

VOL. 4

NO. 2

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1978

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

First I should inform hon. members that I have received the report of the Select Committee appointed to draft a reply to the speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. The report is signed by the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), and the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. McNeil).

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. minister.

MR. N. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, as minister responsible for the Harmon Corporation it is with regret that I announce a resignation of Mr. James G. Cochrane as chairman of that corporation. Mr. Cochrane was appointed as a member of the Harmon Corporation on January 14th., 1976 and as its full-time chairman on February 7th., 1977. His resignation was originally to have taken effect on November 21st., of this year but in an effort was made to have him reconsider his decision. After discussing the matter with Mr. Cochrane, I now regretably confirm his resignation with effect on November 30th. The Harmon Corporation was created in 1967 to provide an essential medium for the control and management of the facilities vacated by the closing of the Ernest Harmon Air Force Base in Stephenville. The role of the corporation was initially one of custody and maintenance. With the commercial and industrial expansion which has taken place in the Harmon area the role of the corporation has become one of development and growth. During his term of office, Mr. Cochrane has contributed significantly to the changing and expanding function of the Harmon Corporation and has given dedicated and distinguished service in the interest of the citizens of the Bay St. George area. Mr. Cochrane is resigning for personal reasons which I respect. I know all my department and the government regrets the necessity of his decision. It is of course

December 5th., 1978

Tape No. 38

DW - 2

MR. N. WINDSOR:

one which we honour and accept. His
successor has not yet been selected but will be announced in due course.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing

MR. SPEAKER: the hon. the member for Stephenville, I would like to welcome to the gallery, on behalf of all hon. members, Father Matthew Kean, who is parish priest at Conche; Mrs. Gertrude Bromley, Mr. Gerald Fitzgerald and Mr. Robert Carroll representing the community council of Conche. I know all hon. members join me in welcoming these people to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. W. McNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to comment briefly on the resignation of Mr. Cochrane, the former chairman of the Harmon Corporation. I regret that he has resigned over personal reasons, but that as it is, nothing more can be said about it. But I would hope, Sir, that the minister will immediately appoint a new chairman to that corporation and also possibly look at the possibility of structural changes within the department. The Harmon Corporation has been under Municipal Affairs, and when it was first formed Harmon Corporation administered the housing sector. And now that that responsibility is given over to Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, I think that possibly we should look towards putting the Harmon Corporation under the Department of Industrial Development where it belongs, since it is now taking the area of promoting the industrial facilities in the Bay St. George region.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure

MR. W. N. ROWE: in presenting a petition to the hon. House, received from the residents of Manuel's Cove - Gillard's Cove in the district of Twillingate. As hon. members are aware, these two communities are on a road on Twillingate Island which joins the main

MR. W. ROWE: road and sort of loops around and then rejoins the main road again. The petition is from 192 residents of those communities which are on that road, that side road, and it reads as follows - it is addressed to the Minister of Transportation and Communications - and it says that "We, the Board of Trustees of the Local Improvement District of Manuel's Cove - Gillard's Cove, would like to draw your attention to the deplorable conditions of the highway going through our communities and connecting us to the town of Twillingate. We the undersigned residents and taxpayers of Manuel's Cove, Gillard's Cove and Bluff Head Cove would very much appreciate it if you would look into the possibility of having this highway paved in the near future."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is one of those roads which must be familiar to every member of the House, certainly it would be familiar to every member of the government, every Cabinet minister presently sitting in the House of Assembly, since this time last year, just a year ago, every Cabinet minister of the government was parked in, camped out in Twillingate district fighting the by-election and I am sure, Sir, that hon. ministers -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. ROWE: - Sir, are quite familiar with this road. It is a road, Sir, which, as I indicated earlier, takes off from the main paved road leading down to the town of Twillingate, loops around to the communities concerned - Manuel's Cove, Gillard's Cove, Bluff Head Cove - and comes back and joins the main road again. Although there are some 400 or more families, or residents, I should say, of these communities, the significance of this road, Mr. Speaker, is not shown by these numbers alone. The road is used by transport trucks, it is used in fact as a second main road leading down to the main town of Twillingate and Durrells a little further down ^{on} Twillingate Island. It is also used, Sir, by school buses to bring children back and forth to school and aside from being unpaved the road is in many areas a dangerous road. For example, I will make mention from notes which were given to me by Mr. Hynes, the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Manuel's Cove

December 5, 1978

Tape No. 40

AH-2

MR. W. ROWE:

Gillard's Cove, he makes mention of a hill which I am very familiar with and I am sure other members are as well, a ninety degree turn at the bottom of a hill near

MR. W. ROWE:

Bluff Head Cove, over which the bus travels and over which many parents fear there is going to be a very serious accident if something is not done to remedy that situation. The road should, Sir, be upgraded and it should be paved as soon as possible. It is one of those roads, I suppose there are several dozen of them, main roads of that type, left in the Province today, Sir, that should be paved, should be upgraded and should be paved. The cost would not be that great. The federal government by virtue of its shared cost programmes regarding the main trunk roads in the Province, the DREE roads and so on, they have taken the major burden off the back of this provincial government and therefore, Sir, more provincial money should be spent on upgrading and paving roads of this type, a road which leads through Manuel's Cove, Gillard's Cove and Bluff Head Cove.

Now, Sir, having said that I do hope that the minister will take it into full consideration and I have great pleasure, Sir, in moving that the petition be received by this hon. House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition on behalf of his constituents in Manuel's and Gillard's Cove on Twillingate Island. I notice, Sir, the hon. gentleman mentioned Bluff Head. I wonder if that was not named, Sir, after the by-election in Twillingate, after all the bluffing that was done by the various ministers. It is not a new name. It has been there for some time.

MR. W. ROWE:

It has been there for a long time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, ot!

MR. NEARY:

But Bluff Head Cove -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

December 5, 1978

Tape No. 41

NM - 2

MR. NEARY: Bluff Head Cove, Sir, seems to be very appropriate, a very appropriate name at this particular time especially when these people were bluffed and told that the road would be upgraded and paved.

I do hope, Sir -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would require the hon. gentleman to confine his remarks to the support of the petition, and without references to historic events of a year or so ago.

MR. NEARY: Well, I support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and I do hope that the Minister of Transportation and Communications, who has left his seat at the moment, will see to it that this promise -

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not the minister.

MR. NEARY: I see. We have a new minister.

MR. W. N. ROWE: They change so much.

MR. F. ROWE: He is changed.

MR. NEARY: - that this promise, along with all the other promises that have been made by this administration to upgrade and pave roads, such as the road to Grand Bay West in my own district out in LaPoile, I hope all these promises, Sir, will be carried out by the administration in the next fiscal year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 187 constituents in the community of Heart's Content in the electoral district of Trinity-Bay de Verdé. Sir, the prayer of the petition reads: "We, the citizens of Heart's Content, wish to make it known that we are very dissatisfied with the lack of interest that government has displayed in their efforts to place a resident doctor in Heart's Content. We feel that a service which has been in existence for the past fifty years should not be discontinued, especially with increased demand for medical services in the area, and the Winterton doctor cannot see some of the patients of the community because he is overworked already."

Sir, that is a rather short petition, and in speaking in support of the petition I might add or might mention, Sir, some of the problems involved in this particular case. About three years ago, Sir, the resident doctor in the community met a tragic death and since that time Heart's Content and the surrounding communities have had a series of short-term doctors in the community,

Mr. F. Rowe: The result of this, Sir, has been that not very many of the residents of Heart's Content nor the surrounding communities will actually support a doctor when they are not sure whether he is going to be a permanent doctor or not. And that has been the major difficulty in the department trying to get a doctor

MR. F. ROWE: to that community because the doctor is not quite sure whether he can make an actual financial go of it.

Also, Sir, the proximity of the Carbonear Hospital is attracting doctors away from the Southside of Trinity Bay and we have a situation where we have a doctor in Winterton and in Green's Harbour and they cannot take the overload from the central part of the district now.

Now, Sir, the people in Heart's Content and surrounding communities are not asking for anything new, it is something that they have grown accustomed to, and that is a resident doctor for the past fifty years. So it is nothing new that they are looking for.

Some people, Sir, may not consider the district of Trinity-Bay de Verde to be isolated. However, when you look at the whole Southside of Trinity Bay, it is close to the sea -

MR. PECKFORD: It is not isolated.

MR. F. ROWE: If the hon. minister would listen, Sir, he might get the point that I am trying to make.

MR. PECKFORD: It is not isolated like Random Island.

MR. F. ROWE: I said, Sir, some hon. members may think that the district of Trinity-Bay de Verde is not isolated. Well I can assure the hon. minister, who does not seem to be concerned about the health conditions of the constituents of the district, that in the Winter that road is on the shoreline and there is indeed isolation when it comes to trying to get to a doctor, and anybody who goes over the Heart's Content Barrens in the Winter realizes what I am talking about. So, Sir, in that sense Trinity-Bay de Verde, when it comes to medical services, is indeed, particularly in the Winter, a very isolated area, particularly when it comes to medical emergencies.

Now, Sir, this petition was presented to me while the House was adjourned or before we prorogued, actually, last session and the prayer is a little stronger than it would probably be

MR. F. ROWE: at the present time because the Heart's Content Town Council and myself have been meeting with officials of the Department of Health and we can see we have had some very useful discussions and we can see light at the end of the tunnel, and there are two prospects now for a doctor for that particular area and we have been meeting continually with officials of the Department of Health and I sincerely hope that within the near future a doctor will be placed in residence, fee for service, in the community of Heart's Content.

So, Sir, as a reminder I ask that this petition be placed on the Table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister of Health, Sir, wishes to comment on this petition I will gladly yield the floor to the minister.

MR. WHITE: He is not here.

MR. NEARY: Obviously, Sir, he does not care about the health of the people in the Heart's Content area.

Mr. Speaker, this whole matter of the petition raised by my hon. friend on behalf of his constituents, Sir, who do not have the services of a doctor, raises the question of the number of doctors who are graduating from the Health Sciences Complex, from the medical school over on the campus here at the university, who are immigrating to the Mainland of Canada and down in the United States. Mr. Speaker, when the medical school was opened, we were told by those people 'in the know' at the time that the medical school would take care of all the needs of every community in Newfoundland. Because the difficulty at the time was attracting medical doctors into the isolated communities, and we were told that the medical school would take care of all this. Now we find out, Mr. Speaker, much to our amazement, that we are graduating students out of the medical school which is costing the taxpayers of this Province, I believe, \$20 million to \$25 million a year and the doctors are not staying in Newfoundland - they have no commitment to stay in this Province, no obligation at all - that they are immigrating to the Mainland of Canada and down in the United States. And I feel, Sir, if we are going to solve the problem of the people in Heart's Content and the people who live in other parts of Newfoundland who do not have the services of a medical doctor, that the government is going to have to review its policy as far as training young Newfoundlanders, men and women, to be doctors over here at the medical school. I think we are going to have to impose some kind of an obligation or commitment on the part of these students to at least spend a few years in Newfoundland. I believe that is the

MR. NEARY: only way, Sir, to solve this problem. It is, as I say, costing the taxpayers of Newfoundland, I believe it is \$25 million a year to operate that medical school, and we must be all shocked to hear a petition brought into the House, with the number of doctors who are graduating over there every year, a petition brought into the House by people

MR. NEARY: who are screaming out, who are desperately in need of medical services of a resident doctor, So I think, Mr. Speaker, that this raises a very important question. The administration, I would think, would be well advised to review the policy of training doctors over here at the Medical School and get some kind of a commitment that they remain in Newfoundland and not emigrate to the Mainland of Canada and down in the United States.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as required under the Newfoundland Medicare Act, I would like to table the annual report of the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission for the year ending March 31, 1978.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I table the fifth annual report of the Newfoundland Liquor Licensing Board for the period April 1, 1977 to March 31, 1978. And I do that as Minister of Finance and past Assistant Recording Scribe of the Sons of Temperance, Grand Division No. 9. I also table the special warrants that have been issued since we adjourned in July.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a resolution. I presume it is done under Notices of Motion.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave the hon. member may -

MR. NEARY: No, not by leave, Sir, I think this is the appropriate heading under which to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is asking for leave.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice of the following resolution.

Whereas there is constantly recurring evidence of direct ministerial orders to senior civil servants to bypass the Public Tendering Act;

And whereas this practice defeats the whole intent of the Public Tendering Act;

And whereas these violations can result in high losses, misuse and abuse to the Public Treasury;

Now Be It Therefore Resolved that a Select Committee of the House of Assembly be struck at the earliest possible date in this present session to ^{review} ~~revise~~ clause by clause the present Public Tendering Act and recommend amendments including specific and severe penalties for ministerial and other violations of its terms.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier, who I hope is recovering - Any idea when the Premier is going to be back in the House?

MR. HICKMAN: By the end of the week. Most likely Monday.

MR. W. ROWE: Well, I hope the hon. Premier does recover quickly, Sir. But in the absence of the Premier a question to the Deputy Premier,

Mr. W. N. Rowe: Minister of Finance and Minister of Justice. Would the hon. Minister of Justice indicate whether they have informed the receivers, Kates, Peat, Marwick, who have announced publicly that they have accepted the proposal from First Arabian regarding the oil refinery; whether the government has informed them of the government's position regarding the First Arabian proposal? Has the government assumed a position? Has the government approved the position? Or has the government notified them that they do not go along with the proposal submitted by First Arabian?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge government has not notified the receiver or anyone else that we approve or disapprove the proposal made by the First Arabian to the duly appointed receiver. If hon. gentlemen opposite would, you know, wish some further detail with respect to this answer, I would recommend that it be directed to my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Industrial Development, who is very knowledgeable and very much involved in the industrial development of the Province including the Come By Chance bankrupt refinery.

MR. W. N. ROWE: I will take the hon. minister up on his suggestion, although, Sir, when he made the suggestion a pained look came over the face of the Minister of Industrial Development. Would the minister indicate whether the government has in fact assumed a position regarding the two proposals, one from the Shaheen group, I understand, which on paper at least looked far superior to First Arabian, and the First Arabian proposal for the takeover of the refinery? Has the government assumed a position? Has the government notified either of the parties or any party involved of its position regarding proposals to take over the Come By Chance refinery?

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

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, the first thing I would like to apologize for is the pained expression which I appeared to have presented to the hon. member, and I can assure him that it was not the question that prompted it, it was rather the gist of it.

