

Indexed by (Sg. MacKennaiz)

H. Martin - Hon Speech (cont'd.)

EM Roberts - re Deputy Spk. page 385
" " re Hon. M. (unemployment p. 391)



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 5

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! The Hon. the Minister of Health.

HON. DR. A. T. ROWE (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent questions asked to me by the members of the Honourable House I think that it is time for me to make a further statement on the present diphtheria problem.

To date, in the Marystown Town Area, three persons have been admitted to hospital for treatment of diphtheria. As the result of follow up work ten persons in the district have been found to be carries of the diphtheria germs. These persons have received the necessary treatment with antibiotics and toxoid and are being kept under observation.

In the Marystown, Burin District, a Department of Health team of nurses, in co-operation with the doctors and nurses in Marystown and at the Burin Cottage Hospital, have carried out toxoid programmes to protect the population. The team will be returning during the week of February 18 to provide booster doses. This programme will be publicized locally at the appropriate time.

During the last week of January two school age children from Happy Valley Labrador were admitted to the General Hospital with complications which were clinically considered as possibly the result of suspected diphtheritic sore throats. Contrary to the previous statement by me in this House, two days ago the follow up of these cases has now today discovered and confirmed the carrier of the diphtheria germ among contacts. This person is under treatment and observation. Since admission to the Janeway Hospital of these two suspects, one of whom is returning home this week, recovered and the other is improving steadily, public health nurses in Happy Valley have added precautions insuring that all school children in the Happy Valley Area have had an adequate course of immunization.

The immunization status of school children in the area is considered to be good. The Department of Health emphasizes that

the control of diphtheria in the province depends upon adequate immunization of the preschool and school children. Surveys over several years have shown that twenty-five per cent to thirty per cent of children are not brought forward for routine immunization. It is essential that all parents ensure that their children receive these regular course of needles starting at three months of age and that they sign a permission slip to have them immunized in school.

The chief medical health officer will be visiting Happy Valley immediately to review the immunization programme and to institute any follow up and control measures that may be required, with the physicians and members of the International Grenfell Association. The Department of Health again emphasises the need for concentration upon adequate immunization of the child population. Children are the reservoir of the disease and there is need to ensure that contact cases are followed up and given the necessary examination and treatment.

I shall at once advise the House if any further areas of the province have become, will become or that become involved. The public can be assured that the government will place all its resources at the disposal of any area where assistance may be needed.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to welcome to the galleries today the Mayor of Grand Falls, Mayor Charlie Edwards; the Town Clerk, Mr. Clarence Randell, and the Town Engineer, Mr. W. Maloney. We welcome you here indeed and trust that your visit is most interesting.

Before we proceed with petitions I would just like to refer back to the amendment as made by the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition immediately prior to the closing of yesterday's session. I have looked at the amendment and found it to be basically in order although there is one phrase which may be a little bit controversial or argumentative. I would urge honourable members in the future in making amendments or motions that you would be a little more careful in the wording of same, otherwise it just might be ruled completely out of order.

I have accepted the amendments, given by the Leader of the Opposition, as such.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, if I might, yesterday you also took notice of another motion which I made a notice which I gave at the point of giving notices of motions and you took it under advisement. The notice does not appear on the Order Paper. I am wondering if Your Honour has had an opportunity to consider the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: No, I have not as yet. I hope to do so and maybe rule on it, hopefully this afternoon.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

HON. L. D. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): I would like to table the Annual Report of The Power Commission for 1973. There are copies available for the honourable members of the House. I would also like to

file the position papers of the Province of Newfoundland on the recent National Energy Conference. Again, there are copies available for all members of the House and maybe it will clear up some of the obvious misunderstandings that the honourable members on the other side seem to labour under.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Minister of Health.

HON. DR. A. T. ROWE (Minister of Health): I would like to table the following reports and regulations. First of all, the annual report of the Newfoundland Medicare Commission which was distributed to all members of the House approximately one month ago - Hospital Insurance Regulations; Department of Health Swimming Pools Regulations; ^(c) Food and Drug Amendment Regulations; ^(c) Medical Care Insurance Beneficiaries and Enquiries Regulations; ^(c) Medical Care Insurance Insured Services Regulations; ^(c) Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance Physicians and Fees Amendments; ^(h) By-Laws Governing the Practice of Dental Hygiene.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member from St. Barbe North.

MR. FRED ROWE (St. Barbe North): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will, on tomorrow, give the following resolution. Whereas, financial assistance to students of the College of Trades and Technology, the vocational schools, the College of Fisheries and Memorial University of Newfoundland varies from one institution to another and whereas, this inconsistency results in an inequality of educational opportunity with respect to a student's choice of where to study.

Now therefore, be it resolved that this House direct the government to establish immediately a commission of enquiry to examine and inquire into all aspects of financial assistance to students of all post-secondary educational institutions and that such a commission of enquiry be directed to report back to the government without undue delay with their findings and make recommendations to equalize financial assistance to all students of all post-secondary educational institutions.

X
MR. SPEAKER: I shall accept the resolution under advisement and rule on it later.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island:

Y
MR NEARY: Mr . Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Energy: Would the minister inform the House if he has yet completed his research on accumulated rentals from the rental of houses on Bell Island that are being held in trust to be distributed to the people of Bell Island, as he promised to do in the last session of the House of Assembly?

HON. L. D. BARRY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the honourable member. I have the answer to his question prepared and it was filed for the opening of the House and I omitted to bring it today but I will have it for tomorrow's session.

X
MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for the same minister: Would the minister inform the House as to who was paying for the feasibility study that is being done on the Bell Island mines to determine whether the mines is suitable for storage of crude oil?

MR. BARRY: At the request of the Provincial Government we have managed to persuade the Federal Government in Ottawa to bear the cost of this study. Originally they wanted to study only a portion of the mine that would be adequate to meet what they saw as the needs of the area but again we have managed to persuade them to do a feasibility study of the entire capability of the mine.

Y
MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister inform the House what the provincial participation will be in this study?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the provincial participation will be very heavy involvement by a number officials of the Department of Mines and Energy who have specific information concerning the dimensions of the mine, the type of problems that could be experienced in the mine and we have several people working in close liaison with the consultants

at all times, in carrying out the study, and they are making a very great contribution to the study.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Would these people to whom the minister just referred, would they already be on the minister's payroll, just the normal staff of the department?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, that is correct, just the normal staff of the department.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Would the minister then inform the House what this study will cost the Government of Canada?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, in actual cash, I am sorry I do not recall the actual figure. I would just be guessing at it but I can supply the estimate

that has been provided.

MR. NEARY: Would the amount be \$36,000? Would the minister think?

Paid by the Government of Canada.

DR. FARRELL: That sounds close.

MR. NEARY: According to Mr. MacDonald, the Minister of Mines and Energy, that is what it is.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why did the honourable member ask it then?

MR. A.J.MURPHY: There you go!

HON. E.M.ROBERTS (Leader of the Opposition): "Doody" misinformed the House last week.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to clear that...

MR. MURPHY: An official of the government! The gall of that! "Doody."

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would now like to direct a question, if I may, to the Minister of Agriculture. I would like to ask the minister if he has received a petition from residents of Portugal Cove, requesting that an inventory be done immediately on all agricultural and non-agricultural land in the Portugal Cove Area, so that residents in Portugal Cove may be able to exercise their ordinary rights as property owners in that area?

HON. E.MAYNARD (Minister of Agriculture and Forests): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did receive a petition from these people in Portugal Cove and as a matter of fact I had a lengthy meeting with the delegation from Portugal Cove last night.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Would the minister give the House some idea of when this inventory will commence?

MR. MAYNARD: We advised the committee from Portugal Cove, Mr. Speaker, that the inventory will take place as soon as the snow goes off the ground and we are able to take the necessary soil samples that are necessary to carry out the survey.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see the honourable Premier is back in his seat. I would like to direct a question to the honourable the Premier. Could the Premier give the House, Mr. Speaker, some details of the \$8,000 that are shown in the public accounts under the

heading; official functions re-introduction of fiscal agents, \$8,000.

