satisfy all our wants and needs simultaneously with co-ordination and with no regard to what we can really afford. And we seem to have lost sight of the basic fact that social progress requires economic resources and that none of our goals can be achieved without a healthy economy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All in which is only to say, we have been living too high on the hog.

MR. DOODY: Or else 'Steve' has got a copy of my Budget Speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: But it all comes back - it is collectively. We have to show some pretty strong leadership. I mean is the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) willing to forego and to explain to his constituents in Gay Side - I think that is one of the communities in his district, small ones - that there can be no water and sewerage project in Gay Side in 1977, because the government is going to use that money and put it into developing a fishery outlet somewhere else, not even in Gay Side. Am I going to be willing to explain to the citizens of Beachside or Jackson's Cove or wherever it happens to be that they cannot have a water or sewer system in the next two or three years? Are we going to be willing to say that education, health and so on are primarily in place in this Province, and that we have got to slow down

Mr. Peckford.

the gears and whatever money we have outside of - now we have got to do a fair amount in education and health always, because of all the buildings and so on, the maintenance in operating it and so on, but I mean additional things, and to take whatever

MR. PECKFORD: funds and resources we have for the next five years and put them wholly and solely into resource development to try to develop a permanency in our economy and at the same time try to attract what we can, which is reasonable, here through mineral development and other industrial development to push frantically for hydro development, to push for oil and gas development and this kind of thing, are we going to be willing as a group of politicians first and foremost to say that as a group?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. minister allow me for a moment?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is he suggesting to the House that the money that is proposed to be saved on certain things is to be spent on other things, that it is not just a case of saving money period, it is a case rather of saving money on A to have it available to be spent on B. In other words, education, health, all kinds of services, infrastructure and public services, to have economies put into effect on them and the millions, and if we are not talking about millions we are wasting our breath -

MR. PECKFORD: Forget about it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - millions to be saved but the same millions to be spent on resource development so that in effect there is no saving in the actual amount of expenditure.

MR. PECKFORD: I understand your point very well. What I am saying is that - I am saying two things, I am saying what you are saying and I am also saying this, what you are saying with some modification - that we must perhaps -

MR. SMALLWOOD: An hon. member is not referred to as 'you'. Very unparliamentary.

MR. PECKFORD: I am sorry! The hon. member. I am very sorry!

MR. PECKFORD: That we must on the one hand cut back on social programmes and thereby try to be very fiscally responsible. Okay? But where we can, and I think I know, where we can divert funds by not borrowing so much, I am saying reduce but where we can save also on social programmes if we can afford it, even though when we save some they must go in resource. There must be no question about where they go, no question whatsoever. So in other words what I am saying is if we borrowed \$210 million and we can get it down to \$195 million or \$175 million or whatever, right, or \$150 million or whatever the figure happens to be, within that \$150 million that we have to borrow, so we save \$50 million. We used to borrow \$200 million, we are now borrowing \$150 million, so we save \$50 million but within the \$150 million where we can divert from social programmes to resource programmes do so. So I am trying to have my cake and eat it too.

MR. DOODY: Never borrow needlessly but when you must.

MR. PECKFORD: Right. So I am trying to be fiscally responsible at the same time recognizing that there are a lot of social programmes in government after you are fiscally responsible and have saved some money that you can still divert into resource development and still do a fairly good job. I do not know if that is possible. I do not think it is too idealistic.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To say the least it will be interesting to see the logic.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes. Right.

Mr. Speaker, so the whole question of our economy, how Canada or Newfoundland deals with it depends to a large degree upon how much governments are willing to really change their whole fiscal structure and pour dollars into permanent resource development programmes and that is a question that is not going to be answered very quickly by a lot of governments in this world from where I sit.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I was very sad to listen to the Leader of the Opposition talk in very general terms near the end of his speech on the whole business of power, Upper Churchill, Lower Churchill, Anglo Saxon route and not really indicate any kind of position that he had concerning it.

It is true,

MR. PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that this administration has spent about \$250 million on Labrador power. It is true that the Lower Churchill is not developed, that we are still working on it to do it. We think that in the long haul that our investment in it will be worth while. At this point in time it can be argued with a great deal of validity that the investment that has been put there to date has not generated the kind of revenue to justify that expenditure. That is a fact. But nobody is going to live from today, February 8, 1977, backwards to when we took possession or took over that and judges this government on that. What we will be judged on as it relates to the investment in Labrador power will be on our efforts here on in to provide the kind of development that will realize the investment that is there plus the additional investment that will come.

It is in the long-term interest that this administration stands on its record as it relates to that kind of investment. It is not on the short-term interest of looking from now back to what we did do. I think still that it was the proper and right decision. Now we are in the process as a government of trying to look at all viable alternatives for the development of the Lower Churchill. Those alternatives are three as I see them. One is still the transmission of surplus energy into Quebec or through Quebec and have it either purchased therefore by Quebec or by other customers by going through Quebec.