Mr. Doody: On the question of whether government has assumed a stance vis-à-vis the two proposals which have been presented to the receiver , I can only say that we have taken both under consideration and we are looking toward the best interests of the Province in both respects. The one that has been recommended and

MR. DOODY: suggested for a most complete and detailed study at this point is the First Arabian proposal. The Peat-Marwick people have told us that on their assessment it appears to be the most reasonable and sensible and tangible one that has yet been offered. We have not seen all the detail on all the arrangements. I am rather pleased to hear that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has said that on paper at least the Shaheen proposal appears to be the most sensible one. I would be delighted to have the authority of the Shaheen organization, or the receiver, or the trustee or indeed anybody in authority to table a copy of the Shaheen proposal, or indeed a copy of the First Arabian proposal. Both of them have been presented to us in strict confidence with great, big, red stamps on each page saying, "Do not photocopy", "Top-secret", "Confidential", "Do not discuss except with the following" and there are some people in there with whom we are allowed to discuss them. I hesitate to go further than that in this particular case. I think that Peat Marwick made that mistake with the last Avalon Refinery proposal and has been subsequently sued for some enormous amount of money for a breach of confidentiality, and I hesitate to go beyond that without the permission of the trustees or without the permission of the people who are making the proposals. All I can do is repeat what the Premier has said on previous occasions, that our responsibility is to protect the best interests of the people of the Province and the people of the Province who have an investment in that particular facility. That will be our purpose throughout the adventure as it continues down the road. I understand that there will be a delegation from the First Arabian Corporation visiting us here in the Province of Newfoundland on the eleventh of this month who hopefully will clarify and expound and give us further detail on their proposal, and I would hope at that time that they will also give us the authority and permission to reveal that detail to the public. As a matter of fact, I would go so far as to say that I would hope that they themselves would take

MR. DOODY: that step and elaborate on their proposal. About and beyond that at this point I cannot go except to say that our interests are obviously the interests of the Province. The first priority is to get the refinery operational and the second, and pretty close to that is to try to recover some of the ill-advised investment in that by the previous administration.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The proposals I referred to, Mr. Speaker, were those which were published in all the daily newspapers and answers to questions, answers given by Mr. Shaheen on one of the open line programmes in which he went into great detail. There seems to be an indication by the minister, and perhaps the minister could give us an answer to this question, from what he says I can only assume that the proposals which he has or the government has marked confidential and secret and so on which have not been published differ in some material way from the proposals of First Arabian and the Shaheen group which already have been published in the daily newspapers.

MR. W. ROWE:

Would that be correct that they are different, the proposals are different from what has been actually published by the newspapers to date?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. DOODY:

Mr. Speaker, I would hesitate to base the government's position, or the position of the people of the Province as enunciated by the government on what was read or interpreted or published by the daily newspapers. Although I have great respect for their editorial ability and their repetorial -

MR. PECKFORD:

Expertise.

MR. DOODY:

- expertise. Thank you. I know very little about the open line shows. I have not had time really to listen to them. Usually from nine o'clock in the morning on I am kind of busy in my office and I do as much work as I can for the people of the Province. However, if my friend opposite wishes to give me the detail of what was said on the open line shows, I will try to check them out, what the facts are and perhaps we can come up with some sort of a consensus, somewhere between the truth and the substance.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Some of your colleagues will know.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if my question, Sir, should be directed to the Minister of Fisheries or to the Minister of Justice, but I have questions for both, and one or two supplementaries, Sir.

I would like to start off with the Minister of Fisheries, and ask the minister if the three mid-water trawlers, the Barricudina, the Blue Hake and the Sand Lance, have been sold or leased to T.J. Hardy in Port aux Basques?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge they were sold. Initially they were leased to the company, and I think subsequently sold to the company concerned, Hardy's.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Sir. The hon. gentleman then will realize that these three boats, I think they were called the sculpin fleet, were built by the Newfoundland Government, built at Marystown, and now one of them has been lost, the Barricudina, and possibly five Newfoundland families have been bereaved. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if the minister thinks that the disappearance of the Barricudina warrants a formal enquiry - I have already asked for one myself of the Minister of Transport - if the Provincial Minister of Justice thinks that there should be a formal enquiry into the disappearance of this boat that was built by the Newfoundland Government and sold to T.J. Hardy and would the minister indicate if the government would support such an enquiry? I realize it is the responsibility of the Government of Canada, the Minister of Transport. Would the Minister of Justice undertake to support such an enquiry?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN:

Mr. Speaker, firstly, what the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) says is correct: The decision as to whether or not there is an inquiry held into the loss of any ship or loss of life at sea is the sole and exclusive responsibility of the Minister of Transport of Canada. My position has always been that when a ship disappears that the Minister of Transport should hold an inquiry. The practice has been when they are held that a judge of either the Supreme Court or the district court is appointed to conduct the inquiry.

If I may digress for a second, this is one of the things that prior to Confederation was very fully covered under our laws. At that time, whenever there was a loss at sea there was what we used to call a Marine Court of Inquiry consisting of a judge of the Supreme Court and generally two master mariners as appraisers who sat with him. But with Confederation, jurisdiction vested exclusively in the Government of Canada.

I have no hesitancy at all in supporting this application or any suggestion that the hon. Otto Lang should hold an inquiry. I believe the practice that the Minister of Transport follows in Ottawa is whenever there is a loss of life at sea that he first directs his officials under the provisions of the Transport Act to conduct their own inquiry and when that is completed and he receives a report from them, he then decides whether or not a public inquiry is necessary. There have been some differences of opinion between this government and the Minister of Transport in that area of endeavour. And in particular, I remind hon. gentlemen of the loss of the San Juan where we formally - and I believe there was a resolution of this House, if my memory serves me correctly,

MR. HICKMAN: asking that there be an inquiry into the loss of that ship. Mr. Lang felt for reasons known to him that as a result of the investigation conducted by his people that an inquiry was not warranted and he was not prepared to set it up. But in any event, if there is an indication - well, I think the most prudent thing to do would be to avoid prejudging what the decision of the Minister of Transport in Ottawa will be. I would assume that he has not received any reports as yet from his investigative team. If, following that, he decides that there will not be an inquiry, certainly he knows the position of this government that where there is loss of life at sea then there should be a Marine Court of Inquiry or a judicial inquiry set up under the provisions of the Department of Transport Act and/or the Canada Shipping Act, and I certainly have no hesitancy in such a request.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman really did not answer my question directly. Perhaps I did not make the question clear to the minister. What I asked the minister was if the government would support in writing or by wire a request for a public inquiry into the disappearance of the Barricudina, not just have it recorded in this House?

Mr. Speaker, apart from bringing into focus the procedures of the present search and rescue operations as far as this Province are concerned, there may be other factors involved. For instance, there are still two of these draggers, midwater trawlers afloat, the Sand Launce and the Blue Hake.

Mr. Neary: And the question of stability of the boats may arise, I do not know. But I believe, Sir, for the protection, for the safety of the crew of the two remaining ships that this government, who built these boats down at Marystown, should join with me in asking for a public inquiry, to bring out the facts. I think, Sir, it should go a little further. After all, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen will remember that in the case of the Cape Royal, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were very vocal, and the member of Parliament for St. John's West was very vocal about getting an inquiry into the Cape Royal, and the circumstances are about the same as far as the Barracudina is concerned. And I believe this government, Sir, has a very serious obligation, and I would like for the minister to state whether or not they will write the Minister of Transport or wire the Minister of Transport and support a move for a public inquiry into the disappearance of this vessel.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, we were indeed very vocal as a government, not only with the Cape Royal but with the San Juan and other ships that have been lost during the last few years, in asking for an inquiry.

I repeat that our demand for an inquiry and our written request for an inquiry is made once the minister of Transport in Ottawa decides on the evidence that is submitted to him whether he is going to hold it. For all we know the hon. Otto Lang may have decided already that he is going to hold an inquiry. He may decide that it is inappropriate today or tomorrow to make that decision, but make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time, if there is a refusal in Ottawa to set up an inquiry into the loss of that ship, the Government of Newfoundland will once again renew a request for an inquiry. And I would hope that this time we will have some success.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: I would assume, Sir, that the minister's answer is no, that this government will not ask for a formal inquiry at this time. The answer is no, I can assume that, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am dissatisfied with the answer and I wish to debate it during the late show on Thursday coming.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: But in answer to the question, may I repeat for the record the answer is yes, but if the hon. gentleman wants to debate it, you know, go to it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River followed by the hon. gentleman for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. STRACHAN: In the Speech from the Throne yesterday we noted that the government has announced steps to create a year-round deep-water port in Labrador. Also, when we read the fine print we find out that what they are speaking about is just getting an icebreaker to study ice dredging in Lake Melville this month.

A question for the Minister of Transportation. I wonder if the minister could inform us whether, since an icebreaker is going to be in Lake Melville this month studying ice dredging, whether there was any request from his department or the government for icebreaker service two weeks ago on the Labrador Coast to assist the Sarah and the Marine Voyager at Davis Inlet, the Bonavista at Nain and the Glenco into Lake Melville-Goose Bay to get the much needed supplies to the Labrador Coast? Whether this government had requested Ottawa to provide this icebreaker service?

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

MR. J. DINN: Yes, I can check the detail of that, Mr. Speaker. I understand we made a request for the Lake Melville part of it, but as to whether we did on the Coast I am not too sure. But I will check it and get the answers for you.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I realize we are far from St. John's and that the minister does not realize what I am talking of. Mr. Speaker, we have the greatest coastline in the world and one of the worst ice conditions in the world, Labrador shares in that. Could the minister tell us whether there will be a formal request or demand to Ottawa to see that there is an icebreaker service provided for the whole Labrador Coast, a suitable icebreaker service, not piddling little boats, an icebreaker service for the whole Labrador Coast during the month of November, during the late shipping season into December every year regardless of whether it is required or not?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, there has not been a formal request for all year-round icebreaking facilities but it is, I would remind the hon. member, a federal responsibility and maybe he should get in touch with his member of parliament.

MR. STRACHAN:

A supplementary Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN:

I have, over the last few weeks, been discussing this intensely - last year as well and the year before - but you are the government - I am an Opposition member here - and it is therefore your duty, as I see it, and your responsibility to realize that this Province also consists of more than St. John's. A question for the minister, could he tell us whether he would request Ottawa and together with the Government of Canada undertake a of air-sea rescue, marine air-radio and icebreaker service on the whole Labrador Coast, to undertake a study on these conditions because it is only through excellent seamanship that there has been no tragedy occur so far. And furthermore would he ask Ottawa for explanations as to why, in the month of November, the Sir Humphrey Gilbert was placed on dry dock in Halifax, the only vessel which is suitable for icebreaker service on the Labrador Coast?

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, far be it from me to answer a question like that from the hon. member. If he is trying to tell me what my responsibilities are may I remind him what his responsibilities are to his constituents and possibly get to them so they will not be petitioning again for his removal.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I must point out to hon. members that the Question Period is not a period of debate and questions should not be argumentative or of a debating type nor should answers.

MR. STRACHAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary.

MR. STPACHAN:

Mr. Speaker, for the past two weeks I have been working on ice trying to help and assist in trying to get foodstuffs into Davis Inlet so the minister need not lecture me about workin on ice.

I wonder if the minister would answer the question whether he is prepared to undertake, this government, this administration is prepared to undertake or ask assistance from Ottawa and the various departments, to undertake a full-scale study of icebreaker service, marine radio service and air-sea rescue in Labrador as it applies to Labrador? We have a great deal of needs in Newfoundland, and I agree absolutely that the Island of Newfoundland needs an upgraded service, but I am wondering if they are prepared to also request this as far as Labrador is concerned since the services provided are totally inadequate?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I agree that the services provided by the federal government with respect to air-sea search and rescue, with respect to icebreaking facilities, with respect to the Newfoundland railway, with respect to many things are totally inadequate. We have, through the previous several ministers, requested many things from the federal government and among them are things like trying to provide services to the people in Newfoundland which they obviously are not. I again say to the hon. member that he should contact his federal counterparts and colleagues in Ottawa, which is a government of the same stripe as the hon. member, and remind them of their responsibility and not try to remind us. We are trying to look after ours.

MR. STPACHAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. STPACHAN:

Would the minister be prepared to table the pertinent documents he says they have requested Ottawa-with reference, in particular, to Labrador icebreaker service, marine radio and air-sea rescue service in Labrador as well as on the Island?

December 5, 1978

Tape No. 51 AH-3

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, no.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the
Minister of Industrial Development. In the announcement

MR. T. RIDEOUT: a week or so ago that the Labrador linerboard mill had been sold to Abitibi-price, I believe the Premier made some reference to the fact that the mill would utilize on - Island wood; I would like to ask the minister whether or not there has been any detailed discussions between the government and Abitibi-Price with regard to utilizing wood resources that were utilized by linerboard mill, for example, in the Roddickton area, which is of particular concern to me at this moment?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: The wood supply question for the reactivation of the Stephenville plant was discussed in great detail with the company and we have satisfied them that there are adequate wood supplies available to provide the company with an adequate supply for the single-machine plant which they envisage. As to the detail of the wood stock or the cordage that is now lined up in Roddickton is it?

MR. RIDEOUT: It is not up there now.

MR. DOODY: Oh, I see. I am sorry. The wood which is yet to be cut, the wood area in Roddickton, I cannot actually say at this point, Sir, whether that was one of the woods areas which had been allocated to the new company area, although I rather suspect that it is not. It is somewhat distant from the mill and it would appear, from this distance, to be somewhat uneconomical in terms of the reactivation of the single machine. When we get into the second machine installation, of course, which is further down the road, I would think that then things would change dramatically. But off the top of my head I feel that that Roddickton wood area is not involved in the original agreement, although I stand to be corrected, and I will look into the matter for the hon. member and see exactly what the wood detail is on that agreement.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his undertaking to look into the matter. In the Throne Speech yesterday there was some reference made to small contained pulp units that would be used to break wood down into pulp and thereby ship it at a more economical rate to mills like Corner Brook and, hopefully, Stephenville and maybe other areas. Could the minister tell the House, in view of the fact that the whole economy of the Roddickton area and I could add Main Brook and my colleagues district depends largely on a thriving forest operation-whether or not that particular area would be investigated for the possibility of including one of those chip mills, or whatever the technical name is, within the area so that the pulp could be broken down and thereby transported at a more economical rate to where it can be utilized by the mills?