Would the Premier give the House some details on this expenditure?

HON. F.D. MOORES (Premier): I will take it as notice, Mr. Speaker, and try to have the information tomorrow.

HON. J.C. CROSBIE: The honourable member wants to know what the money was spent for, is that the idea?

MR. NEARY: That is right. I want dates and vouchers.

MR. CROSBIE: If the honourable gentleman wants dates and vouchers he can put a question on the Order Paper. If he wants to know what the money was spent for, that money was spent in connection with visits by the Premier and other cabinet ministers to the financial capitals of Canada, Montreal and Toronto approximately a year ago when several very successful functions were held, when various members of the investment and financial community listened to addresses delivered by the honourable the Premier and yours truly.

In all modesty, I can say that as a result thereof, the province was enabled to borrow considerable funds for the last two years in Canada and the United States. That was the purpose of the trip and it accomplished a great deal for this province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, another question for the honourable the Premier. I am sure he will be able to answer this one, Sir. Could the Premier tell us what the \$2,832, under the heading; official entertainment by the Premier, what that is all about? Could he give us some details on that? It is in the public accounts report.

MR. MOORES (Premier): Take notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: What was that? I did not get the answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOORES: Take notice. Put it on the Order Paper. Do not be so stupid!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it must have been quite a booze party. The Premier does not even remember what it was about.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: A blackout.

4
MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the honourable Premier tell us then, what the \$1,383, listed in the Department of Finance Public Accounts, was for, under the heading of press receptions?

4
MR. SPEAKER: Order please! It appears to me that some honourable members are perhaps abusing a little bit the oral question period. I am sure honourable members read Beauchesne and the Standing Orders. The only oral questions which basically are permitted are those which require an immediate and urgent answer. Others should be placed on the Order Paper. This has gone on for the past two or three days and I think it is time that honourable members began putting questions on the Order Paper which do not require an immediate answer.

MR. NEARY: Could I direct a question then to the Minister of Health and ask him why \$241.00 is showing under the Premier's Office?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order! Order!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members have not even heard the question yet.

AN HON. MEMBER: A spiteful question.

MR. NEARY: Well all right, Mr. Speaker, I will direct a question to the Minister of Social Services seeing as he is so cocky over there. Would the minister tell us how many prosecutions have resulted from the hard line taken by his department against - Mr. Speaker, this question is in order - how many prosecutions, Sir, have been taken as a result of the hard line of his department against people who are sick and unemployed through no fault of their own? That is an urgent question, Mr. Speaker. I want to know how many prosecutions have been taken so far.

HON. ANTHONY J. MURPHY (MINISTER OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE): Mr. Speaker, just in reply I want to say this: If the honourable member would put this on paper to me and tell me the hard line that was taken against the sick and the dying and the perishing and the starving and the naked, I would be only too happy to find out and have it investigated.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the gentleman, as I must call him, from St. John's Centre -

MR. MURPHY: I am proud of it.

MR. ROBERTS: He may be proud of it but I am not. Could the gentleman from St. John's Centre, Sir, tell us when he will give the answer to the question I asked him on Tuesday, which he took as notice, quite properly? Could he indicate when we may have an answer to that, please?

MR. MURPHY: I have yet to receive that question as a proper notice on paper. As soon as I get it, I will.

MR. ROBERTS: Well then, Your Honour, may I raise a point of order, Sir? Let us have this settled for once and for all. When an oral question is asked, a minister of course is under no obligation to answer it. When a minister takes a question as notice, is further action required by the member asking the question? I understood and the parliamentary practice in Ottawa is well established, I submit, when a question is asked in Ottawa and a minister takes it as notice and I understand the Ottawa practice is well established, no further action is then taken by the member. The minister takes it as notice

and in due course he prepares the answer and presents it. Would Your Honour please direct us as to whether when a minister stands up - for example, the Premier took a couple of questions as notice. He could not be expected to have the information on the tip of his tongue. Nobody would expect him to. Are we then required or expected - is Your Honour listening to me or would that partisan gentleman from Port au Port -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You have no respect for him.

MR. ROBERTS: I have no respect for him, of course not. He does not deserve any.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Would Your Honour please give us some direction? Are we expected to follow up? If the minister takes as notice are we expected to submit the question in writing or is his standing in the House and saying publicly "I take it as notice", does that mean what he says, that he is taking it as notice, that he will get the answer and supply it in due course? That is the Ottawa practice, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: It is the Chair's understanding that if an honourable minister takes a question as notice that further action on the part of the honourable member is not needed. Of course the minister still has the right not to answer that question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do I have the understanding that it would be in order for me to give the honourable Premier notice of questions that I want to have the information on tomorrow? Would that be in order, Sir?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is different.

MR. NEARY: Okay. Well, I only have one other question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct it to the honourable the Premier. Would the honourable Premier inform the House if the government are still open for suggestions on a new provincial flag or have they already taken a decision that the Newfoundland flag, the provincial flag has already been decided on and that the government is not open for

suggestions?

MR. MOORES: As I understand, Mr. Speaker, before anything is done regarding the flag design, it has to be approved by this House.

At that time I am sure any amendment, other than the picture of the member for Bell Island being in the center, would be acceptable.

MR. NEARY: Maybe a glass, with an arm holding it in the right hand corner, would be in order too, Sir. I could suggest a few other things to put into the left hand corner too.

Mr. Speaker, would the page then take these two designs that I received in the mail today across to the Premier so that they may consider these when they are revising the provincial flag?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I might ask the Minister of Health a question arising out of his statement at the opening, his ministerial statement. I understood him to say that they, his officials, have now isolated ten suspected or actual carriers in the Marystown, Burin area. A few days ago the report he had was, I believe, five - although I am speaking from memory. Now obviously, Sir, this is a matter of the utmost importance because if there are further unsuspected carriers, then we could have further possible diphtheria cases. Could the minister tell us please, Mr. Speaker, what steps are being taken, whether further steps are contemplated and when will he be, indeed is he now in a position to say that - as far as man knows, one cannot be absolute but that all reasonable steps have been taken and we are reasonably certain that we have located all of the carriers of this disease, this germ.

We can never be certain that we have identified or established all the carriers. We are doing everything humanly possible to swab and culture swabs from the throats of all people who are contacts or all people showing any symptoms. This has been done on the Burin Peninsula. I think that today's result was the final report, at the present time, from that area. All the contacts that the Department of Health team can find or the local doctors or nurses can find have been swabbed and the necessary cultures done. It takes some four to five days to grow the organisms for the various grades of media. I will assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that everything that is possible is being done. Dr. Severs is giving his complete work to this problem at the present time.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. In view of the fact that the Whelan Royal Commission Report is not expected to be completed until about May 1, 1974, can the minister inform the House of the status of the applications for the establishment of local improvement districts and the establishment of municipal councils?

HON. H. R. V. EARLE (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not think that that is of immediate urgency. If the honourable member would have it placed on the Order Paper, I will get him a detailed answer.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: What I am trying to get at is whether there is a freeze on the establishment of these councils because I am getting quite a few inquiries about the status of the application. I think it is a matter above urgency.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I did not understand that to be another question but merely a statement on the question.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Is there a freeze?

MR. EARLE: Is there a freeze? No, there is no freeze, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is chilly out. It is very chilly.

MR. H. W. C. GILLETTE: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Rural Development? Would the minister tell the House whether or not it is definite that he is planning to hold or will hold an informational seminar in Gander on Saturday coming? If so, has the committee of the Twillingate Area been notified and invited to attend?

HON. J. REID (Minister of Rural Development): Mr. Speaker, I am not too sure but I certainly will find out. To the best of my knowledge, I felt that everyone was notified.

MR. W. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. As a result of the survey recently taken in Goose Bay on some thirty vacant apartments that surplus M.O.T.'s requirements, I was wondering what action has been taken and if those apartments will be rented to tenants who are now urgently needing housing in that area?