Now, how that will be done - there is a great deal of interest now in the new administration in Quebec and there seems to be a fair amount of interest by the Energy Department in Ottawa relating to that and we will be informing the House of any developments that occur on that during the Spring as negotiations proceed on that. So let me just take the Quebec government as one and the route through Quebec. That is one possible alternative. Because we have 1,600 megawatts of power or so on the Lower Churchill itself, 800 of which

MR. PECKFORD:

we could use pending the negotiations on the Upper and 800 or so that we would have to export on a short-term basis until we could need it. So one route is that way, one possible way of getting the development going.

Secondly is through the Anglo-Saxon route, the cable across the Straits of Belle Isle and that is being investigated pretty thoroughly right now both by Nova Scotia Power Corporation and hopefully the Maritime Power Corporation now if it comes into existence and ourselves. That is technologically feasible. And what has to be determined now is the parameters financially, whether we can deliver power into Nova Scotia or through Nova Scotia at a rate equal to or close to coal fired or nuclear generated electricity. These are the two other alternatives. So that is the second strategy that we have to use.

The third strategy we have to use is can we as a government as a Province, attract sufficient industry into this Province to utilize the surplus energy on the Lower Churchill that will also provide us with the capabilities of developing some of the other rivers in Labrador as ongoing hydro demands require it for this Province. That is an interesting concept if you can do it on reasonable and good terms because we would still need other hydro power, that surplus that would be used by industry. We would not be able to get it back for them. But we would have to proceed on to other hydro developments in Labrador to provide that extra additional energy when we need it.

So it is a three pronged approach. We might be able to. We have to assess the Quebec situation and whether in fact any transmission of power through or to their province can be realized and that has to be done in the next couple of months. We have to look at the Anglo-Saxon route which is being done right away, right now. We will have some handle on that within the next month or two. And we also have to try to attract through a major initiative by government to see whether we can attract industry who are willing to pay a reasonable market price for power, for hydro power here to the Province to

Mr. Peckford: employ Newfoundlanders and make use of our hydro power. Three approaches that the government at the present time is taking as it relates to the Lower Churchill. I think they are realistic, I think it is the kind of thing we should do. But you cannot, once again it is like creating jobs, Mr. Speaker, There is no problem to create jobs at what cost to the taxpayer or to the consumer or whatever or a citizen of this Province. The same thing goes for the Lower Churchill. There is no problem in developing the Lower Churchill. I am sure you can get several industrial customers interested in a matter of a half year if you could pay them five or six or seven or eight or nine or ten mils, if they could purchase power for about ten mils. But it just so happens that to develop the Gull Island site alone, if you just had a house near the Gull Island site you are talking about more than ten mils. And so therefore it is at what price and at what cost are we willing to go that route. And I hope we are never placed in the position whereby we have to, as a Province, enter into deals which give very short term prosperity and success to any development or to the Province. We should be looking for long term, and in the end we will get the kind of industry that we want.

So these are the alternatives on the power and where the government stands on it. That is our policy as it relates to the Lower Churchill. This is how we are trying to move the thing along. And we will be informing the House as time goes by this Spring on developments along that score as they occur, and as they are consummated.

Mr. Speaker, another point that was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, which I do not think was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition during his main address, which he responded to -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is the minister now dropping the subject of the Labrador power for the moment?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before he does, I am quite surprised to notice that he has not referred at all to the very wise words of the Premier

Mr. Smallwood:

in his speech here on opening day, when he talked about Labrador power and the kinds of use that could be made of it and where.

The hon. minister has not mentioned that.

MR. PECKFORD: If you are talking about the industrial -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The use of Labrador power in Labrador.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes. Right. Well this is what I meant by the industrial customers that would be located in Labrador, the possibilities and I am sensitive towards the fact that my colleague the Minister of Industrial Development might want to get into this at some point in time too, so I did not want to go into it. But the government are looking very seriously at central port facilities and this kind of thing, and for - and when I talked about industrial customers I meant industrial customers in Labrador for that kind of development. That is being looked at very carefully right now. And I think that is the only proper way to go, as long as the environmental aspects are protected, as long as it is the kind of development that the people in the area think is satisfactory. I think we have got to be careful on that score, but then you have to weigh that off against the kind of progress that you need and the kind of jobs you want. But I think as the Premier said on opening day, and as I would endorse 110 per cent, is the idea of developing the power in Labrador by industry that would be located in Labrador rather than bring the power across the tunnel or cable or whatever happens to be down somewhere on the West Coast of the Island, and put the industry there, if it can be put viably in that section of the Province in Labrador. So I would endorse that, but I do not want to say too much more about it at this point in time because it is a big early in the game to do that, but the government are serious on it, and we are working on it at this present moment to see what can be put together on that. And that was one of the three that I mentioned.

The other subject that I wanted to touch on, Mr. Speaker, related to offshore oil and gas, which was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition on opening day, but I do not think it was mentioned by him in his speech.

MR. PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, seeing I am embarking on another topic that I want to spend some time on, and number one, considering the time, number two, which is around five to eleven I wonder if it would be in order for me to move the adjournment of the debate if it is satisfactory to hon. members.

MR. SPEAKER: It is in order, and I understand that it is agreed. Do hon. gentlemen wish to call it 11:00 o'clock is that the intention?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 11:00 o'clock the House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 9, at 3:00 P.M.