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. minister.

MR. DOODY:

Yes, that is one of the areas that this thermo-mechanical process, these small pulping operations are directly aimed at, the Burlington Peninsula area, the Main Brook - Roddickton area and other areas which have proven to be uneconomical in terms of shipping the pulpwood as such in their totality to the two mills, and now the third mill which will be operational in the Province. I can assure the member that that is one of the areas that is under active investigation. Hopefully, it will result in utilizing that forest resource. It is one of the better, as the member knows, forest resources in the Province. So far it has not been economical to use it for the mills that we have now under the conditions that we have now. I think that with this process there is some hope that that may be accomplished. I sincerely hope that it will happen. It is under investigation, it is one of the areas that we have identified.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Leader of the Opposition.

A supplementary, the hon.

MR. W. N. ROWE:

just answered a question did I understand from his answer,
or has he been informed by Abitibi whether they will or
will not be cutting wood on the Labrador for use in the
converted or

MR. W. N. ROWE: or reconverted Linerboard mill?

MR. DOODY: The answer is, unfortunately, no.

The plan for the activation of the Bay St. George mill does not include the useage of the wood resource in Labrador. It is not part of the plan, unfortunately.

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans, followed by the hon. gentleman from St. John's West.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications. I have not studied the Throne Speech yet but I do not recall having heard any mention of the Province's programme for new highroad construction this coming year, and I would ask the minister if it is the government's intention to build the road between Bishop's Falls and Grand Falls in the 1979 construction season? Now, when the road was first announced it was indicated it would be in the first phase of the new agreement with Ottawa. Is it the Province's intention to have that strip of road, the twinning of the Trans-Canada between Bishop's Falls and Grand Falls, included in the 1979 construction programme?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, that will depend on whether the money stretches. All of the Trans-Canada, you mean, between Bishop's and Grand Falls? Is that the question?

MR. FLIGHT: And the twinning.

MR. DINN: And the twinning?

MR. FLIGHT: Yes.

MR. DINN: We do not know if the money will stretch for all of that section of highway, but we will know in very short order.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I would remind the minister that work has already gone on, the widening of the right of way and that kind of thing. And in view of the minister's answer, I have to ask, Has not the government left the impression in the Province, or at least with the general public, that the work to be done, the various projects, twinning here and widening there, was designated and that the monies over the four years would do the necessary work and that you have a programme? Now do you have a programme or do you not? Are you aware of what projects you are going to take on in 1979 or is it depending on the money running out at the end of the four years? And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear the minister indicate whether or not he is satisfied that the agreement that the previous Minister of Transportation negotiated with Ottawa, is he satisfied that the financial end of that agreement will cover all the reconstruction we need in this Province? And is it true the indications that he gave as minister, that the areas to be reconstructed were set in a rigid plan and that he knew what areas he would be rebuilding or widening or reconstructing?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, we have a definite plan. We had some pre-engineering done when the plan was first started and we have since got some final design on a lot of the highways that were supposed to be done under the present agreement. Unfortunately, the money will not cover all of the roads that were in the preliminary design, and therefore, we do not know at this point in time exactly what will be covered over the three year period with

MR. DINN: respect to the dollars that are
in place right now. So we will know soon and when we do
find out we will certainly inform the House and the hon.
member.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for
St. John's West.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is aware of
what is in the Standing Orders with respect to
supplementaries.

The hon. member.

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, my question is
directed towards the Minister of Housing, the Chairman
of the St. John's Housing Corporation and Chairman of the
Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

The Daily News of last week
carried a rather shocking report that \$900,000 in RRAP

DR. KITCHEN: hundred thousand dollars in RRAP funds to the city would remain unspent," and quoted the Central Mortgage and Housing chief here in St. John's as the source of that report. But I would like to know what is the truth of this report because it would be very serious if almost \$1 million were to be returned to Ottawa when so many people in my own district, for example, are in very great need of RRAP money. To see the money returned to Ottawa at the end of the year, it would be very serious. I am wondering if the minister could tell us whether or not this is true, that money will be returned to Ottawa that is not spent and if it is true where the fault lies.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Housing.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can tell my hon. friend is that in discussion with the Vice-Chairman of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, he informs me that up to the present time something close to \$800,000 is remaining in terms of monies available and I am advised that efforts are underway, in fact tenders have been called for proposals to take up that money. I am unaware of any surplus funds which will be returned to Ottawa. Indeed, it would be very unusual if the blame would lie with us. Because -

AN HON. MEMBER: You have nothing to do with it.

MR. HICKEY: - the best I can gather from my discussions with the people in Housing, at this particular point in time, is that the federal government are taking initiatives to cut the cost themselves. So I am certainly not aware. But I will get the details over and above what I have said and confirm or otherwise.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Order one, debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, first of all before I begin my few remarks let me say how pleasant it is to see my former Padre in the galleries, Reverend Matthew Kean from Conche and his delegation, who spent so many years with us in Baie Verte. It is indeed a pleasure to run into him again.

Let me begin, Sir, by complimenting the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) and the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan). I am sure that each of them spoke sincerely. They did speak eloquently in their moving and seconding the Speech from the Throne.

Sir, it has been said that politics make queer bed fellows and indeed it is true.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Strange. Strange.

MR. RIDEOUT: Queer, I deliberately used the word queer, Mr. Speaker, Deliberately. And indeed it is true. Because when you see two former ministers, Mr. Speaker, two former ministers of the Crown, well respected ministers, highly placed ministers at one time, relegated to the backbench notoriety of moving and seconding the Speech from the Throne, then it is true. When those people hop in bed together then it is true. There is something queer going on, Sir, when those people move and second the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. So I deliberately used the word that I used.

AN HON. MEMBER: What does it mean?

AN HON. MEMBER: Wrong part of the - ?

MR. RIDEOUT: It means, Mr. Speaker, it means I suppose that none of the permanent backbenchers, and there are only a few of them over there now, Sir, it means that none of the permanent backbenchers

MR. RIDEOUT: had the gall or the gumption to again rise in praise of this administration. It could mean that. So the unwanted task, Sir, the unwanted task, the unwholly task fell to two former Ministers of the Crown, two former Cabinet Ministers. It fell to those people, Sir, to defend the indefensible, to sort of psyche up the troops, I suppose. That was their job yesterday, to be the morale boosters, to put on a kind of a show for the viewing audience. That job yesterday, which ordinarily would fall to a couple of ordinary backbenchers, this time around for circumstances that are plain for all to see, had to fall in the lap of two former Ministers of the Crown.

MR. SIMONS: Two queer fellows.

MR. RIDEOUT: Two queer fellows, Sir. But, Sir, they nor those, indeed, who go to their political

MR. RIDEOUT: graves believe that the indefensible can be defended by backbench hangers-on, by friends in disguise who criticize the administration as if they were in Opposition - that certainly can be said of at least, I think, both of those gentlemen -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: - by disgruntled former ministers who left the administration and have publicly quarrelled with it. Vain are those indeed who think that the administration can be defended by those types of people. The strategy, Sir, of having two former ministers move and second the Address in Reply, coupled with the strategy of moving the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) from the very extremities of the House up behind the Government House Leader will do nothing, Sir, to enhance the image of a tired, worn out, run-down administration.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Try as they will, Sir, that will do nothing to improve their image.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Well said!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, there are too many scores that must be settled. There are too many disappointments of the people of this Province that cannot be healed. There are too many blunders that cannot be borne any longer. There are too many expectations, Sir, by too many people who have been inflated too often and then callously ripped apart.

MR. F. WHITE: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: There have been too many wrongs perpetrated on our people by this administration. There have been too many scandals, too much skulduggery. Too much deceit has been allowed to go on. Yes, Sir, there is no doubt about it, Mr. Speaker, that the time

MR. RIDEOUT: for atoning for one's sins has arrived. The day of reckoning has caught up with this administration.

MR. NEARY: Caught up with the (inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, it has caught up with the member also. And the people are waiting for their chance, Sir. The people of this Province are waiting for their chance to go to the polling booths and say in their numbers, 'Depart from me, ye cursed, for ye have not been good stewards!'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: They will say, Sir, 'Ye have been deceitful, ye have been dishonest and lazy and ye have been believers in the divine right to govern.' So they will say that you must go, that this land must be rid of the cancer with which it has been infested for the last six years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: That is what the people are waiting for a chance to say, Sir. -And no amount of blustery cover-up by two former ministers and moving a former minister up to prop up the Government House Leader is going to change that attitude, Sir, on the part of our people.

Mr. Speaker, how can one help but be negative, in the main? There are some good things such as I will get to later, but how can one help, Sir, but be negative, in the main, about the Speech from the Throne?

MR. W. N. ROWE: The facts are negative.

MR. RIDEOUT: The facts are negative, and I will get into them in a few minutes. The first Throne Speech, Sir, ever brought before this House by this administration in 1972 - February or March, I am not sure of the month, but in 1972 - the first Throne Speech ever

MR. RIDEOUT: by a brand new government, Sir, brought before this House by this administration, did not even wait to get off the first page - on page one it said, Mr. Speaker, 'Newfoundland need not have the highest unemployment record and the lowest per capita income of this great nation. My Government is planning to introduce new social and economic policies to guide effective development within the Province. My Government pledges itself to the philosophy of inter-regional equity, government inter-departmental coordination and inter-governmental partnership.' They did not wait, Mr. Speaker, to get off the first page in their first Throne Speech to enunciate the fantastic goal of providing employment for our people. But, Sir, in the Speech that we saw yesterday the word 'unemployment' is not even mentioned. There is not even a mention of the word 'unemployment', that great cancer that is scouring this Province of ours today. There was not a word mentioned about unemployment in that Speech yesterday. Eight Throne Speeches later, Mr. Speaker, eight Throne Speeches and six wasted years later down the road, the great platitude that this government started off with six years ago and could not wait to get off the first page because unemployment was so rampant in Newfoundland in 1971 and 1972, that was their great platform. Six years down the road when unemployment has more than doubled, when this Province is worse off unemployment-wise than it has ever been even during the Great Depression in numbers, there is not a word, Sir, in the Throne Speech

MR. RIDEOUT: about unemployment. And they say you are negative. What an attitude, Mr. Speaker. What a callous defense for the indefensible.

MR. MCNEIL: Trying to say that it does not exist.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now why is there not some word in the Throne Speech, Sir, about the greatest single problem facing this Province today? Why is there not some word about it in the Throne Speech? Because, Sir, the record of this government in job creation has been a dismal failure. That is why there is no word, that is why there is no mention of the word 'unemployment' in the Throne Speech. You can take the whole nine Throne Speeches, Mr. Speaker, from 1972 up to now and in the first three or four you will see some whimpering about unemployment. But then the bottom began to fall out of the barrel, they could not cope with the situation, they gave up in despair, and nine Throne Speeches later, down the road, you do not even see the word in print. What a shocking admission, Mr. Speaker, for a bunch of people who want to govern this Province to have to make, and to have to make it in writing and to have to have it read before this hon. House by the Lieutenant-Governor of this Province. It is sad that the document that was read to us yesterday, Sir, had to bear the name Throne Speech let alone anything else.

Six years, Sir, after taking office, six years under this administration our unemployment rate is still the highest in the country. Six years ago in their first Throne Speech they said, that need not be the case. And so I say, Sir, what have they done about it? The facts speak for themselves. They have obviously done nothing about it. They have not been able to cope with the situation. And, Mr. Speaker, were it not for Federal Canada Works grants, unemployment insurance payments and other federal monies coming into this Province I would suggest to you, Sir, that there would be riots in the streets of this Province today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: We would be a disaster area. There would be no hope, Sir. The federal government that is so often taken to task

Mr. Rideout: in this House by politicians on the other side, so often, Sir, is the only thing, Mr. Speaker, that is keeping this government going. Sixty per cent, I believe, of our revenue that we spend comes from Ottawa. And were it not for Canada Works and UIC the people of this Province would be going in the thousands, Sir, to the welfare offices attempting to scrape a bite to eat.

MR. NEARY: Fifty per cent of the welfare comes from Ottawa.

MR. RIDEOUT: And fifty per cent of that comes from Ottawa, that is right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question is having read the Throne Speech yesterday, where is the government's programme to create new jobs? Where is the government's programme to get our people back to work? That is the single most important issue facing our people today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: And it was not addressed in one single phrase or one single word in the Speech from the Throne. It is unbelievable, Sir, that the government does not even know it exists. They do not even know it is the number one problem that is facing this Province today. What have they done about it?

We saw—what?—a year and a half or two years ago we saw a \$2 million Bandid approach. Remember the great job creation programme that this administration embarked on a couple of years ago, the \$2 million Bandid approach? We have seen that. We have seen the \$2 million telephone line, the Action Group. What has that produced in terms of jobs for this Province? People who already had a good job and making a fairly good salary have a better job and making a better salary—

MR. NEARY: Part-time job.

MR. RIDEOUT: - we know that has happened. Part-time job. We know that has happened. But, Mr. Speaker, we have not seen the jobs. It is as simple as that, we have not seen the jobs, we have not seen the programmes or the policies, we have not seen the

Mr. Rideout: bold new initiatives that this Province needs, Sir, in order to get the people back to work and to get the Province back on a sound economic footing. We just have not seen it. We have not seen the programmes or the policies to create jobs for our people.