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I think I understand the honourable member's question. He is probably referring to thirty apartments which were turned down by the Department of Transport as being unsuitable for habitation. Surely, the Hon. member for Labrador North would not expect the government of this province to place people in houses which had been condemned by another authority. The best advice I have from my housing officials is that these houses should not be taken over.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: The houses in question were habitable and lived in up until such time as the USAF took over the -

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. member for Labrador has been making a speech and if he wishes to ask a question, I suggest that he do just that.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: We find through the authorities that those houses are safe and should be inhabited. M.O.T. does not want people to live in that area and this is why they have condemned them. This has been brought to the attention of the honourable minister's department.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Hon. Premier? It concerns the question that has been raised publicly in the last few days, DREE schools and the possibility of getting more money for them. Is it true that this government's policy is not to go after any more DREE money for the construction of ordinary elementary and ordinary day schools in the province.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, this is being considered -

there has been quite an imbalance with the educational system as it is, as the honourable member from White Bay South knows very well.

The situation that has been is that one denomination gets so much money and there is always an outbalance or an imbalance to the other denomination. We feel there should be a better way and the Department of Education, the Minister of Education, has this under consideration now and when the policy is definitely identified the House will be informed.

MR. WM. ROWE: A supplementary, Sir, is it correct that there is no government policy at the moment on this question?

MR. MOORES: Not so, Mr. Speaker, we have an ongoing programme and this does not have to be reviewed until we are ready for the supplementary agreement with the DREE persons in Ottawa and as I say, as soon as it is identified it will be made known to the House.

MR. WM. ROWE: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, for asking all these supplementaries but I do want to be clear on the question. Then it is not right that the government is not going after DREE funds as the Minister of Education stated the other day. That is an erroneous statement of fact, is that correct?

MR. MOORES: No that is correct, Mr. Speaker, we are not going after DREE funds for education at this time.

CAPT. WINSOR: May I direct a question to the honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications. Is he aware that there is an electrical blackout at Tilting on Fogo Island, caused by a bad snow storm there last night, and the Highways Department is unable to plow that road because of a breakdown in machinery?

HON. T. V. HICKEY, Minister of Transportation and Communications: I am not aware of it, Mr. Speaker, I will have the matter checked out for the honourable member and get him whatever information he wishes later this afternoon.

CAPT. WINSOR: I hear rumblings here. Why did the member not report it? The member did report it and he reported it to the Deputy

Minister of Highways this morning but up until noon this afternoon or two o'clock this afternoon there has been no action taken and the lights have been out there since nine o'clock last evening.

MR. HICKEY: Your Honour, I must object to that statement that no action has been taken. The fact that the situation has not been sorted out is certainly no basis for the honourable member to assume that my department has not taken action. As I said, I will be happy to give him an up-to-date report on it within the hour.

CAPT. WINSOR: I appreciate the concern of the minister, and would he give personal attention to this because if they have to go another night without electricity it is going to be a hardship on the people of that area.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the honourable Minister of Highways, would the minister inform the House why no public tenders or formal contract to the tune of \$1,120,000 was not called on eight projects in his department and why no contracts and no public tenders -

AN HON. MEMBER: Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to know the reason. This is rather urgent, Sir. This is an urgent matter. Here is a government slashing out contracts without calling tenders or signing contracts.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I have to rule the honourable member for Bell Island out of order for making a speech.

MR. NEARY: I will put the question if I have an opportunity to do so, if Your Honour will just try to restrain that crowd on the other side, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I have ruled the honourable member for Bell Island out of order.

MR. NEARY: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Would the minister inform the House why no public tenders were called -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is violating the

rules that govern the question period, he is reading from the Auditor General's Report which is going to be submitted to the Public Accounts Committee and it violates the ruling that you have made earlier today. It is not an urgent matter. It could be tabled. It is going before the Committee on Public Accounts and there is another at least dozen reasons why the question is out of order.

MR. NEARY: Could we have a ruling, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: I was waiting to hear the honourable member's question but it does appear as if it should be placed on the Order Paper although he did not get the chance to complete his question, I feel ~~feel~~ from what I heard that it should be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, can I put the question this way, Sir?

I am sure this is in order. Would the minister inform the House if it is the policy of his department to call public tenders and have signed contracts before -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is that all the -

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to remind all honourable members that when one member is speaking he has the right

to be heard in silence and that applies to each and every member in this honourable House. If I am to rule on questions being in order or not at least I should get a chance to hear the question completed.

HON. T. P. HICKEY (MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS):

May I just offer one comment to clarify the situation. The honourable gentleman could have gotten this answer if he had directed his question properly in the first place. As usual he goes off on a tangent and sees things into something which are really not there. This is customary out of him. Let me assure him that it is the policy of my department to call tenders, it is the policy of this government to call tenders for projects. Let me assure him also that as per usual his suggestion is just a figment of his imagination. If he would look deeper into the statement in the Public Accounts he will find that there has been no contract awarded without public tender. Wishful thinking.

MR. NEARY: I wonder if the honourable minister could inform the House why the painting of white lines on the Trans-Canada Highway for the year 1972-1973 almost double the estimated cost that was allocated for painting these lines?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island's question should be on the Order Paper.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: In the debate on the Address and Reply I think the last day the honourable member for Labrador South adjourned the Address in Reply, and he has thirty minutes left of his time.

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to get through the summation of my address in the time allotted, if I am permitted to by honourable members, for the edification of those who were not here on Tuesday. I might say we had participated briefly in a delightful little group discussion. I think today I would like to steer clear of that as much as possible because what I have to say really sums up what I was trying to bring forward on Tuesday. If I would be permitted to summarize briefly what I did say on Tuesday, perhaps I could get on with the rest of it.

The Throne Speech to which we are addressing ourselves as I have said, Sir, is neither good nor bad. It merely clarifies our suspicions that this administration is fundamentally the same as that of the previous Liberal Administration. The only difference, as I said, being that of style. We are not surprised since both are dedicated to what we believe to be maintaining the status quo in our society. Both are backed by the same power elements and therefore cannot be expected to have any grasp of the substance of the ills which affect our society. Not perceiving therefore these to be in fact ills or if perceiving them and finding it in their best interest not to acknowledge that, they of course will not even begin then to cure them.

I went on to say on Tuesday that in my estimation the Liberal Party, when they were in power, were confronted with the same dilemma and have since proven that they are as incapable of providing good opposition, as they were incapable of providing good government.

I would be happy to elaborate upon that. I do not think it is necessary. I believe honourable members of the House understand what I mean but I shall be delighted to go into that in more detail if I were asked to do so.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, okay, Mr. Speaker, I will substantiate briefly and without going into too much unnecessary detail.

For instance, there have been several very good debates begun on matters of great importance. It started off in all sincerity to be debated seriously by all members on both sides. There have been very good amendments put forward by the opposition but in the putting forward of these amendments, which were in the first place in the interest of the general public, that in the wording of these amendments the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues have made it virtually impossible for members on the other side to vote for these amendments and thereby destroyed the whole affect before he started. This is what I mean by not providing good opposition, Sir.

X I would also like to inquire perhaps point out something that rather disturbs me because I do not think it is quite proper. Certain persons in the hierarchy of the civil service, who were placed in their jobs by the former administration for one reason or another, still do not consider themselves to be under the jurisdiction of the minister in whose department they are employed and are, in the absence of any direct orders from their ministers, continuing to take orders from people who were their former ministers. I think that is rather a serious problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a serious charge.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is true.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, that is a very serious charge and I bring it forth in all sincerity as a serious charge. I think that we can substantiate that. However, there will be another time to get into this when we get back into the debate on rules of the House and into the debate on the resolution concerning the matter of election expenses and all this kind of thing. There will be ample opportunity to get into this in greater detail. However, I do not want to take up the rest of my time here today on that subject.

I mention in passing the various programmes outlined and outlined very sketchily, I might say, in the Throne Speech and the recurring thing, that nothing was to be done without thorough planning analysis; a very commendable and sensible approach, Sir, but having the built-in danger of leaving the planning far beyond the time when implementation should begin, thus naturally leading to the implementation of obsolete plans, a state of affairs I think probably worse than having no plans or no action at all.

X MR. NEARY: May I raise a point of order, Sir? Mr. Speaker, the honourable member in his remarks a few moments ago made some very, very serious charges against top-ranking officials of the government.

Now, Sir, these charges are so serious that if the administration were to retaliate it could have very serious effects on these gentlemen and their families. I would like to ask the member if he would

substantiate his charges or withdraw the charges altogether.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order, that is a spurious point; the type of thing that the honourable member for Labrador South has been justified in bringing up and referring to the nature of the debate in this honourable Assembly. It is not a point of order at all and the honourable member for Bell Island is quite incorrect in getting on his feet and interrupting the honourable member while he is speaking.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would submit that that is a legitimate point of order, Sir. You cannot make unsubstantiated charges in this honourable House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Ah-h-h-h-h!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, charges were made, unsubstantiated, were made in this honourable House, and judicial inquiries resulted from these unsubstantiated charges. I say, Sir...

MR. MARSHALL: The honourable member is using this for the purpose of making a speech.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not have to...

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order has been raised and I ask Your Honour's ruling.

MR. NEARY: I am speaking on this point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I feel that there is not really a point of order and I am sure the honourable member for Labrador South is aware of what statements he is making.

MR. F.B. ROWE: May I direct a question to the honourable the member?

MR. MARSHALL: No he may not.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am asking Your Honour if I can ask a question of the honourable the member, and it is up to the member to answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please! All honourable members are aware that when a member is speaking he has the right to be heard in silence and it is his own right to permit a question by another member. If the honourable member for Labrador South wish to permit

the question by the honourable member for St. Barbe North then it is completely up to him. Now the honourable member for Labrador South is recognized.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I have have said, I did not make that comment lightly but neither am I prepared to surrender the rest of my time in the Address discussing it. I think it is a matter which requires much more discussion. I said it deliberately, knowing that there would be more discussion and I think it is about time we did have more discussion on it but at this particular time I am not prepared to surrender my time in the House on this matter, Sir.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Would the member permit a question, Sir?

MR. MARTIN: Not on this particular subject at this time. At a later time, yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Substantiate the charges.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador South has the floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MARTIN: We saw in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, also, the subject of health. We look forward to seeing some positive action taken to curb the rising costs of health services. The Speech mentioned that health care costs were escalating at an alarming rate. I think this is a first rate piece of intelligence. Except for saying; "So what is new" to this statement, I might report to this Assembly that we in Labrador who suffer under the tender graces of that great philanthropic empire builder group of the International Grenfell Association, continue to watch the standard of our service deteriorate while the price goes up.

We thought at first that we might be making some headway in our efforts to communicate intelligently with the I.G.A. as regard to the quality of service that they are delivering. However, in our

naivety we neglected to take into account the fact that intelligent communication presupposes that there is an intelligent listener at the other end, and we are paying dearly for that omission. There is just no reliable method of dealing with blatant arrogance so we continue to try to find a better means of getting our point across to the I.G.A. staff and their patrons.

On the subject of health and the rising cost of drugs I believe that the only way to stop pharmaceutical companies from gouging the public further is for the government to not just bring in a pharma-care programme (after all, we have only to look at the medicare programme) but to take over completely the distribution of drugs.

Pollution and the control of same also got passing notice in the Speech. It leads one to ask again what steps the government have taken in Labrador West with the Iron Ore Company of Canada, to stop the dumping of their mud tailings in the lakes, which is polluting the upper river systems.

Speaking again of powerful interests and controls and gouging and all such and both, we will be very interested, Sir, to see just how much courage this government will have in dealing with land-use issues, particularly as they affect land costs. I wonder if anybody has ever considered that land, like air and water, is public domain, priceless, the common environment? I think that land must be free for everybody to use. Like air and water it must be free to everyone excepting, of course, the natural laws governing the habitation of space by one body at a particular time.

I do not think that we are likely to see a general acceptance of that concept, it goes contrary to the larcenous side of our souls. Even so, government must, since no one else can, take steps to stop the profiteering in land and to ensure that all land is put to the best possible use for the common good.

I think the mention in the Speech from the Throne of electoral boundaries was redundant as several other items were. However, if I may make a comment or two here: During the intervening period

since that legislation was introduced last year, I have had time to assess the matter more thoroughly and the implications thereof. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary at this time to increase the number of seats in this Assembly. It will not become necessary unless and until we experience substantially greater increases in population or dramatic population shifts from one area to the other, and this is not likely.

It is time, to be sure, to redraw political boundaries but a simple changing of boundaries is all, Sir, that is required. Aside from all the other considerations, the cost of the operation itself, when considering the benefits to be derived therefrom,

the costs are prohibitive. I would ask the honourable Minister of Finance to take a closer look at this. For instance, taking the salaries for the new members alone, disregarding the associated costs of extra back-up staff, secretaries, office space, travel expenses, phone calls, this kind of thing, without taking those costs into consideration, the salaries alone will cost the province \$90,000 annually. With this money, Sir, in my district we could in the course of one term of office build enough primary industry on the coast to dramatically change the whole picture, the unemployment picture or the employment picture.

For instance, for \$80,000 we can put one small fish plant - there are fish plants there now in the north roughly that cost - we can put one small fish plant in the coastal community, capable of handling all the local production of these communities' fishermen and at the same time employing all the rest of the labour force there. Instead of employing just nine people, we would be perhaps employing indirectly and directly maybe as much as 900 persons. I think in these times of short money we can ill afford to disregard the basic economics of this.

There is another point which has to be brought before the assembly. It is a documented fact that the Census Canada figures, the Statistics Canada figures for the census are wrong in Labrador, wrong to the tune of about 10,000 out, 10,000 short. If this is so and if the new electoral map is to be redrawn on the basis of the guidelines provided the commission by this assembly, Sir, then this assembly and the government have the obligation to those people in Labrador to make sure that those figures are corrected. If they are not corrected, I think I can practically assure this honourable government more trouble in Labrador than it would care to get into at this time.

I therefore, Sir, urge the government to withdraw this present legislation concerning electoral boundaries, to set about correcting this disparity and then to bring before the House amended legislation requiring simply a redrawing of the electoral

boundaries without increasing the number of seats.

Finally, I have come to one of the sorest points in the entire Speech from the Throne. There is already before this House a resolution calling for amendments to the rules of order. It is something which we as members, I think, unanimously agree upon, that the rules have to be changed. I ask you, Sir, to what advantage is it to change the rules of order if honourable members persist in breaking those same rules? We could have the best rule book in the world and if honourable members do not abide by that rule book, deliberately break the rules, then what is the point of going through the whole process? I find this a little difficult to understand. We are here as legislators, Sir, charged with the responsibility of creating laws for the citizens of our province. As such, as legislators, surely to heavens we should be expected to provide some kind of guidance. We should be expected to at least uphold the very laws that we make for ourselves in this House. If we cannot do that, then how can we expect the citizens of this province to abide by the laws that we create for them?

The rule which states that honourable members have the right to be heard in silence, a small thing, a small rule perhaps but nevertheless, small as it is, we are honour bound to obey it. If we do not agree to abide by our rules, then perhaps we should give it out altogether. Visitors to the gallery, Sir, I think must believe that we hold this whole great institution in such contempt that we really do not deserve to be here in the first place.

I would like to, at this point, recall a remark made by my honourable friend from Labrador North on Tuesday, who said, "Never mind the House, get something for your district." "Never mind the House, never mind the House," it should be maybe our signature song. My notes contained rather unkind cuts towards the honourable member from Labrador North but I do not think that I need to relate them here because he has made that unkind cut toward himself. The people in Labrador North I think will understand. They understood before the election when the majority of them, the electorate, rejected him.

In any case, he was only voted in by a simple formality.

The question was asked and rightly so I think; "What do I have to offer as constructive criticism - I, as a member of this assembly - toward a government and an opposition that I have been guilty of criticizing?" I have said, Sir, that I do not have all of the answers nor would I presume to imply that I do. I can and I will offer some suggestions as to how we might approach the problems confronting us.