I realize, Sir, I am not naive enough, Sir, to suggest—I realize that unemployment is a national problem, there is no doubt about that, but, Sir, in Newfoundland it is more than a problem it is a disaster, it is a disgrace. And this Provincial Government has a role to play, it has a responsibility, but, Mr. Speaker, judging from the Speech from the Throne yesterday you would not know that the problem exists. We have not even kept up, Sir, since this government took office six years ago. I know there have been more people join the labour force and so on, but we have not even kept up with where we were then. We are worse off now, we are falling behind, and this administration has the gall to bring a Speech from the Throne into the House and does not even mention the number one problem facing the people of this Province today. I say, Sir, it is unbelievable, it is something that this hon. crowd will take to their political graves and deserve to be buried with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Another Throne Speech gone by, Mr. Speaker, and we still have to ask ourselves, we still have to ask ourselves after six years and nine Speeches from the Throne, we still have to ask ourselves, What is the government's plan for the development of this Province? It has not been spelled out yet, only in political pious platitudes. It was not outlined in the Speech from the Throne yesterday, Sir. There was a lot of talk about the development of the fishery,

MR. RIDEOUT: there were a lot of words about fishing and I would say that is good, but, Sir, we need more than talk, we need some action because the fishery is the backbone of this Province and will continue to be the backbone of this Province. There are times, Mr. Speaker, when I can be complimentary to the Minister of Fisheries, there are also some areas where I can be critical and I do not mind doing both. I will say though, Sir, about the Minister of Fisheries that this minister in most instances has bent his shoulder to the task, he has not been afraid to work and he is one of the few ministers on that side of the House, Sir, in that administration that I can say that about. The Minister of Fisheries has at least given the appearance that he is working for and on behalf of the fishermen of this Province and I compliment him for it. But, Sir, having said that I will have to say that a man would have to be a dunce, a man would have to be a stunned mope, Mr. Speaker, not to look good as Minister of Fisheries in Newfoundland today.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: You would have to be as stunned as they come not to look good as Minister of Fisheries in this Province

MR. SIMMONS: Thanks to Romeo.

The fishery, Mr. Speaker, is taking on a great upward swing due to the 200 mile limit. There is no doubt about that.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you Ottawa.

MR. RIDEOUT: So Newfoundland, Sir, is reaping the benefits of that upward swing and so we ought to. So there is every reason, Sir, for the stupidest mope in the administration to look half decent in the fisheries portfolio today. But, Sir, having said that I also must say that there is a great deal that needs and remains to be done in the fishery. Some of the concepts, for example, outlined in the Speech from the Throne and the minister's recent conference on the fisheries are laudable. There is no doubt about that. I will not be small enough to say that they were not. Fish Our Future has a beautiful coloured picture of the minister in there. Some of the

MR. RIDEOUT: concepts are laudable, some of them are worthwhile and will not doubt help fisheries development in this Province. A man would be small, Sir, not to say that and not to admit it and I have no hesitation in saying it and doing that. But I will say, Sir, that I am very wary, I am very cautious about the superport concept that the minister has hung his star to, I am very wary about that concept as explained to the fisheries conference a week or so ago and mentioned again in this House yesterday in the Throne Speech address.

I have been told, Sir, that the superport concepts have not really worked all that well in other parts of the world. In Scotland, for example, there are some dicey questions about the superport concept.

MR. NEARY: That is the one Mr. Davidson went over to study.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is right. the one that he did not get paid for and therefore began to let all the political goings on hit the fan.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: They should have paid him, Mr. Speaker, because it might never have come out.

MR. NEARY: That is the one Andy Davidson went over to study.

MR. RIDEOUT: The Grimsby report, was it?

MR. NEARY: The Grimsby, that is right. He only got paid half the amount.

MR. RIDEOUT: Because he never got paid he is after springing a lot of things loose since that. The government should have paid him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: They do not even know how to buy people off, over there.

MR. RIDEOUT: They do not even know how to pay their bills properly. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, Sir, the superport concept is one that I would like to give a lot more thought and study to

MR. RIDEOUT: because I have been told, and I have seen instances where the superport concept has not been working in other parts of the world and I have mentioned the situation in Scotland as an example. In fact, Sir, I have been told that the superport really established an industrial ghetto, those are the words that were used, an industrial ghetto causing major social and economic upheaval. Now I would suggest, Sir, that that may not be the route that we want to go in this Province. I am not turning thumbs down on the idea, Sir. I am open to it. I would like to see full details and information brought before this House so that we can share it and debate it and discuss it and maybe come to some sort of consensus. But all I am saying is go cautiously. Do not go into this thing overnight. It has been tried elsewhere, Mr. Speaker, and they ended up with problems. They have ended up with major social and economic problems as a result of it. So tread carefully, Sir, where you are going. And I would suggest that having looked at it we may come to the conclusion in Newfoundland that it is not the route that we want to go in the development of the fisheries in our Province. Instead, Mr. Speaker, of looking at one superport, one major industrial fish oriented port, instead of doing that we may - maybe we ought to be looking at a half dozen major strategically located ports around this Province. Maybe that is what we should be looking at, I am not sure. I would, from the information I have now, I would be inclined to think that way but I would like to have more information on it, Mr. Speaker. And I think the minister, before he goes off, you know, making pronouncements that there is going to be no changeover, has an obligation to come before this House so that we can get into the meat of the situation. It may be that we ought to be developing a half dozen strategically located fish landing centres around this Province. It is an area that we certainly should be looking at.

MR. J. WINSOR:

Argentina.

MR. RIDEOUT: Argentia is one possible example. Harbour Grace could be another one. I do not know, Twillingate may be another one. There could be a half dozen strategically located areas around this Province where we should be concentrating our efforts into a major fish handling centre rather than putting all our eggs into the one basket and into the Harbour Grace area.

MR. SIMMONS: I do not think you are going to help the Burin Peninsula for example.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: Or help the West Coast.

MR. RIDEOUT: So, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that it is something that we should take a very hard look at.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while some progress has been made in the development of the fishery in this Province, while I have very quickly admitted that, I hasten to add that there is much more that needs to be done in the development of our fishery. Many communities, for example, around our coast are still sadly lacking in fish handling facilities. I am sure the problems exist in every district. Many viable fishing communities have no facilities at all. It is almost impossible to believe, Mr. Speaker, that viable fishing communities have no fish handling facilities at all in 1978. I can name two in my own district. Smith's Harbour; I suppose there is more fish landed in Smith's Harbour than any other community in the district with the exception of LaScie, and there is no fish handling facility whatsoever in that community. There is an old shed on the wharf operated by National Seal Products from LaScie, and they talk about quality control. Woodstock is another community, Mr. Speaker, in my district where there is absolutely no fish handling facility and I would have been able to name another half dozen had it not been for the generosity of Canada Works.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: There is no doubt about that. There have been a few fish handling facilities built over the last three or four years utilizing Canada Works grants in order to get them done. So fish handling facilities is of major importance and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we still have a long way to go before we solve that problem adequately.

Many communities need expanded and upgraded facilities. The original facilities put in under Canada Works, for example, three or four years ago are no longer adequate. Two years ago we built a fish handling shed in Breh's Cove for twenty-seven fishermen. I was there a couple of weeks ago and there are fifty-two who used it last year. So that shed is no longer adequate. So we need upgraded and expanded facilities and that is another area that we have to get into. And, Mr. Speaker, that should be our task and we ought to dedicate ourselves to it, not to get caught up totally in the one major development concept that has been presented to us so far.

At the same time, Sir, that we are concentrating on this we must concentrate on marketing. There is no doubt about that. We must concentrate on quality control. There has to be more freezing

MR. RIDEOUT: capacity. Some moves have been made in that direction, but other more giant moves are still needed. There has to be an expansion of freezing capacity; there has to be some move made to solve the perennial glut problem that we have in the fishery along our Northeast Coast every year.

So, you know, Mr. Speaker, there are all kinds of problems in the fishery development, and while the government and the minister have addressed themselves to some, it appears to me as if he has become more or less caught up in the great industrial super-port concept surrounding Harbour Grace, and that, Mr. Speaker, could very well be to the disadvantage of fishermen along the Northeast Coast of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I hope nobody is over buying land in Harbour Grace either.

MR. RIDEOUT: It would be interesting to know who is buying land in Harbour Grace, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: They have the land for (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: They cannot buy it, 'Frank' has it all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have not reached the stage yet where we ought to make ourselves champions of the multi-national companies. The inshore fishermen and the midshore fishermen should be our prime concern as a provincial Legislature, and we ought to be directing our energies into that area.

Mr. Speaker, there was nothing in the Speech from the Throne to cause one to be over-enthusiastic about development of Labrador power, to branch off in another direction. The Lower Churchill Development Corporation, Sir, in the exact words of the Speech from the Throne, 'seeks to remove all obstacles

MR. RIDEOUT: to the recommencement of construction work in the Lower Churchill basin.' That is word for word from the Speech from the Throne, and apparently, that is what the Labrador Development Corporation is all about.

Mr. Speaker, after the firecracker plot of 1975 that pulled the greatest deceit that was ever perpetuated on our people, after that, three years later, you have the government saying, the Lower Churchill Development Corporation has been established to seek to remove all obstacles to development of power in the Lower Churchill basin.

MR. SIMMONS: Obstacle number one is 'Frank Moores'.

MR. RIDEOUT: Obstacle number one is the government of this Province.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: The firecracker plot that they bounced off in the Fall of 1975, after all that, then, Mr. Speaker, you have a line like that in the Speech from the Throne. Mr. Speaker, the deceit that was pulled on both sides of the Straits of Belle Isle in 1975, in Anchor Point on one side - What is the place on the other side?

MR. WHITE: Savage Cove.

MR. RIDEOUT: - Savage Cove on the other side, the deceit that was pulled on the people of this Province in 1975 cost this Province, the people of this Province, the taxpayers of this Province, tens of millions of dollars, there is no doubt about that.

MR. SIMMONS: One hundred and ten million dollars.

MR. RIDEOUT: One hundred and ten million dollars, Sir, that deceit, that firecracker plot cost the

MR. RIDEOUT: people of this Province.

And then they have the gumption to come in in the Speech from the Throne in 1978, three years later, and say, 'We are hoping to remove the obstacles to the development of power in the Lower Churchill basin.'

All that has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that a federal/provincial corporation has been formed to remove obstacles - that is all. There is no commitment, there is no more of a ray of hope now, Sir, than there was three years ago. They just have a federal/provincial Crown corporation to look at the obstacles, I suppose to look at the Quebec question, to look at the Anglo-Saxon Route, to look at the possibility of raising financing. There is nothing there about markets. There is nothing nailed down yet, Sir. One hundred and ten million dollars and three years later down the road, we are no closer, Sir, to the development of power on the Lower Churchill River than we were in 1975 when we had the gunpowder plot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: That is all you can call it.

MR. WHITE: The new Guy Faulkes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Guy Faulkes the Second.

MR. RIDEOUT: Guy Faulkes the Second, happens to be Premier of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard pious platitudes from this government about power development in Labrador, but I have seen no evidence that Labrador power is to be developed primarily for use in Newfoundland and Labrador. That has been our position. The government say it is their position, but we do not see any evidence, Mr. Speaker, that it is their position, that the power that will be developed in Labrador will be developed for the benefit of the Labrador portion of the Province and the Island part of the Province. We are

MR. T. RIDEOUT: still operating, Sir, in the dark, we do not know what is happening and the government has no more idea now of what it wants to do in Labrador then when it was afflicted, or infected would probably be the better word, with election fever in 1975. They have no more notion, Sir, three years later they have no more notion about what they want to do with Labrador power than they did in 1975. None whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, the same is true, Sir, for other aspects of development in Labrador, not only the development of the hydro potential, but the same is true for other aspects of development in Labrador. I noticed in one of the previous Throne Speeches, Sir, that I was looking at last night there was some lofty reference to a Trans-Labrador Highway. I scoured the speech that was presented yesterday, Sir, I went through it word for word even counted the 'a's' and the 'ands' looking for another lofty reference to the Trans-Labrador Highway and what did I find? Only the wishy washy words 'an ultimate link'. An ultimate link.

MR. S. NEARY: A needed (inaudible).

MR. T. RIDEOUT: There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker the Minister of Justice must have written the Speech from the Throne, An ultimate link! The lofty words of four or five years ago with the Trans-Labrador Highway gets now, in this Speech from the Throne, the wishy-washy, really weasle words, of 'an ultimate link'. An ultimate link when? An ultimate link to begin when? When is construction starting? Have you got a deal with Ottawa on a ninety/ten basis? What is it all about, an ultimate link? Mr. Speaker, they have no definite policy now on transportation in Labrador, none whatsoever -

MR. SIMMONS: Or on the Island.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Or on the Island, and it's little wonder, Mr. Speaker that some people in Labrador began to look in

MR. T. RIDEOUT: other directions. There is little wonder because they have been neglected, they have been heaped with neglect by this administration ever since they came to office. This Province, Mr. Speaker, - I have not heard the Minister of Transportation in this Province, this present minister, the former minister, the present Minister of Industrial Development, his former minister and the present Minister of Tourism I have not heard one of them Mr. Speaker, raising hell about developing an adequate transportation policy for Labrador, have not heard a squeak about it in the House or out of the House, have not heard one squeak, Sir, about an adequate transportation policy for that great rich area of our Province. Have not heard a word from any of the three former ministers of transportation that I have named and we find nothing about it again in the Speech from the Throne.

MR. SIMMONS: They treat Labrador like a Fiefdom.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, that same Throne Speech that I am referring to, three or four years ago, spoke of building a roads network in Labrador. Now they talked about the Trans-Labrador Highway from Happy Valley/Goose Bay up through to the Western part of the Province but not only that, Mr. Speaker, they talked about a roads network for Labrador. Was there any reference in the Throne Speech that was read yesterday, Sir, about a roads network for Labrador? Not on your life, Sir! What has happened to the grandiose idea? How many miles of road has this administration built in Labrador since it has taken office, Mr. Speaker? What have they done? Precious little! You only have to make one trip to Labrador, Sir, to realize that. Precious little! It is not in this Speech from the Throne, Sir, not even mentioned. So the transportation policy and the roads network policy that was brought in in a Throne Speech three or four years ago, Mr. Speaker, has obviously the died the normal death of most of the great concepts that

MR. T. RIDEOUT: were included in former Throne Speeches under this administration. There is no doubt about that, Sir, a lot of them have died the normal death and they do not get referred to anymore.

Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to hear a week or so ago, as I indicated in Question Period today, that the government had negotiated the sale of Labrador linerboard mill. Sir, our position as a party was so right two years ago when that mill was closed down. The mill ought never had to be closed in the first place. We said it, we stood man after man and said it two years ago and now, Sir, our position has proven to be so right

MR. RIDEOUT: there was no need of it. I venture to say, Sir, that this government, this Province saved absolutely nothing by closing down the Labrador Linerboard mill. In fact, Sir, I would venture to say that it cost a great deal of money not only in dollars, Sir, not only in dollars but in the social sense. It cost irreparable damage to a whole area of this Province, the Bay St. George area. Newfoundland families, Mr. Speaker, forced by the callousness of this government to move as far away as Iran and the hon. crowd on the other side want to talk about a resettlement policy. Let them talk about it. There was no need. We could have negotiated the sale of the mill if that was the right thing to do and I happen to believe it was, while it was working. We are probably very lucky to have sold a piece of closed up, ghost town real estate, anyway. Then, to think about the social damage that was done to the people of the Bay St. George area. But, Mr. Speaker, having said that I want to say that I am glad that the mill was sold. At least there is a ray of hope for the people of the Bay St. George area again. Even though they have been through some dark times there is a ray of hope for them again. But as I indicated in my question today, Mr. Speaker, what about the other areas of the Province that were so dependent on the Labrador Linerboard mill? What about the Roddickton area, for example, in my own district? The Burlington-Middle Arm area? What about the Goose Bay area in Labrador? I am happy for the people of Stephenville and the people of the Bay St. George area but I am waiting to hear, Mr. Speaker, from the government the details and the ramifications of the sale of that mill for other areas of the Province that were so dependent on it for economic survival. I think those people have a right to know. Their expectations are up once again, Mr. Speaker, because they were really doing well during the period when the mill was operating and they are wondering now where they stand. And I think it is time that the government let them know, and make every effort to ensure, whether it has to be done by the turning over of Crown timber rights or whether it has to be done through negotiation

MR. RIDEOUT: with Bowaters, make every effort to ensure that where it is economically feasible the areas of the Province that were so dependent on the operation of the Stephenville mill will continue to reap the benefits from that mill once it goes back into operation. To do any less, Mr. Speaker, would be a dismal failure on the part of those ministers to those people in those particular areas of the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many other areas I could get into. There was a little mention made in the Speech from the Throne yesterday about education. The government gave notice that it intends to bring in Grade XII in 1980, I believe it is. I do not see why it could not be brought in -

MR. NEARY: 1982.

MR. RIDEOUT: 1982 is it? I am not sure now. Grade XII 1980 or 1982? It is going to be phased in by 1980. And, Mr. Speaker, other than the wishy-washy remarks on developing a proper history curriculum for our schools there was nothing else mentioned in the Throne Speech about education.

MR. SIMMONS: Who is going to write the history?

MR. RIDEOUT: Somebody is going to be commissioned to write a history.

MR. SIMMONS: According to the reference they have obviously decided who it is going to be. You know, it is pretty definite.

MR. RIDEOUT: I do not know if the minister can tell us? Has anybody been commissioned to write that history yet?

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Morgan.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Morgan, oh! God help the school children!

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, Sir, the only two references to education in the Throne Speech were, you know, the history and also the reference to the phase-in of Grade XII by 1981 or 1982. With all the problems, Mr. Speaker, that we are facing in education in this Province today there was no addressing the problems in the Throne Speech. We spent hour after hour

MR. RIDEOUT:

hour, Mr. Speaker, harassing the life out of the Minister of Education during the last session about teacher cutbacks, about cutbacks in scholarship programmes, cutbacks in transportation grants to school boards. We spent day after day,

Mr. Rideout: presented petition after petition and, Mr. Speaker, nothing has happened. It does not even deserve a line in the Throne Speech, and that is the educational policy of this government. Now, Mr. Speaker, I accused the Minister of Education last year of being incompetent. At least he could have gotten a line or two into the Throne Speech to let us know what it is about. What new initiatives is the minister going to bring in in the field of educational development in this Province this year? No indication of that in the Throne Speech, Sir, no indication whatsoever. Now, Mr. Speaker, the youth of the Province, the youth of this Province, Sir, I would imagine today are very enthusiastic; they are very overjoyed that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador is about to set up a Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Corps. There is no doubt about that, Sir, that is the best news that the youth of this Province have heard from this administration in the past six years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: The hon. thumper may thump away because he was the only one who was thumping. Forget about that one now for this year.

Mr. Speaker, that is all that was in it. The youth of this Province, Sir, may have been interested, and I would submit to the House they are very interested, to hear about any job-creation plans this administration might have so that they might have a job next Summer; they would be interested in that type of thing. What happened to the Youth Commission, Mr. Speaker, that this administration set up a few years ago? Now, they got a Youth Commission; now, they need a Youth Corps. I remember debating a bill two or three years ago in this House to set up a youth commission. Somebody - Mr. Furey or other - was appointed head of it. I have not heard a stir about it since.

MR. NEARY: What is Rex Murphy doing now?

MR. RIDEOUT: You know, maybe this is going to be a job for Rex Murphy; it could be.

MR. NEARY: No, he has some kind of a job already.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well now, we will have to talk about that one, mister.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not hold your breath.

MR. RIDEOUT: The Minister of Tourism could be wrong as he usually is, Mr. Speaker.

So, there was nothing in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker. Yes, the Minister of Tourism, the Minister of Tourism wanted to run for the nomination. The Minister of Tourism wanted to run for the Tory nomination in Bonavista-Trinity-Conception, I believe it is called.

MR. SIMMONS: He could not make up his mind whether he wanted the Tory or the Liberal nomination.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is right; he could not make up his mind. So, in his usual way - but then again, Mr. Speaker, the Premier promised him that he could say what he liked, do what he liked, criticize the government when he liked, criticize the Premier when he liked, but he would never be kicked out of the Cabinet because he was going to squeak. So you see, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Tourism is safe; he is safe in the Cabinet. There is no doubt about that, Mr. Speaker, because he opposed the government on the budworm issue in the House of Assembly; he wanted to produce the McLean film and got into a big public row with his colleague, the Minister of Housing. He did that, Mr. Speaker, and he embarrassed the administration. When the Premier went out of the Province he almost - he got with the Minister of Fisheries and almost caused a breakdown of the Cabinet. He did all that. Any other minister would have been given the boot, but the Minister of Tourism went public and said, "If I am given the boot I will spill the beans; I will tell the truth." And the Premier, of course, Mr. Speaker, is afraid of the beans. The Premier does not want the beans to be spilled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to have a word to say about the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice gave his usual theatrical performance yesterday in a sort of half-hearted attempt to defend the government. Rumour has it, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister

MR. RIDEOUT: of Justice is on the way out, that yesterday was his last hurrah. He made Custer's last stand yesterday, Sir. Rumour has it that he is leaving; the ship is sinking; he does not want to be part of the sinking ship, so he is going, going before the next election the Deputy Premier.

MR. WHITE: He is going then for sure.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, you know, look what happened the last time. So I hear he is leaving. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the minister yesterday, the Minister of Justice yesterday, Mr. Speaker, was a living example of the old saying, the old adage, that a politician's favourite colour is plaid, because he never said anything; he did not know where to stand; he did not know where to begin to defend the government. The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, was so soft it was like putting your hand into a sort of bowl of putty and getting nothing; there was nothing there. The minister could not find a straw to cling to, so the old theatrical master himself reverted to the same old tactics that he is so known for in this House. It was retreat by being cynical; it was cover your tracks

Mr. Rideout: by sarcasam. It was a plain hypocrisy. But, Mr. Speaker, cynicism, sarcasam, and hypocrisy the minister should know are of no oratorical value whatsoever especially when they are transparent, and he was as transparent yesterday as he could be.

Mr. Speaker, the minister tried to justify the existence of the government by getting up and riddling off the St. Lawrence fish plant and two or three other accomplishments from the Throne Speech of last year. He did not get out this particular sheet, Mr. Speaker, that talks about the goals of the Tory Government are to reach full employment and have price stability. He did not talk about the inexpensive shared-cost programme to cover loss of fishing gear. He did not talk about the \$40 million dragger fleet. He did not talk about the fish auction centres around the Province. He did not talk about the 200 jobs at Octagon steel mill, how they can be maintained. He did not talk about legislation to be introduced to control wildcat strikes. He did not talk about any of this. Dozens and dozens and dozens of great platitudes that were put forth to the people of this Province in previous Speeches from the Throne, he did not talk about any of that, but he tried to justified it with four or five examples that they have succeeded on from the Speech from the Throne last year. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the type of thing that you will get from the defender of the government.

So, Mr. Speaker, for this side, let the word go out that the affairs of this Province have been sadly neglected by this government, and let it be known that they have no policy to develop adequately the resources of the Province that was seen in the Throne Speech yesterday. Let it be made clear that honesty and integrity have not been the cornerstone of this administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Let it be realized that the poor have become poorer, and the fat cats fatter under this administration condoning ripoffs to their political friends. So let it go out to all corners of the Province the type of government that we have had. It has been a corrupt

Mr. Rideout: inefficient, bungling administration. So let the word go out, Mr. Speaker, from this side of the House, we are not intended to sit on it, we are not intended to let cover-ups go unchallenged, to let corruption go unnoticed or neglect to go unaccounted for. If that is the negative, then you will hear it, Sir, in this House day after day. Where there is praise to come, we will praise; but where criticism is necessary then we will criticize. And when the time comes to fight then we will fight this government from this side of the House, at the polls or wherever they want to meet us, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I did have some hope for the hon. gentleman who last spoke, but it seems to be all gone now. He seems to be following his leader in the same footsteps of the negative attitude and the negative outlook towards our Province and the Province's people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Because the Throne Speech does point out quite clearly the policies of this government that have been formulated as a means of consultation with the people of the Province and is going to be of major benefit to the Province and its future. First of all, may I say maybe the Opposition would like to have some proof.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, I think we would.

MR. MORGAN: Maybe it is the time that we tell the truth. Maybe today I should make some headlines by telling some truths about certain Opposition members of the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Because if the hon. member who last spoke, maybe if his honourable leader, the present leader, had not resigned his seat back in 1974-1975 - well of course he would not be here today to speak in the Assembly. My question is - and I ask it loud and clear - why did the hon. gentleman who is now leader of the Liberal Party quit and run away in 1974-1975? Why did he quit? Why did he foresake

MR. MORGAN:

the people? Why? And where did he go in such -

MR. F. ROWE: Making an innuendo.

MR. MORGAN: It is not innuendo, Mr. Speaker. I make no innuendo. Why the sudden rush to Ottawa to get a passport processed? We all go through the normal regular channels which takes approximately six months in some cases. With his own personal efforts it was processed within a period of two to three weeks. Why the rush to leave our beloved Province?

MR. MORGAN: Province. He now comes back to say -

AN HON. MEMBER: I can get one in two days, sure.

MR. MORGAN: Why? Why?

AN HON. MEMBER: I can get a passport -

MR. MORGAN: Well, I would like the hon. gentleman who is now aspiring to become the Premier of this Province to tell the people of the Province, to tell us in the House of Assembly why he ran away in 1974 and 1975. Tell us why and where did he go. I understood he went to Paris to speak French. I have not heard him speak too much French since that time, French since that time. I have also heard that he went to take political science. Well, I think if any of us here in this House checked out that with the colleges and universities in France they will find there was no William N. Rowe in France. In fact, I could tell the House of Assembly exactly how long he was in the country of France. It was not long enough to take a course in political science. It was not long enough to take a course to learn to speak French. So if the Opposition members want the Bonavista member to tell the truth for a change, how about some truth? How about some truth? Well, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that I can tell lots of truth, but I think the onus is on the individual concerned, and I am asking him the question, and I am asking him the question. I am asking him the question. Why does not he tell the people of this Province why he forsook them back in White Bay South back in 1974-75. Let him answer that question. Let him answer it truthfully. The onus is on him. He is the man that is going to become Premier of the Province. Let him answer these questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the man who is aspiring to become Premier of the Province stood in the House yesterday and clearly indicated to the people of this Province his hypocrisy in regards to what he stands for. He stands

MR. MORGAN: now, for example, for Rural Development.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman is required to withdraw the word 'hypocrisy' and I would point out to all hon. members that there is need for restraint in choice of language and -

MR. NEARY: Sit down while the Speaker is making a ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the word 'hypocrisy'.

MR. MORGAN: Sure, Mr. Speaker, I follow the rulings of the Chair and I withdraw the word 'hypocrisy' and I will say double standard.

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

MR. MORGAN: He is using a double standard.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I address these words specifically to the hon. gentleman to my left and, of course, they are - Order, please! - they are operative for all hon. members. One may not evade or avoid or dilute or circumvent the ruling of the Chair by substitution of one term for another, so I will ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the remark without making further reference to it, and I will generalize that. I think perhaps a habit has grown up where an hon. member is required to withdraw something and the answer has often been "Yes, I withdraw that, but I add..." or "but something else...", and actually the requirement for withdrawal is a requirement for withdrawal, full stop, without paraphrasing or attempt to circumvent: and I would say in general as well that hon. members must exercise caution in the language they use toward other hon. members. terms like hypocrisy and terms like deceit and others are to be avoided.

Hon. member.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the word 'hypocrisy' and I will continue by saying that what the hon. gentleman stands for now while he is Leader of the Opposition and of the Liberal Party is completely contrary to what he stood for when he was on the government side of the House of

MR. MORGAN: Assembly here, part of the official government.

MR. NEARY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to hear a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour directed the minister, Sir, who is speaking for the government, speaking for his colleagues, to withdraw a certain statement that was considered by Your Honour to be unparliamentary. There was no interruption from this side. Then,

MR. NEARY:

Your Honour, the minister refused to follow the directions of Your Honour and then Your Honour had the second time to instruct the minister, who was being very unparliamentary and lowering the decorum of this House, to withdraw. Then for the second time the hon. gentleman defied Your Honour's ruling and went on to say 'but' and then did through the back door what he could not do through the front door. And I ask Your Honour to direct for the third time the hon. minister to withdraw the unparliamentary remark that he used or Your Honour name the hon. gentleman and have him removed from the Chamber.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I did withdraw the word 'hypocrisy' which I was instructed to by Your Honour and I was in the process of continuing on with my speech when I was interrupted again by these silly points of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am in a position to rule on this matter. Hon. members will recall that the term 'hypocrisy' was required to be withdrawn, was withdrawn and in so doing the term 'double standard' was insinuated. I then made the ruling that one could not avoid the ruling of the Chair by the use of a word very similar. My understanding is that the allegation of 'double standard' toward the hon. gentleman to my right was also withdrawn. The hon. gentleman then went on to say something to the effect that the hon. member does not now advocate the same policies that he, in the opinion of the hon. gentleman to my left, advocated at a different time. I think this is a question of a difference of opinion with respect to a question of fact or alleged fact but not an imputation of motive or a personal allusion. There obviously could be difference of opinion on it but the personal allusion or inference is lacking there.