First of all, we must accept the fact that at the present time, in this society, all of our rules, all of our laws are stacked against the little man, the ordinary citizen, in favour of the wealthy. The changing of that situation will take a great deal of courage, a great deal of wisdom. At the bottom of the whole thing, the source of all our problems lies in the fact that we do not have a proper education system. There is no particular person to blame for this. It is simply a matter of historic fact. I suggest, Sir, that even if it cost us one hundred per cent more than it is costing us now for education that we must get on with the job. If that is what the education budget requires, then we must get on with it. We must accept again the principle that this world owes nobody a living. Everyone of us, no matter who, must be expected to make some kind of contribution toward our society. It is possible, Sir, and it is indeed imperative that we make it possible.

While everyone should make a contribution, everybody does not have an equal opportunity to make that contribution. Therefore, let us put some sense into our education programme.

For instance, politics, dirty old politics, what does the average citizen know about politics? What does he feel is his responsibility towards the political institution? Whether we like politics or not, whether we think it is dirty or not, unless we understand the political institution, then there is no way the ordinary citizen, the voter, can get around to changing it. I think it is time we put that into our elementary school system.

We should have education dealing with the laws concerning

labour movement because whether again we agree or disagree with the labour movement, the principles of unionism, it is a fact of life that we have to live with. I think the sooner everybody comes to understand that, the less trouble we are going to have. The time to start is right in the schools.

Economics, curricula must be concerned with every day basic, corner store, down to earth economics. I think most of all legislators have to concern themselves with profiteering. In certain countries, Sir, people who engage in profiteering are stood against the wall and machine gunned. Thank heavens we are not living in that kind of society! We do have a more effective way of dealing with it. I think we can legislate it out.

If we truly wish to rehabilitate our society, then we must accept as our guiding philosophy the concept of justice for all. Now, that is a trite phrase, trite perhaps, as one of my learned friends pointed out just a while ago. Let us just for a minute think about it; justice for all. It is no less true, no less important for being trite. I submit, Sir, that in this province in this day there is not justice for all. If there were, we would not have pressure groups, we would not have professional radicals, we would not have other so-called agents for change because the concept for justice itself is not really understood, not really accepted. What it is that we must try so hard to change are the rules, the laws and the regulations because these are no longer relevant.

What we have is a built-in inflexibility, built-in red tape, bureaucracy for the sake of bureaucracy. There is no point, Sir, in restructuring government

if we are not going to decentralize authority at the same we decentralize responsibility, let us cease to be so preoccupied with what is legal and instead be guided by what is just. The state of legality or illegality can be altered in an instant by an "aye" or a "nay" of this assembly, but justice is immutable and I would suggest to the honourable gentleman from Green Bay who put the question to me the other day, what I would do to change what has to be changed, the first thing I would do is to make sure that everybody has a better chance of making sure that there is justice for all.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Green Bay.

MR. B. PECKFORD: It is rather difficult to speak after the last several paragraphs of the member who preceded me because I think it will be symbolic though, because what must come from the hurly burly of the ideal and the Utopian down to just exactly where we happen to be, in that we are dealing in a very human and frail world in society. So perhaps my best comments to him about his speech is simply the way in which I handle mine and try to keep within the realm of practicality rather than to waiver in those golden worlds of his, most of which I think he is way off base about and I think it would -

MR. ROBERTS: His head in the clouds.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, it is a head in the cloud type thing although some of his points are well founded. They are very theoretical and really do not have too much relevance to the world as we now find it in although it is nice to listen to.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the honourable member for Bonavista South, the mover of the Address in Reply, and the honourable member for Harbour Grace. While complimenting them I should also welcome the honourable member for Hermitage to the assembly not only because he is now the member for that district, because he has been for many years a

colleague of mine in the District of Green Bay. I would also say to the honourable member for Hermitage who I understand until recently or is now still a constituent of mine, that next time around he can find it more to his advantage rather than to go south but to stay where he is and have a real political battle on our hands.

MR. WM. ROWE: He wants to go back teaching does he or what?

MR. PECKFORD: No, I want very much to stay in politics and I think one of the ways that that could be assured is to welcome the honourable member for Hermitage back to Green Bay.

MR. WM. ROWE: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: I have some choice words for the honourable member for White Bay South as I come to them and if he will just hold his breath for a while he will hear it soon.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is frightened to death.

MR. PECKFORD: Before I get into the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, I would first like to make my remarks about the District of Green Bay and then go into the Speech from the Throne afterwards.

The District of Green Bay is a very large district and contrary to the comments of the member for Labrador South it is too large a district for one man to represent even though the population might be rather low, as he indicated. It stretches from the Baie Verte Peninsula at Shoe Cove near La Scie right around and down to Triton and out to Two Islands, Little Bay Islands and Long Island. Like most other members of this honourable House we have the same or similiar problems, chiefly those of water and sewerage and highways.

As far as employment opportunities are concerned within that district, it pleases me and satisfies me to no end to think that over the past couple of years, even though we had mine close-downs of monumental proportions economically within the district, the employment picture in Green Bay is perhaps one of the brightest in the whole of this province. I doubt very much whether there is a district, outside of Corner Brook, Grand Falls and St. John's, that

can boast of the employment opportunities that are present right now in the District of Green Bay. That is not only because of what resources are there but it is directly the result of government participation in bringing to the District of Green Bay badly needed money to develop the forest resource that is there, to develop the agricultural resource that is there and to develop the mineral resource that is there.

It gives a great deal of satisfaction for me to be able to talk about the mine that was started there last summer under the Green Bay Mining Company which is totally a local firm. As some of my public comments have indicated, I should like to see over the next two or three years around this province a greater involvement of local people in developing resources. One of the ways I think this can be done and one of the problems we have in this province is that too many people in our rural areas are not fully versed as to just exactly what funds are available, from what sources. I have often said in many meetings around the province that perhaps one of the things government could do if they wanted to spend some money wisely, albeit the honourable member for Labrador South might want it just for pure education, is to institute some kind of a programme through the Department of Municipal Affairs, and if it costs \$200,000 or \$300,000 I think it would be worthwhile to go around to all the rural areas through the development of associations and through the councils and have seminars or meetings outlining the actual functions of the various departments of government, both provincial and federal, and I think we could go a long way to helping developing our resources, go a long way to educating councils and members of councils as to just exactly what the procedures are.

I think that is one of the problems we have, that there is a lot more red tape than is necessary in the Department of Municipal Affairs simply because we have individuals who through no fault of

their own, do not know the process. Now perhaps the process or the system itself is wrong, I do not know. It is a good academic argument and I am not going to delve into it but we have the process as it is right now for good or for bad and it seems to me that we could go a long way to solving a lot of the red tape if we took the initiative and had all these councils and development associations. I know now in many parts of this province because I get correspondence from them, that a lot of even the development associations are not altogether clear on their role and are not altogether clear on where avenues of finances are available, through the provincial or through the federal governments. So I think it would be a good thing to see, even if it costs \$200,000 or \$300,000.

Getting back to the District of Green Bay and the mineral exploration and exploitation that is going on there right now, it is an example for any other district or group of persons in this province I think to copy. It is a totally local company that is developing an ore body that cannot be developed economically by a large company like BRINEX, nor Kerr Addison, nor Noranda because there is not enough ore there to make it profitable for them, they are not going to make the huge profits that they want to keep their company going, to explore elsewhere.

I am sure under this new mineral claims-staking programme that the Department of Mines and Energy has now, nobody in this honourable House as of yet has really laid any emphasis on it because I suppose it does not affect them in their districts because they are not involved in the mining thing but to me it is a very significant departure of policy from the past because do not forget there are thousands of square miles of land going to be opened this year and it allows the opportunity for individuals who are interested in the mining field to free-stake.

I know for example last summer of various groups within this province who put claim on areas of land to explore them. Right now that Little Bear Mine near Springdale, near Little Bay, employs

about fifty-nine persons, all receiving high wages. I think this is the kind of thing that could be done not only perhaps for minerals but in agriculture or in the forest industry for processing rather than shipping raw logs or just lumber, and could be done a lot more.

Of course the funding for that mine came primarily from the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation but there was a fair chunk of it that came from the local area as well, and it is progressing very well. But it is not only through the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation

that we can thank or look to for progress in the Green Bay District and we can also look to the Rural Development Authority.

Now there is something about this Department of Rural Development (I do not know what it is) that gives some people on the other side of this honourable House the jitters, particularly the Hon. member for Hermitage, a few weeks ago, the Hon. member for White Bay South and perhaps all of them over there. It gives them the jitters because it is, as I stated last year in this honourable House, the first time in the history of this province that any party or government ever attempted to say to rural Newfoundland, we are going to give you a few bucks to see if you can develop something in your community to make it a viable place in which to live and where our grandfathers, grandparents and our ancestors have lived for centuries. It is the first time, never before! Nobody can defy me on that.

Mr. Speaker, for years we had a Department of Community and Social Development that waltzed in the hinterland of what? Of fairies down there, concocting some kind of programme which it was supposed - you talk about long-term planning! I can remember years ago trying to find out what the Department of Community and Social Development was doing. All I could figure out for sure what they were doing was that they were moving people around. Moving people around! One can go anywhere in this province, to anybody who has received loans from the Rural Development Authority, and ask them about it and you will get your answer - whether the Rural Development Authority is a worthwhile programme or not.

Mr. Speaker, I remember here in this House last year some of the opposition members saying that we will wait. We will wait! I thought that that was a fair comment. That was not too bad. The programme had just been brought in. We will wait for a while. We will wait and see. I say now that we have waited long enough. I would like to know what constructive criticism the opposition

have against the Rural Development Authority when they get up to speak in this honourable House on this Address in Reply. I would like to know it. If there is an honourable member on the other side who wants to go on the airways of this province and allege this is political pay-offs, let him prove it or keep his mouth shut. Let him prove it.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. PECKFORD: Document the case and see it.

MR. NEARY: I can document it.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, and bring it to the honourable minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. PECKFORD: The other thing about this, Mr. Speaker, if I still have the floor, is where they start splitting hairs, where they start getting into the grey area. Now they have had a year. They see that this programme has been a fantastic success around this province. No question. It has been a success. They are confronted with it every day, if they go around this province. They are confronted with it. They see it. It is working. Five or six persons are working in this sawmill or that sawmill. We do not have to bring in so much lumber this year as we did last year from up along.

Mr. Speaker, now they have had time to assess the programme. Now they will try to find some way; they will go into the depths of whatever they can find and come up with one or two applications, which were not completely black and white when it came before the board. They will come up with this. They will forget about the hundreds of applications to Liberals, Communists, Progressive Conservatives, New Democrats or anybody else that the money was given to. They will forget all about those hundreds of good things that were done and they will pick one or two, just one or two. Now your programme is a failure, Mr. Premier! Your programme

is a failure because there are one or two out of eight or nine hundred applications that are in the grey area. It is a failure!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. PECKFORD: They have the jitters now.

I will ask any honourable member of this House, if he wants to find out whether the Rural Development Programme worked or not, to go down to three communities in the Green Bay District; Middle Arm, Burlington and Smith's Harbour. You can leave out Smith's Harbour if you want to. Just go down to Middle Arm and Burlington. Just ask them. Two or three years ago look at the abled-bodied assistance and welfare rolls of the Community of Middle Arm. It used to be known years ago because it had such a name like that; it used to be known as "Little Belgium."

MR. ROBERTS: Little what?

MR. PECKFORD: Little Belgium. This was the connotation, yes. I remember this past summer, Mr. Speaker, going into Middle Arm; I remember going there campaigning in March, 1972. There was hardly any employment there at all. Nobody was working. I went down there this summer and walked into Middle Arm and went down to the other end where a gentleman was allowed to establish a sawmill and here they were, fellows who only eighteen months before that had no jobs. They were pushing the logs along and sawing up the lumber. "Lots of market for your lumber, skipper?" "Cannot keep it going." That is fact. If any one would wish to prove it, he can come down with me on Saturday and I will show him. I will show him because I am going down there on Saturday.

Mr. Speaker, besides that and contrary to the analysis of the Hon. member for Labrador South who did not know for sure whether this government had an access roads' programme - perhaps he meant to say that there was no access roads in Labrador South. I do not know if there are any or not. If he was trying to say that there was no access roads' programme, there is one, a substantial

one, with a substantial increase since this party came into party, as everybody knows.

Overall in the District of Green Bay, employment opportunities in the last two years - I say that Green Bay could be used as a microcosm for the rest of this province, if you want. Employment opportunities have in fact increased in the last two years (that is a fact that cannot be denied, Sir,) through the Rural Development Authority and through the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation.

The Hon. member for Labrador South says that there is only a change in style between the previous administration. I do not have any attention of going back to the past. I do not want any more to do with the past. It might be enough in my past, politically and otherwise, to keep it back there too. I am not interested in it. He says that there is only a difference in style. I will tell him that in one area of this government there is a difference in substance and that difference (it cannot be said too often) is in the Department of Rural Development.

Before I leave my district and get on to other things, there are a number of roads in my district which I should bring up, as the representative of there. Two years ago I would have never thought that I would ever stand in this honourable House and fight for a better road connection from the Baie Verte Highway down to Burlington, Middle Arm and Smith's Harbour, because it was going to be unjustifiable. There were sixteen to twenty miles of road there. The gravel road was not all that bad. The economy of the three communities themselves and the population really did not warrant upgrading of that road substantially. There could be a bit of work done on the other end of it, the five miles there of bad turns but essentially it is a pretty good gravel road. But I can

stand in this honourable House and request, with a good deal of authority and facts behind me, that that road now meets the upgrading simply because we have trucks and trailers driving over that road every day with wood going to the Labrador Linerboard Mill. We also have other individual, private trucks going over there with lumber. That area now is economically viable. It has a future, especially as it relates to the forest industry in that area, besides the fishing that goes on in Smith's Harbour. Now I can stand up two years later and say that something needs to be done with that road.

MR. W. ROWE: Is the honourable member (inaudible) because these particular places are going to be out of his district, if the commissioner's report is accepted?

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am just showing the Hon. member for White Bay South that he is going to have everything done for him if that part of my district, of Green Bay District goes into White Bay South or goes into the Baie Verte Peninsula seat. He will have no worries nor problems, it will all be done. It will all be done for him. The ground work will be laid. He will just have to walk in and take credit for it if I do not get elected again.

Besides that road off the Baie Verte Peninsula road down to those three communities, of course, there is a road primarily in White Bay South District which splits Green Bay and White Bay South District, the LaScie Highway, which is of constant concern, worry, phone calls, letters and all the rest of it as the honourable member can easily attest. Last year there was about \$1 million or so spent on that road. This road is now underway and hence something has to be done with it. The Rambler Mines are off the LaScie Highway and hence there are ore trucks everyday travelling back and forth over that road to Tilt Cove, Green Bay District, where the concentrated is shipped from and hence there is a great need, not only because of the population but because of the economy of the area, to have that road continued on its course of completion and upgrading and eventual paving.

because of LaScie itself, too, with the fish plant and hopefully that plant will even be viable in the next few years if we can get somebody to take it over, to really go into the fishery in an honest and hard-working way.

In the central Green Bay District, the Communities of Springdale, Little Bay, St. Patrick's, Big Side, Jackson's Cove, Harry's Harbour, King's Point, Rattling Brook

from that area and South Brook which are all in the centre part of the district. There is one area there where a road is very essential, a new improved road is very essential and that is the road to King's Point which leads on to Harry's Harbour and Jackson's Cove. This is one of the potentially great areas for farming in this whole area of Central Newfoundland. Right now, there are a number of fairly large farms down there and there is a lot of produce which comes over these roads. I think it is only fitting to observe that that road and I think I am safe on saying that I now know all of the roads in Hermitage district and I know all the roads everywhere else in the Province. I have travelled over them. I do not think there is a peice of road that I have not travelled over in the last four or five years.