The hon. member.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, yes, it is my opinion that it is a complete about-face in regards to the positions

MR. MORGAN:

on policy that is now advocated by the Leader of the Opposition and the official Opposition, the Liberal Party Leader because when he was in government he advocated then -he did not advocate support for rural development, we all know his position on that - he advocated recentralization, or resettlement rather and centralization programmes. And he was also at the same time the minister responsible, the minister in a position to carry out policy, to develop policy on rural development but did not do it. But he now stands in favour of the rural development policies of this government.

He also of course now stands for getting a fair deal from the Upper Churchill. But was he not part of the government, the party that was then in power, that gave away the Churchill Falls power, the Upper Churchill that puts us now in such a very serious condition as a Province? We would be today a have Province if it was not for the fact that the power had been given away by that party which was then in power.

Mr. Speaker, he advocates a policy -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman either stated or implied that my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, Sir, was a member of the administration -

MR. MORGAN: The party, party.

MR. NEARY: No, was a member of the administration, Sir, or party, even a party, that was involved in the negotiations of the Upper Churchill. Sir, that is false. It is misleading. My hon. colleague was not, as the hon. Minister of Justice can bear witness, a member of that administration. But I do believe the Minister of Justice was a member. And I am calling upon the Minister of Justice to make it clear to this House that the hon. gentleman, who was a member of that administration, who I believe participated in the negotiations for the Upper Churchill, can verify that my colleague was not a member of that administration. I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw and apologize to my colleague.

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

I am in a position to deal with this matter. Actually, in my understanding there is no point of order involved. There are obviously differences of opinion with respect to fact. It is a question of fact; either the hon. member was or he was not a member of a certain administration at a certain time, or he was or he was not a member of a certain party at a certain time. But these are differences of fact or differences of opinion with respect to fact and these are not matters on which the Chair can make a ruling.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It seems that the silly points of order may be an intention to cut down my time which is limited to forty-five minutes. Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech clearly outlines the policies of this government and clearly outlines where this government intends to put this Province in the future, in a position that we will become a have Province in the not-too-distant future, primarily because it is a planned development. I recall back a

MR. MORGAN: plan developed. I recall back a few years ago, the Opposition members complaining bitterly and loudly about the studies we were doing in regards to resource development. They complained about all the studies we were doing, feasibility studies, etc., task force reports. That was the plan to first of all find out what should be done in the Province in a proper planned way; and now we see the policies as a result of these studies and plans that were formulated a few years ago.

The fisheries is clearly outlined in the Throne Speech, the positive aspects of our fisheries, yet the Leader of the Opposition keeps saying that the Throne Speech is barren; it is empty. Yesterday it was unbelievable to me, I sat here for an hour and a half and I watched the hon. Leader of the Opposition flailing his hands around the House of Assembly and kept on repeating "It is barren: it is empty. There is nothing in the Throne Speech: it is empty. There is nothing for the future of this Province. We are doomed to economic disaster." A quote - a quote "We are doomed to economic disaster". And the people of our Province, of course, were listening and saw and I said to myself "I sincerely hope that we will one day get the cameras in the House of Assembly to televise the proceedings, because if we have two or three more episodes like we saw yesterday, I think that the Liberal party will have difficulty in finding a few members in the House after the next election". Because he kept saying that "Look, the Opposition is not negative: it is not negative!" It is negative. If it is not negative, why are the people saying it throughout the Province "The Opposition is completely negative".

AN HON. MEMBER: Ed, we want Ed.

MR. MORGAN: They are saying, "We want Ed" around the Province. Editorials are saying that the Opposition are negative in their attitude towards the Province's prospects, the Province's economy. Everything is negative. Open-line

MR. MORGAN: moderators are saying it. Day after day they are saying it, and I am sure that some of the open-line moderators who are saying it are not partisan in our direction, are not known to be; they are known to be non-partisan. They are just out there doing their jobs as open-line moderators and they listen to the views of the people on their programs, what people are saying; people are saying the Opposition is completely negative. And yesterday the Leader of the Opposition clearly indicated that, because despite the fact that the Throne Speech points out all the plans that we have the fishery we are going to build a multi-purpose vessel to prosecute the seal fishery - that is negative? - completely negative. Everybody in Bonavista South says it is negative. Hello negative! The only person saying it is negative is the Opposition. We are going to establish additional ice-making capacity. We are going to establish better fish-handling facilities. We are going to increase the cold-storage facilities. We are going to develop new products, establish a new laboratory product or a new product laboratory. We are going on a major marketing initiative, which has been going on for the last year or so. These are all negative things according to the Opposition. He said 'All fisheries are not being developed in this Province. The government is not developing it: they have seven or eight ministers.' There was one outright untruth right there - seven or eight ministers. If I recall correctly we have Mr. Cheeseman, my hon. friend, the Minister of Health, the hon. Minister of Health, the hon. Mr. John Crosbie, now the M.P. for St. John's West, and the present minister: but the Opposition Leader said seven or eight; we have had seven or eight ministers who could not develop, who could not plan development of the fisheries. And the fisheries conference

MR. MORGAN was a partisan organization, and I hope my good friend, the Minister of Fisheries, is not going to listen to what I have to say because it is going to be controversial: because the hon. Leader of the Opposition yesterday afternoon stood in the House and said "The Minister of Fisheries used the conference

MR. MORGAN: for partisan reasons, for partisan reason, because it was filmed by a PR firm. Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, a certain Opposition member of the House of Assembly at that same conference, at that same conference, guess what he was doing? Guess what he was doing? Pressuring, not soliciting, but pressuring certain companies to give donations to the Liberal party at that same conference, and I can prove it, Mr. Speaker, and I can pass it on to my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, the names of the companies, names of people contacted and a certain Opposition member, spokesman for the fisheries, at the conference put the pressure on a certain company, at least one I can prove, to make donations to the Liberal party.

MR. F. ROWE: Point of order.

MR. MORGAN: At a government conference, at a government conference.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: The hon. the Minister has now named the person who he is accusing of putting pressure on presumably an executive officer of a firm at a fisheries seminar for the purpose of political contributions. Now, Mr. Speaker, I deny that emphatically, number one, and I ask the Minister to withdraw the remark if he cannot provide the witness or the proof.

MR. MORGAN: Point of order?

MR. F. ROWE: That is the point of order, Sir. It is an untruth and unless the Minister can prove it, bring witnesses before the House or an affidavit, I ask him to withdraw the remark.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to withdraw the remark, I am telling the truth: the facts and everything I said this afternoon is facts and the truth.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: I am not going to withdraw anything I said was the truth.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
This matters seems to - well, it does not seem to. it does centre around the allegation of the hon. gentleman to my left that some hon. member to my right solicited, he said pressured, pressured, solicited. requested, pressured, contributions to a political party at a certain meeting, at a meeting of the fisheries conference, at a certain conference. For a matter to be unparliamentary, it must impute false or unavowed motives or be a charge of a falsehood; abusive and insulting language is the most general term. The soliciting of political contributions is not to my - or pressuring - well, pressure - well, let me put it this way: the soliciting of political contributions is not against the law or against the Standing Orders of the House. Such a thing could be with a change in the law or a change in the Standing Orders, but it is not now, so there is no allegation of any wrongdoing in stating that. Whether that happened or not is a difference of opinion between members. If some member alleges it, another member denies it, it is not for the Chair to decide; it is a difference of opinion with respect to alleged facts. So there is not in a soliciting of political contributions, there is not an allegation of any wrongdoing. Now, an attempted extortion obviously is an allegation of wrongdoing. What pressuring is, on which side of the line that is, it certainly is not an allegation of extortion. It is more than an allegation of requesting; I suppose it is an allegation of requesting very strongly, very firmly, but as long as there is not an allegation of any wrongdoing, then I cannot rule it out of order.

In order to clarify the matter, I think the best way of clarifying the matter - there is no technical definition of 'to pressure' - in order to clarify

MR. SPEAKER: the matter, if the hon. member will make it clear that he was not making an allegation of anything of wrongdoing.

MR. NEARY: Or questioning the honour of my hon. friend.

MR. SPEAKER: WELL, of wrongdoing, then I think that will cover it. Because of the ambiguity of the term 'pressuring', I cannot come up with a technical definition of 'pressuring', so if the hon. gentleman will make that clear that will dispose of the matter.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I did not make any accusation of wrongdoing; I merely pointed out the activities of a certain member of the Opposition, in this case the spokesman on the fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN:

while attending a fisheries conference which was convened by the Minister of Fisheries and sponsored by the Newfoundland Government. I did not say it was wrong what he did. What I am saying is it is rather unique that on one side we have the Opposition Leader saying the Minister of Fisheries used the conference for partisan purposes, for partisan reasons by having the conference filmed by a PR firm. What I am saying is that the same people took advantage of the conference to use it for a different partisan reason, to raise funds for the Liberal Party, whether it is wrong or not is not my interpretation -

MR. S. NEARY:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that Your Honour let the hon. gentleman go on and repeat what the hon. gentleman had been saying for the last five minutes. Mr. Speaker, the statement just made by the hon. gentleman that my hon. colleague used the fishery conference for partisan political purposes to either solicit or to pressure anybody into donations for the party, that statement, Sir, is false, it is a lie, it is an untruth and it should be withdrawn. It is not true, Mr. Speaker, it is a lie. And I ask Your Honour to ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

There is no matter of privilege on which the Chair can make a decision. The hon. member when directed by the Chair to clarify or to state that he was not making an allegation of wrongdoing did so. What he is now doing is alleging that an hon. gentleman to my right for political motives did something at the conference. It is not a question of whether it is true or not. The Chair does not decide on that. It is a question of fact and a difference of opinion with respect to fact; either an hon. member requested somebody for political contribution or he did not request him for political contribution. The Chair is not in a position to make the decision one way or the other. It is totally a difference of opinion with respect

MR. SPEAKER: to fact and not a matter on which the Chair can take any further action. For example, it is not the first time we have heard allegations that something has been done for a political reason - this road paved or not paved for a political reason, or this water system installed or not installed for a political reason. So the allegation that an hon. member at the conference did something political is not a matter involving a privilege of the House or a matter on which the Chair can make a determination. There appears to be very clearly a difference of opinion with respect to alleged fact but those differences will have to be canvassed in debate but it is not a matter on which the Chair can make a ruling.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of personal privilege, Sir, at the risk of being repetitious, I would like to inform this House, Sir, that I did not approach a single person at the fisheries seminar for the purpose of soliciting -

MR. MORGAN: I can name him.

MR. F. ROWE: - party contribution of any kind whatsoever. I did not approach a person, Sir. It is an absolute falsehood, Sir, what the hon. minister is suggesting. It is a lie, Sir, it is not the truth and I would ask the minister, if he continues with this particular course of argumentation, that he provide the proof, the affidavits, anything that is necessary, but prove it. The hon. minister cannot stand in this House and tell a lie, Sir, and get away with it. He may be able to do it technically within Beauchesne or within the Standing Orders of this House, Sir, but I state emphatically for the sake of my own honour as an elected representative of the people that what the minister is saying is absolutely untrue, it is a lie, Sir. I ask him to withdraw.

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

May clearly points out that an hon. member may get the attention of the Chair on a point of privilege and then make a matter of personal explanation, which the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) has done. He has made a matter

MR. SPEAKER: of personal explanation presenting to the House his statement, so it is not a matter now on which any debate can be heard. The explanation has been made by the hon. gentleman for Trinity - Bay de Verde and it is not a matter which may be debated.

MR. MARSHALL: A point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Another point of personal privilege.

MR. MARSHALL: Not a personal privilege, privilege of the House. In the course of the statements made by the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde and the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) the words were clearly used, the statements that were made by the hon. minister were a lie. We are going to have it degenerate

MR. MARSHALL:

like other sessions, I would suggest that -

MR. NEARY: Well why do you not talk to your colleague.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these words cannot be allowed to remain on the record of the House without being withdraw by both hon. gentlemen and I would assume that both hon. gentlemen would wish to withdraw it in the interest of the proceedings of this House.

MR. NEARY: To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour knows, Sir, that that is vexatious. The hon. gentleman is just trying to irritate members of the House. In order to be unparliamentary, Sir, you would have to accuse the hon. gentleman of deliberately lying or misleading the House. There is no word 'deliberate' used. My hon. friend who professes to be such a parliamentary expert better take another look at Beauchesne before the hon. gentleman gets up and tries to make his colleague look sanctimonious and pious, Sir, when the hon. gentleman knows that the decorum of this House this session has been lowered by his colleague who in the very tone, the very nature of what he has been saying, Sir, the very tone of his voice has been trying to smear an hon. member of this House and attack his character. That, Your Honour, is precisely what the hon. gentleman has been trying to avoid, so he tells us, for the last several years and his colleague sitting to his right spoke about yesterday.

Now let it go out, Sir, loud and clear who is lowering the decorum of this House, who is using smear tactics, innuendo and trying to attack people's character. Let the hon. gentleman get up and condemn his colleague for such tactics in this House. Otherwise, Sir, if we continue along this vein, Sir, the decorum of this House is going to sink down, go down in the gutter. We will all have to get down in the mud and roll with the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The matter before the Chair now is that the allegation of hon. members to my right with respect to the hon. gentleman to my left, the allegation that he was lying should be withdrawn. The distinction

MR. SPEAKER:

was made with 'deliberate' or 'not deliberate' but that distinction, when it has been used, has been used with respect to misleading and deliberate misleading is obviously deceit. I think lying has as its very connotation that meaning. A lie has as its very connotation deceit.

It is not, I suppose, uncommon that two hon. members will have diametrically opposed views of what happened and one hon. member may state as strongly as he wishes what he states happened and another hon. gentleman on another side may state as aggressively as he wishes what he states to have happened. The Chair does not reconcile it. Two hon members may hold diametrically opposed views as to something alleged to have happened or not to have happened and that can continue as long as unparliamentary language attributed by one to the other is not used. So I must require hon. members to withdraw the allegation of 'lie'.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think the point has been made, I withdraw.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious situation, the charges that the minister made, and I withdraw the word 'lie' and simply say that what the minister said was a complete untruth, Sir. Nor do I believe it. I know it to be an untruth.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I assume I can continue.

MR. NEARY: Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I think that should dispose of the matter. Allow me to repeat: what I think is very important and what is perhaps not always evident, is that an hon. member (a) may state something and an hon. member (b) may state something entirely opposite and both have the complete right to make those statements as long as they are not allegations of something unparliamentary or something improper or something of that vein. They may hold totally opposed views and may argue those views back and forth but they may not attribute unworthy motives or deceit or hypocrisy or whatever, these unparliamentary terms. They may not attribute those to one another.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I assume I can continue after these many interruptions. Mr. Speaker, it seems that those people who attempt to create the image of the clean, white knights in this Province

MR. MORGAN: cannot take criticism when criticism is due. I say it is wrong to attempt to give the image to the people of this Province, to the people around the Province, of a clean, white-knight image of the Liberal party: they do not do any wrong, they have not done any wrong in the past and they cannot do any wrong now. My comment is that let those people who live in glass houses not throw stones, and I say again, Mr. Speaker, and it is my opinion that the Liberal party did use the conference for partisan purposes, the fisheries conference, and my colleague, the hon. Minister of Fisheries, used it for the benefit of all the public of this Province. It is a big difference, a big difference. The hon. gentleman would not dare call me a liar because I can pass the name of the company along to my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries. I will pass the name of the company along to the Minister of Fisheries: he can reconfirm the accusation I just made or the truths I just quoted in the House with the company concerned even along the lines -

MR. NEARY: What is the accusation?

MR. MORGAN: It is an accusation, Sir, that the Liberal members used the conference for partisan purposes, that is the accusation, to the point where indication of powers of persuasion were that along the lines of how much the donation should be to the Liberal party, along the lines of per amount, an amount per employee of the company. That is not innuendo; it is fact.

MR. NEARY: Point of privilege, Sir.

MR. MORGAN: The name of the company, Mr. Speaker, has been passed - if I can carry on.

MR. NEARY: Point of privilege as a member of this House, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of privilege.

MR. NEARY: I believe your Honour said in a previous ruling that where an accusation is made, an accusation or a charge, that the gentleman making that accusation would either have to produce the evidence or he would have to withdraw the statement. An accusation, your Honour specifically mentioned accusation. Now, your Honour, and if your Honour wants to send for the tape, your Honour will find out that the hon. gentleman, because I asked the question, Sir, of the hon. gentleman, the hon. gentleman said "I make the accusation", and that is unparliamentary, Sir, and I ask your Honour to ask the gentleman to withdraw.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, there was no accusation of any wrongdoing. If the House of Assembly wants to determine it was wrongdoing to use the powers of persuasion to solicit funds at a government conference - I do not know if it was or not, it was wrongdoing or not, but I know it happened; it occurred; it took place.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
I think the principle here is related to and perhaps identical with one on which a decision was made a little bit earlier. If there is an accusation or allegation of something wrong, of wrongdoing, by one member against another member, then it should be withdrawn. If there is an accusation or allegation of something which is not a wrongdoing and the other hon. member denies having done it, then it is a difference of opinion with respect to alleged facts, and there is no wrongdoing in what the hon. gentleman is accusing another hon. member of doing. It is not against the law of the Province, and it is not against the Standing Orders of the House; there is no allegation of extortion, or bribery, of any number of things. So there being no accusation of wrongdoing, the matter is a difference of opinion with respect to certain facts.

MR. NEARY: How can you make an accusation if it is not an accusation?

MR. SPEAKER:

I could accuse an hon. member of not sufficiently knowing Beauchesne or something. There can be an accusation of something apart from being an accusation of wrongdoing, but this is an improper precedent because we cannot enter into this kind of a discussion.

Hon. member.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, without going back to your ruling and the points made, I could accuse the hon. gentleman for not going to church last Sunday. Accusations and accusations. I did not say there was any wrongdoing involved, but what I said was facts and the facts will be passed on to my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, and he can investigate the facts that I give him, and then he could indicate, clearly indicate, that the statements made yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition that the conference was used for partisan purposes will be proven - it will be proven because it was used

MR. MORGAN:

by his own colleague for partisan purposes. So, Mr. Speaker, again it is in my view time that we on the government side clearly indicate to the people of this Province that the Liberal Party are not all white knights. I have sat in this House over the last session and listened to each and every day the smear tactics and the accusations and innuendos, scandals here and scandals there and charges of scandal here and scandal there and I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that it is time to retaliate and let us give a few facts about a certain few individuals.

MR. NEARY: We'll give us a few facts.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, when I am ready to give the facts I will table them in the House of Assembly and some hon. gentlemen will have white faces-or red faces. And if members of the Opposition think I am bluffing, before this session is over I will prove I am not bluffing because let us not be deceptive to the people of our Province. I am saying at this time the party that is aspiring to become the government is being deceptive, saying, "The P.C. Party is corrupt, but us over here are clean, white knights. We are the good boys in the family. We are the good boys in the Liberal family."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Sure. Sure, Mr. Speaker. But the time will be, another time, when the information and the documents that I have gathered over the last eleven months, with help from certain individuals across Canada, from Vancouver, B.C. to St. John's, Newfoundland, people who are with the R.C.M.P, the law enforcement agencies, people who are with the reporting agencies in different networks across the nation, the information I have will be gladly made known.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Justice is squirming over there.

MR. MORGAN: The Minister of Justice has got no reason to squirm over the things that I am saying.

MR. NEARY: And the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. MORGAN: The things I am saying are common knowledge to more than the MHA for Bonavista South. It is knowledge to a number of prominent Newfoundlanders. It has been relayed to them by this member

MR. MORGAN:

of the House of Assembly. And the kind of documents and evidence I have, if he wants the truth about certain things that have occurred in this Province since 1973-1974, will be made known, not saying it involves any of us here in the House, not saying at this time it does. When I make that charge, Mr. Speaker, I will prove it by tabling the evidence in the House of Assembly.

DR. KITCHEN: Why did CBC laugh at you?

MR. MORGAN: Now unfortunately, Mr. Speaker - Mr. Speaker, why condemn CBC? No one mentioned CBC.

DR. KITCHEN: They laughed at you.

MR. MORGAN: I did not mention CBC, Mr. Speaker.

DR. KITCHEN: They looked at what you had and laughed at you.

MR. NEARY: That is right, they looked at what you had and laughed at you.

MR. MORGAN: I did not mention CBC. Somebody has a guilty conscience over there. A guilty conscience. Why talk about CBC? Why talk about CBC? Is CBC involved? Involved in what? Investigative reporting of what and where and when? Tell us more! Tell us more! Do not say I am accusing the CBC. I did not make mention of CBC. The hon. gentleman mentioned the CBC. What about I do not know. What it involves, I do not know.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately because of the rude interruptions by many of the Opposition members my time is now almost up and I will again repeat that the people throughout this Province I am sure are aware, if not they are going to be aware, that the party that is aspiring to become the government of this Province is not what they are attempting to portray to the people of this Province, the image of being the clean, white knights who will wipe out all bad things and everything will be good. Because, Mr. Speaker, they cannot wipe out their past. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister said a lot but so little of substance which requires a response, an awful lot of stuff that I have never heard of, a lot of stuff that I know nothing about and, Mr. Speaker, the Minister made mention of the Opposition's comments respecting the emptiness and the barrenness of the Throne Speech. Well, Sir, a good case could be made for this point of view, though, a good case could be made for this position but, Sir, I think what really is at stake, from this particular Throne Speech as proven and substantiated by action taken on the basis of previous Throne Speeches by the government or more appropriately the question is not so much the actual content or the actual substance of the Throne Speech, but based on the lack of following through on promises and commitments made by the government through previous Throne Speeches. What is at stake, Sir, is the credibility of the government and that will be the main thrust of the few remarks that I will make today. I have read, Mr. Speaker, all of the previous Throne Speeches by this government and each speech is remarkably similar since the government's first Throne Speech in March of 1972, similar in terms of the government's faith and confidence in the ability of this province to become an economic and financial viable entity within the Canadian Federation and contingent, of course, upon the full development of our resources - human, natural, our forests, lands, waters, fisheries, minerals, our natural gas and petroleum reserves, tourism, in short all base resource industries to be developed by and for our people, thereby approaching the goal of maximum development and providing full employment for our people. Throne Speeches, Mr. Speaker, amazingly similar in respect to being cluttered and chock full of lofty ideas and concepts and promises to develop these resources, to provide for extensive future employment opportunities for our people.

MR. LUSH:

Previous Throne Speeches hauled out promise after promise for the development of the fisheries, development of our forestry and agriculture, the development of tourism and so on. But, Mr. Speaker, also previous Throne Speeches are similar in their expression of the confidence and faith which our people have in our province and similar in exposing a recognition of a growing optimism among our people, glowing words about the opportunities that lay ahead for our people. Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt the people's faith and confidence in this province, neither do I doubt their optimism because if our people lacked confidence and faith in their province, if they lacked optimism one thing is for certain, the government did not offer any consolation, offered no direction, no leadership and no guidance. Optimism, Sir, was self-developed, probably nature's way of building in some kind of mechanism as a protection or as some sort of a reaction against despair and frustration that was created by this government. And, Sir, they developed opportunities but they developed them themselves, in spite of the government. So, Mr. Speaker, it is not the province in which they lack faith and confidence, it is their government. So after all of these announcements and previous Throne Speeches about

MR. LUSH: the development of our resources, what is the action, Mr. Speaker? What are the results of all of the promises and commitments made in these Throne Speeches to develop our human resources; our natural resources, what is in the record? What is in the performance of this particular government, what criteria can we use to show the record of this government? Could we use as a criteria the number of fridges, new fridges, bought last year, the number of new homes, the number of new cars - is that the measure? - the number of new hair dryers and the number of dish washers that the Minister went on with the list yesterday that was read in the Throne Speech? Mr. Speaker, I think a good criteria by which to measure the performance of the government is with the unemployment statistics, that is a very good yardstick, that is a very good measure.

MR. SIMMONS: You did not mention that one, 'Alex'.

MR. LUSH: That was not mentioned, The unemployment statistics were not mentioned or the level of unemployment in the province. In October of 1972, I think probably five or six months after this government took over the administration of this province, the unemployment rate in this province, the seasonally adjusted was 10.1 percent, not certainly a desirable goal then, not a desirable goal, 10.1 percent. But in October of 1978 the unemployment rate was 16.8 percent, up just about seven percentage points in six years, seven percentage points, Mr. Speaker. In October of 1972 there were 16,000 people unemployed; today we are talking about 34,000 people unemployed, Now, Mr. Speaker, that is where the Throne Speech is at fault, that is where all the Throne Speeches have been at fault. Despite all of the promises, despite all of the commitments that were made to the people of this province, that is what the record shows today, 16.8 percent of our Newfoundlander's and Labradorians unemployed and we will have more to say about that, Mr. Speaker, in the days that lie ahead. Hopefully we do not get on to the kind of debate

MR. LUSH:

that the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Morgan) introduced here today, that we will get an opportunity to talk about the unemployment problem in this province; and not to talk about the problem but to talk about the solution, that is what is important, that is what our people want, they know the problem - they want the solution. And just a further statistic, Mr. Speaker; 1978 - in our labor force it was made up in the ages between fifteen and twenty-four, they made up 67,000 of our labor force, just about fifty percent of it. In the age from fifteen to twenty-four there were 67,000 people making up just about half of the labor force. Mr. Speaker, out of that 67,000, young people between the ages of fifteen to twenty-four, the rate of unemployment was 22.4 percent, 22.4 percent of the people between the ages of fifteen and twenty-four, unemployed, 15,000 of them, 15,000 out of 67,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the record of all the material and all of the grandiose ideas and grandiose concepts that were contained in previous Throne Speeches. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition is looking negatively at this particular Throne Speech. As I have said, it is not so much that it is barren, it is not so much that it is empty; it is the lack of performance of this government of following through on previous Throne Speeches. Why should we expect that they are going to follow through on this one, Mr. Speaker? Why should we expect that they are going to do any better on this particular Throne Speech than they did on previous Throne Speeches? Throne Speeches filled with lofty ideas, lofty concepts which were never developed, promises of development which were never fulfilled,

MR. LUSH: never materialized. So, Mr. Speaker, that is what is wrong with the Throne Speech. Our people have lost faith and confidence in this government, they have lost all trust. But it was not always that way, Mr. Speaker. I remember when this government came into power in 1972, even I, a devout Liberal, welcomed the change and hoped that this government would come in and make a fresh start to revitalize the economy again, to do certain things that they said they were going to do and I looked forward to it. Remember that first Throne Speech? I thought that we were in for a real great time, a time of prosperous government, a time of prosperity, honesty and integrity once again was going to be restored, not that I thought it was gone, mind you, I never thought it was gone but they almost made me believe it was. I did not believe it was but I thought they could do - it was time for a change. They came in with a clean sheet and, Mr. Speaker, they ran off the tracks as quickly as Bobby Hull can put a puck in a soccer net - ran off the tracks so quickly, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, when they came to power the people of this province had great expectations and they had great confidence and great faith in this government but because they did not measure up to the kinds of promises, the kinds of commitments they made in various Throne Speeches that they lost the favor of the people -

MR. NEARY: They did not put their money where their mouth was.

MR. LUSH: - faith and confidence were eroded for several reasons, Mr. Speaker, one, as I have said, was the not following through on the promises and commitments made in previous Throne Speeches and that is why we are so leery and that is why we are so negative about this present Throne Speech. Another reason, Mr. Speaker, why our people have lost their faith and confidence in this government is because of the mismanagement and squandering of public funds, unparalleled graft and corruption. But, Mr. Speaker, we have said enough about that and I will move on to my third point of why the people have lost their faith and

MR. LUSH: confidence and why the government lacks credibility through the establishment of the bureaucracy which alienated the people from the government. We all remember, Mr. Speaker, that this government was the government that was going to take itself to the people, they were going to take the government to the people and get ideas here and get ideas there, and now, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for the people even to get to the government, let alone the other way around. But this was the government that was going to to bring back democracy, they were going to get their ideas from the people. Sir, they have established one level of bureaucracy on top of another and now it is very difficult for anybody in this province to see a Minister, very, very difficult for anyone to see a Minister and to get them to go to your district, that is unthinkable. The levels of bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker, the Action Committee that we talked about so much, the great Action Committee - another level of bureaucracy. The Advisory Committee that the Premier just recently set up: I imagine that is a good Committee the Advisory Committee -

MR. NEARY: There are your ordinary people.