So, I am safe in saying that a peice of road between Springdale Junction Road and King's Point is the most dangerous piece of gravel road in the Province today. There have been a number of unfortunate accidents on that road and deaths and hence I think this is of immediate importance and that road -

MR. J. MORGAN: He have never been to Bonavista South

MR. PECKFORD: I have been all down through Bonavista South.

MR. C. BRETT: He was never in Trinity North.

MR. PECKFORD: And everywhere in Trinity North.

MR NEARY: I wonder if Your Honour could remind the House, Sir, not to speak from anyone else's seat only their own, Sir. I wonder if Your Honour would enforce that rule.

MR SPEAKER: Of course that rule has been well established and honourable members to my left may have been violating that rule, or any honourable members should certainly keep it in mind and restrain their enthusiasm until they get back to their own seats.

MR PECKFORD: A suggestion along that line, Mr. Speaker, might be for the honourable member from Bell Island to set a good example. I am sure we all look up to him so much in this House. We all admire him, his sense of political maturity, his experience in this House over the last

three or four years, all lead us to look up to him and hence I am sure that if he set this example we would all bow down and there would never be another burp out of anybody on this side of the House when somebody else is on his feet.

To continue, Mr. Speaker, there is one other area of Green Bay district that I have not mentioned which I shall and that is the area down from South Brook on the south side of Green Bay district to Robert's Arm, Pilley's Island, Jim's Cove, Card's Harbour, Triton and Brighton and the two islands off the coast, Long Island and Little Bay Island. Down in this area you have a population of close to 3,000 people. There are about 1,245 in Robert's Arm and 1,204 in Jim's Cove, Card's Harbour and Triton, both a municipality. Both these areas right now - especially Robert's Arm is in desperate need of sewerage facilities. It has a water system and Triton is in desperate need of water and sewerage facilities.

This is an area, especially the area in Jim's Cove, Card's Harbour and Triton for anybody who has ever travelled that part of the Island - we have some of the most independent people in the whole Province. The unemployment rate in Triton, Jim's Cove and Card's Harbour over the last ten years would be close to nil. It is absolutely fantastic, great lobster fishermen, loggers and carpenters. They always manage to find employment when it seems that nobody else in the area can and they are very deserving, 1,200 people, very viable community. There is a new herring factory starting there soon, this spring. It is now under construction and they are very deserving of a water and sewerage facility. Plans are already well under way in that area for a full-scale highway. It is just about completed now - about twenty-five or thirty miles and hopefully some black-top will follow that upgrading that was completed this past summer.

One area that fishermen very often look to and I was talking to a few people dinner time about it - if you want to look at an area, one little place in this Province which has succeeded in small industry,

one has to look at Little Bay Island, really in contrast to Long Island where there is not very much but there is a canning factory on Little Bay Island that cans crab. There is a long-liner haul out there and there is a barrel factory there, all owned by the same firm, S. T. Jones and Son. It is an example to other parts of the Province where the fishery is still of importance, especially inshore fishery where a lot can be done, a tremendous lot can be done and twenty or thirty jobs created almost around the calendar. It is a fantastic little community for fishing and sealing and anybody who is very interested in that field I invite them down on the ferry that goes from Springdale right now to Little Bay Island and Long Island to see Little Bay Island and the development that has occurred down there over the last ten years. It is absolutely fantastic.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Very well indeed, especially when there is ice all around the Island and they are looking for an ice-breaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to leave the district of Green Bay and to go on to other matters of importance. I should like to deal with the Speech from the Throne and like the honourable member for Labrador South, perhaps I will take it bit by bit. I reject, outright and totally the suggestion by any member on the other side or on this side, whoever they may be, that this Speech from the Throne is void, lacking ideas, has nothing to say, is completely a waste of time, which in actual fact that could not be further from the truth -

Mr. Speaker, on the first page of the Speech from the Throne we find our people can look back upon 1973 as the most prosperous year in the modern history of our Province, fantastic stuff, beautiful, the most prosperous year in the history of this Province. What is wrong with that? What is wrong with that statement?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Last year witnessed a marked and significant increase in the numbers of jobs created. Can anybody doubt that? Last year and the year before we have created more jobs in two years than we have ever created in two years before that time, since Confederation at least and I am happy to guess that even before that. Is this a sign of decadence? Is this a sign that this Province is on its way down? Is this a sign that we still must go to Ottawa, with cap in hand, to ask them would you please give us one or two dollars so that we can start some ad hoc programme somewhere in this province, to pretend to the populace that we are doing something for you? No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot buy that.

At the same time the number of persons in receipt of short-term assistance has been decreased by almost one-half since my government assumed office. Is this a sign that the government of this Province over the last two years, this government of non-action, this government of long term planning, this government of just sitting in the Confederation Building and waiting for something else to happen, is this a sign that this is what is going on? I mean, let us get our perceptives straightened away. We are no miracle worker over here. We are no miracle worker here but when -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Could we have a quorum count, please?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, see that is the kind of criticism, there it is, Mr. Speaker. To continue Mr. Speaker, here is a fact alone, one unassailable fact, that we have as a government, through our efforts, through the Royal Development Authorities and through creating the right climate in this Province, been able to take people off the welfare roles, off the dole and put them back either in the woods or in the sawmills or whatever. This is something, I am sure, the honourable

member for Bell Island would sure like to see reversed. Nothing would give him more pleasure than to see in the last year we had increased the number of people on able-bodied assistance. Unfortunately it is not true.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Sure there is credit to the unemployment insurance

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: No, because they are not here in the Speech from the Throne, you see, and we are talking about the Address in Reply Mr. Speaker.

At the same time, the gross rate of the gross provincial products increased at a rate double that experienced by Canada as a whole. Another interesting side-light to this Speech from the Throne

what is wrong with you, presumably void of any kind of indication of what this government have been doing and intends to do. That there are more people than ever before returning back to the province, it is on the first page of the Speech from the Throne. Mr. Speaker, you do not have to go very far to see it. Just look back for a second to the first page of the Speech from the Throne which is just suppose to be a general resume of what is going on and what the government intends, in a general way, will go on in the next twelve months in this province. It is not a speech intended to specifically delineate all the different policies that this government intends to bring in. It does not specifically say that. In a general way it shows the training, the kinds of things, the kinds of policies that we are going to try to emphasize in the next six, eight, ten and twelve months.

This is all the Speech from the Throne intends to do, to look back and then to look ahead at what we intend to do. We are not going to tear down mountains and built great edifices to the sky. There are somethings in here which do not only show a difference in style but also a difference in substance.

So all of these things indicate what has been happening over the past year. They are indicators that this province is starting to go on the right course. There are people coming back to the province. They have confidence that there is something going to be done back here, that we are getting more people off welfare than ever before, that we had a very buoyant economy in 1973.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there comes on the next page the most significant part of the whole Speech from the Throne. It is the core, the crux of it all. I do not think it has been given enough emphasis so far and that is forest policy. Now I do not know how many there are on the other side, I think that I should move, I should bring in a private member's resolution to have some of the gentlemen from the other side who have already spoken and have not laid too much emphasis on this, move that the

government pay their way to Central Newfoundland and Western Newfoundland to take a look at the forests of this province and to take a look at what goes on in the forests of this province. This is by far, it might even be outside of the Rural Development Programme, the most significant thing that is going to be done in the next three or four years in this province. Because one of the resources, renewable resources that we have in this province that can provide many more jobs than we now have is through forestry. It is one of those unfortunate things of history that back in 1920 and 1930 and so on when the government of this province were so eager to get some kind of large industry here that in their eagerness to do so they lost their foresight to see that by giving away all these large tracks of trees and forests that in 1965 or in 1960 and thereon we have not had enough trees for our own use, that crown land was becoming a very expensive proposition, that there were hardly any trees left for anybody to cut except going to the paper companies and either getting a contract from them or trying to get a few sticks to build a house somewhere.

So this marks, I think, a real watershed in the history of this province in regard to forest policy, because if it is possible in the next couple of years, in the next year to sixteen or eighteen months, for this government, for this province to acquire additional timber stands, think what it will mean to just about everyone in this province. Absolutely hundreds and hundreds of jobs and it will guarantee at the same time that the rural development programme that is started will have a pretty permanent future, because right now one of the things that are hampering rural development programmes from expanding at a faster rate and providing more jobs is the lack of trees. It is as simple as that - it is the lack of trees.