MR. LUSH: There are your ordinary people. Five is it? Five, six business tycoons in the province?

AN HON. MEMBER: More than that.

MR. LUSH: Five members. Now here is another chance that the Premier had, a great opportunity to do something for the province, to really let the people know, to really make the people feel

MR. T. LUSH: that he was involving the people of this Province. He could have set up a Committee that was representative truly of the people of the Province. But what is it representative of, Mr. Speaker? One segment, the business segment of Newfoundland that is the only thing which it represents, the business interests, the only thing. It does not represent Labour, nobody there from Labour, nobody there from Education, only one segment. But here is another committee I expect that is going to go the way of all the other committees or the several committees that were set up by this particular government.

MR. SIMMONS: The task force has played an exercise in the market.

MR. T. LUSH: They lost the confidence of our people, Mr. Speaker, because they failed to develop the natural resources of this Province as they said they would do.

AN HON. MEMBER: From that vantage point, yes.

MR. T. LUSH: Let us look at forestry, Mr. Speaker, Does anyone in this hon. House say that our forest industry is developed to its maximum potential, that we are anywhere close to it? What we have now, Mr. Speaker, is vast acreage of our forests infested and that did not happen overnight.

DR. KITCHEN: It came in with the Tories.

MR. T. LUSH: It seems as though they were a long time recognizing it and a longer time to take any action.

MR. SIMMONS: A political budworm.

The budworm is a raging Tory.

MR. T. LUSH: Political budworm. Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, it is only at our urging the incessant urging, the incessive pleas made by the Opposition by those of us over here that it looks like they have now adopted or say they are going to adopt a policy of self sufficiency in agriculture. Now, Sir, it is time they did that. I come from the largest farming area in the

MR. T. LUSH: Province, the Terra Nova district, and the largest farming area in the Province, the largest.

MRS. McISAAC: I question that.

MR. T. LUSH: Well, I am going by an answer that minister produced me in the last session in response to questions I asked, three pertinent questions as to which area in the Province had the most acreage under cultivation, which was producing the most products and which got the most money, and to these three questions it was the Terra Nova district. We lost on one account, with cabbage, we lost on that one. That one was somewhere on the West Coast, maybe the hon. member's district; we lost on cabbage.

MRS. McISAAC: What do you want, cabbage heads?

MR. T. LUSH: We lost slightly on cabbage heads.

MR. SIMMONS: Hold on now. I think we can set up a little marketing board here.

MR. T. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, the success of the agriculture, of the agricultural activity in the Terra Nova district is not a result of this government's encouragement or this government's support; it is in spite of the government's encouragement. Musgrave-town - Lethbridge, two of the largest farming areas in the Province sixteen miles off the Trans-Canada, and they have been asking for years to get the road paved down there -

MR. S. NEARY: That is right!

MR. T. LUSH: - to help get their produce to the markets more cheaply so that people can get in to see the farms and to buy. Never, ever can get any response. That is what they have done to help the farming down there, allowing the farmers to truck their produce over the worst kind of gravel roads, Mr. Speaker. Also the same thing applies with the forestry, a lot of logging going down in that district and in certain times of the year, Mr. Speaker, with the half-load limits are imposed it costs double to get the logs out of that area because they can only take a half load naturally so they have to make double the trips. We have made all of these points to the government about the need for improving the road transportation

MR. T. LUSH: system there, not as a matter of convenience but as a means to help the district to develop to its potential to develop the logging, and to develop the agricultural potential of the area with no recognition at this point, Mr. Speaker, no recognition. And Mr. Speaker, there should not be any difficulty in the government encouraging and supporting agriculture in this Province with all of the experts that are in the department as a matter of fact one farmer recently made the comment to me he thought there were more experts in the Department of Agriculture than there were farmers in the Province. And Mr. Speaker, with all of these people out there in their regional offices there should be all

MR. LUSH:

kinds of help made available to the farmers. Let me tell you in talking to the farmers in my area very infrequently do they get a visit from the agricultural reps out there.

The Speech from the Throne also, of course, in talking about the development of our natural resources, also talks about the regional offices set up from the Department of Forestry. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know - I am not objecting to the regional offices; it is a good idea but they cannot do anything, can they? Can they do anything? What can they do? I took a person who lives in St. Brendan's to St. John's to get a permit to cut. We found out that we had to go to Gambo. We went to Gambo only to find out that the application had to be mailed back to St. John's. Now, Mr. Speaker, that certainly shows the value of the regional offices. They cannot issue permits. They cannot issue licenses. On both accounts we left St. John's, went to the regional office in Gambo, because the St. Brendan's, the community of St. Brendan's, its forestry falls under the jurisdiction of the Gambo regional office. So a trip to St. John's, find out we had to go to Gambo only to find out that the application had to be processed back here in St. John's. Now, Sir, that is another level of bureaucracy. That is another thing that has been set up to bring the people closer to the government.

Another example, Mr. Speaker, another reason why the people have lost their faith and confidence in this government is because of the failure to develop the Lower Churchill. Mr. Speaker, all of these things that I am talking about, they have been mentioned in Throne Speech after Throne Speech - the fisheries, our natural resources, the forestry, agriculture and the Lower Churchill. Well now we have the corporation set up but how far are we away from getting power? That is the point, Mr. Speaker. How far are we away from getting power? There is no way that our people are going to believe that we are any closer today than we were two months ago. That is what is at stake, Mr. Speaker. It is not the substance of the Throne Speeches but the credibility. When, how soon are they going to follow through

MR. LUSH:

on all these concepts?

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the reasons why the people of this Province have lost faith and confidence in the government. These are some of the reasons. Mr. Speaker, the only little bit of optimism that I find in our people is that offered by our democratic system of government. That is that very soon there is going to be an election and that therein lies the only bit of optimism that I sense among our people. They are longing for that election to come. They cannot wait.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the minister who spoke just a few moments ago is so receptive to what he hears and reads, the news editorials and the little bits of information he gets in this community and that community, certainly curtains are down for this government. If it is anything close to what I am hearing, they were down a long time ago. So that is the only bit of optimism, Mr. Speaker, that I sense among our people, that there is going to be an election soon so that they can get rid of this lackluster, unproductive nonproductive, unperforming, nonperforming and uninspiring government. This is what our people are looking forward to. This is the optimism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: That is the optimism that is abroad in this Province. Well, Mr. Speaker, what was in this particular document, the document of 1978, what was in this? Very likely as mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, probably the last Throne Speech. So now after their complete failure to measure up to previous Throne Speeches and because of all the mismanagement and squandering of public funds they are trying to make amends. Well, Mr. Speaker, if this is the document in which they propose to make amends, I think this government is in trouble.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. LUSH: Yes, that is for sure. This government is certainly in trouble if this is the document that they think is going to make amends for them.

MR. LUSH

If this is the document they think is going to take them off the ropes, Mr. Speaker, they are going to have. I think to produce a lot more documents.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before that it is not so much the content as the credibility and it was one of the things that I would like to refer to is the things that they did not mention, that was not mentioned in this particular document yesterday. I have already made reference to the fact that there was no reference made to employment, unemployment, the high level of unemployment in this Province, and no reference to what the government planned to do about it, no reference to that at all. No reference to what they plan to do about the minimum wage, Mr. Speaker, no reference to that, but what there was reference to is something that this government has been known to do ever since 1972 and that is the reference to the long-term planning, Mr. Speaker, the long-term planning. Now, nobody, nobody disputes the merit of long-term planning, but how long does this government think they have? How long do they think they have? How long do they think the people in Clarendville are going to wait for their hospital? I noticed in this document yesterday that they are going to enunciate a plan of long-term hospital construction. I suppose Clarendville will know eventually when they are going to get it. Maybe it will be at the end of the fisheries policy program in 1985. Maybe it will be in 1983 at the end of another five-year forestry program. Mr. Speaker, all I hear are seven-year plans, ten-year plans, five-year plans. I wonder sometimes where I am living when I hear of those five-year plans. I wonder if I am not in the wrong country - five-year plans,

MR. LUSE: seven-year plans, ten-years plans.

Well Mr. Speaker, I think this government would be well advised: long-term planning is good, but if this government hope to change their image, if they hope for the people to change their attitude about them, they had better think about some short-term planning, because they do not have too much longer to wait.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Well, Mr. Speaker, on what are they going to rest their hopes now? Over all of these years of non-performance, non-productivity, on what are they going to rest their hopes now? Well, they are going to re-open the two projects that they closed down, two projects that the Liberals opened up and two projects that are not looking too bad now today, two projects that were condemned outrightly and now they are going to open them up and close them down. Well, if that move should be successful it is going to be bad for governments in this Province, because all we have to do, all they have to do is close down industries and six or seven months before the election open them up again, and close them down again and hope that the people are going to go along with that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are they going - I expect, I expect, Mr. Speaker, when they open these two projects, when they open the Linerboard and the oil refinery, they will be just about at the point where they were before they closed them down and just about at the point - they have not even maintained the status quo. I do not know if it is illogical to say that you can catch up with the status quo or not, but, Sir, if it is logical to say it, that is what they are going to do by opening the Linerboard and the oil refinery they are going to catch up with the

MR. LUSH: status quo. Sir, that is the accomplishment, catching up with the status quo. That is what would have happened, and then, Mr. Speaker, then, Mr. Speaker, they expect us to come in and to applaud - they expect us to come in to applaud and to praise this document, this Speech from the Throne. They expect us to applaud it and praise it, not to be negative about it. Mr. Speaker, how in heaven's name can you be positive about a government with such a poor track record? How can you be positive?

Mr. Speaker, such a sameness, such a similarity about all of these Throne Speeches - the big fisheries plan,

MR. LUSH: offshore oil and gas-and nobody on this side ridicules these developments, we are praying that they will come forward, we are praying that they are going to get off the ground, Lower Churchill power, we are all hoping for these.

Education; we are longing for improvement there, we are glad to know that we are going to get grade twelve, again an idea that was announced by this party three and four years ago. The hon. member from St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) almost had it but for a little -

AN HON. MEMBER: Six years ago.

MR. LUSH: Six years ago, yes. Now, Mr. Speaker, they expect us to get up and laud - the Minister said yesterday: "You did not say anything about Newfoundland history, Newfoundland geography, Newfoundland literature in the schools," What a lot of unmitigated nonsense, Mr. Speaker, unmitigated twaddle. Newfoundland literature in their schools - now what is new about that? I have been teaching for sixteen years, I have been teaching Newfoundland literature, I have been teaching Newfoundland geography, I have been teaching Newfoundland history - indeed the curriculum never prevented me from teaching all the Newfoundlandia I wanted to teach.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Here, here.

MR. LUSH: Let me tell you what is needed, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what is needed. It is not so much the introduction of Newfoundland literature, Newfoundland geography, Newfoundland history. It is a replacement of the Newfoundlandia that is now in the schools but at different grade levels, that is what is necessary, put Newfoundland history at a grade where it can be understood, put Newfoundland literature in a grade where it can be understood, put Newfoundland geography in a grade where it can be understood. That is what is needed, Mr. Speaker, is putting this Newfoundlandia, we have

MR. LUSH: got lots of it around us, putting it in different grade levels. But the government tried to get a few kudos, said: "We are bringing in Newfoundland literature, Newfoundland history, Newfoundland geography," as if this were a new and a revolutionary idea. So old, Mr. Speaker, good teachers have been doing it for years and years, and we are glad that the curriculum allows us that freedom to do it, that flexibility. But, Mr. Speaker, I am doubtful if the government do not give any more money to Education than they have been giving we are not going to get this Newfoundlandia, where are they going to buy it?

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Mines is choking on the (Inaudible)

MR. LUSH: Oh, well. So, Mr. Speaker, these things, we do not disagree with them, we do not disagree with the opening up of the Linerboard and oil refinery at Come By Chance; we want to see them happen, we want to see them happen quickly, Mr. Speaker. But now, Mr. Speaker, as I said there was no reference in the Throne Speech about the minimum wage - but let me speak about the references first because the Throne Speech talking about the great progress talks about the increase in the per capita income, talks about the increase in the number of fridges and all of this sort of thing. Now if we are going to take credit for the sunshine we may as well take credit for the rain as well. Are we going to take credit for the high unemployment rate in this province? Are we going to take credit for the large number of families in this province that are beneath the low level income or the poverty line? - 16.7 percent of our families receiving salaries below the low income level or the poverty line, 16.7 percent? Unattached families, individuals not married, I suppose - the statistics call them unattached individuals - 52.1 percent of these people receiving incomes below the low income level. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to take credit for the increase in the per capita income, if we are going to take credit for the roads paved, if we are going to take credit for the

MR. LUSH: new houses built, if we are going to take credit for the number of new cars bought and the new refrigerators bought, certainly goodness this government must assume the responsibility for the high level of unemployment in this province and the number of families and unattached individuals that are living on salaries below the poverty line. That is the

MR. LUSH:

facts, Mr. Speaker. That is performance, 16.8 per cent unemployed, 52.1 per cent of our unattached individuals living on salaries below the poverty line and 16.7 per cent of our families living on salaries below the poverty line.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of - if we take credit for the things that were mentioned in the Throne Speech yesterday let us also take credit for these not so favourable aspects of the economy. Now, Mr. Speaker, there was no reference yesterday in the Throne Speech to recreation for our youth. I remember the great plans for recreation for our youth in the first document, great plans. What is it now, all done? Have we got the recreation taken care of in the Province? Everybody got the facilities they want? If they have them, Mr. Speaker, they are not in the Terra Nova district.

AN HON. MEMBER: You got your golf course.

MR. LUSH: Oh we will get a golf course soon but no thanks to hon. members opposite. We are going to get the golf course. Did somebody give me a note?

MR. NEARY: No, you are all right.

MR. LUSH: Oh, okay. Just wondering, Mr. Speaker, what the policy is now with respect to providing recreation for our young people, people in rural Newfoundland that this government say that they are do concerned about, rural Newfoundland. No soccer pitch in Terra Nova. No baseball diamond in Terra Nova.

MR. NEARY: No Aquarena in Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: No stadium in Wesleyville yet, either, although the government promised that. No stadium in Wesleyville. Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering what the government's policy is now with respect to recreation for our youth. Nothing said about it.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at three of the clock and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved that this House adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 P.M. Those in favour "Aye". Those contrary "Nay". Carried.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday at 3:00 P.M.