Then, not only does it inhibit expansion of sawmilling industries or more sawmills, it also inhibits a man say in Point Leamington or outside Badger somewhere or outside Green Bay District from saying to himself: "Well now, I can see a future here. I have a block of timber in there of about fifty thousand cords. Now seeing that I

have and I have my sawmill rigged and all, and I am going to get a new one now, I have a good future, so now I can go into some kind of processing of that product rather than just take the log and saw it and give it to somebody else to plain perhaps. Now I can see a future here where I cannot only have a saw mill which can employ four or five persons but now I can see a future I can expand and bring in a few other machines and perhaps make a few mouldings, perhaps make a few axe handles, hammer handles or something to process the work a little further and hence provide more jobs."

But this cannot be done under the old system. There is just no way it can be done. There is no crown land left in this province worth talking about. What is there is gradually being depleted. Of course, hand in hand with any kind of forest policy which makes more timber accessible to the private individuals of this province must also go a management plan. It is no good to allow a group of individuals in any part of this province to just go in and high-grade the whole forest. It must be done on a management plan so that we can be assured that thirty years from now that area again will grow trees so that you will be able to continue it.

So if you are talking about a block of timber of 100,000 cords or 150,000 cords you are going to be talking about perhaps 8,000 cords or 10,000 cords per year allowed to be cut and no more. So hand in hand with getting more trees from the companies must go on a management plan so that we can ensure this kind of industry to go on for perpetuity and not just for forty years or fifty years.

As I understand it, this is all part of this policy that is to be introduced. Make no mistake about it, not only will it mean more small and medium sized industries where they are feasible from Gambo to St. George's or down towards Port aux Basques, in that whole area, not only will it mean more jobs but it should help the Labrador Linerboard in its timber. It should give them more resource rather than having them to go outside of the province to obtain it. Hence, it should give them a cheaper supply of wood. If this can be done, well it is all the better.

I do not see anybody in this province, I do not know the reason for it, I do not see anybody in this province getting terribly excited about this programme. Well, I think it deserves all the excitement one could give it. It is a departure from the past. It is not a departure in style, it is a departure in the substance because we had an administration for twenty-three years that completely ignored anything to do with the forest industry of this province, not only the forest industry but with trying to develop the trees that were there to any kind of programme.

Now we have a government that have not only devised a programme for rural Newfoundland but hand in hand or simultaneous with that to try and make available to all these sawmill operators and loggers a resource that will keep this kind of industry going forever. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if the honourable previous Premier of this province were standing here today and he had in his hand a speech from the Throne which read about the forest policy it would be heard far and wide, in every door, in every cranny, in every inlet and every bay of this province, that nobody would be able to talk about anything else for about a whole year, only trees. It is trees we want. It is trees we want. You can hear it. This forest policy would be lauded across the nation as one of the greatest revolutionary steps ever taken by a provincial government in the history of the Canadian Confederation. Yes, it would, every bit of it, Mr. Speaker, it would be. The only reason for it is that there are a lot of people in this province who really do not have, not saying that I have, do not have a knowledge of the forest industry. One of the groups of individuals, and I have mentioned this before, that have been entirely overlooked very often by public figures is the logger. Boy I am telling you he works for his pay. That is what he does, he works for his pay. The sawmill operator works for his pay too. They are a vital part of this economy.

I agree there is a lot to be said for the fishery. We have had a lot of emphasis on the fishery. Yet fishermen still agitate that they are not getting a square deal from a government, either provincial or

federal and that we should be doing more for the inshore fishery and more for them. There is another side to that, there is another side to our economy that keeps this place moving along and that is the forest industry and that is the logger. I know loggers out in my district who have worked in the woods for ten and fifteen and twenty years and more than that. I know men who have died, strained at fifty-one years old just because of the strain of being in there with a bucksaw fifteen or twenty years ago. Although there have been a lot of improvements in the camps it is still hard work when you get in cutting down trees.

So, Mr. Speaker, this forest policy is a radical departure from the past. It is opening up new horizons for a lot of our people and it should be heralded as such. It is a fantastic thing to see come about that this government have the audacity even, we have the audacity, we have the nerve to encourage, we are not afraid that Bowaters might close down tomorrow morning or that Price Newfoundland might suddenly say they are going to shift to Quebec, that we can offer them sufficient wood supply to keep their operations going and even expand them, if they so desire, but at the same time guarantee the other people of this province who are into that small, medium and large, that they can have a great access to this resource. So that not only will we have a company employing 2,000 or 3,000

people and then if you cannot get a job with the company you cannot go in the woods, no. Then you can also have hundreds and hundreds and even thousands of people to go in the woods and begin an industry on their own. That is a radical departure. That is a change in substance from three or four years ago. I dare anybody to take me up on that as it is.

This came about, Mr. Speaker, in two years, through planning. That is how this forest policy got as far as it did today. We just did not suddenly say, back eighteen months ago: "Oh, come on let us see what we can do with the forestry. Let us go to Bowaters and we will get a little block of land here for a group who are agitating over on the West Coast." Then a month or so later somebody hears about it in Gambo. Now, we have got to go to Price now or perhaps back to Bowaters and get another block for them to keep them from agitating anymore and having this ad hoc arrangement which would be a patchwork thing around the province, not really solving anything. No, Mr. Speaker, it was not done that way. It was not devised that way.

It was done through planning. It is a direct result of this government's intention that when we go to do something, let us research and let us find and let us get the experts and then let us develop a policy along the guidelines that the experts suggest. There might be some areas of change but in essence we shall accept what the experts, federally and provincially and wherever else they may be, suggest for this area. Hence we have a forest policy, the direct result of the planning by this government, the planning that is downgraded, the planning that is criticized, the planning that is of no consequence; says the opposition. We should not plan. "Forget about planning. Throw it out the window. Give us a chance. Wait until the next election when we get over there. We will show you all about planning. We will move this country along. We will just say one day that we are going to do something and then it is going to be done and the people of the province will all rise up in one

accord and say, hurrah for that great government that does things in an ad hoc manner, because I had that crowd who were agitating right there satisfied and another crowd over there who were agitating satisfied. Forget about it."

Another part of this forest policy is the government's intention. Now, let us not be specific here. It is general. It is the way a Speech from the Throne is supposed to be written. It is something, a trend, that we are going to try to pursue. We are going to try to get into utilizing all species of timber. It is a known fact that in this province right now there are huge stands of birch, for example. We can sustain even a fair number of cords per year and perhaps we should try to do something to develop this birch. I know, as of a couple of weeks ago, for example, that the market for birch in the United States has opened up drastically in the last few months and I know of operators who are getting into that market here in Newfoundland. There is a lot could be done there.

As I mentioned earlier in talking about all species, there are some blocks of timber on the West Coast, of hardwood, that could be developed and turned into moldings or other related forestry products, furniture components or something. We could do a lot along that way. It is the intention of this government to try to pursue this policy, this idea, of getting other species, of taking advantage of them. There was a time, several years ago - it is not a very delightful little anecdote to this - there was a few years ago, I know, a firm from Eastern Canada which came into Newfoundland and were guaranteed a loan by the province, by the government of the time, to go and cut some birch down in Loon Bay, for spools of thread, in the honourable Speaker's district. They came in here, high graded the block of great birch that was standing there and walked away. I know a few side lights to that story that I would not care to relate here because I am not that kind of a person. I do not want to get into it and I am sure the honourable Speaker is quite aware of them.

Here is the point: Let us forget about the rest of it. Here

is the point. A company was allowed, and this should never be allowed, to come into this country, under a guaranteed loan from this province of over \$200,000 and take away many of the best birch trees that existed in that part of the province and then walk away, say; "Goodby, we have got what we wanted. We made our couple of million bucks. We have beautiful spools. Now, we shall walk away and leave you holding the bag." No more was done with birch from that day till this until the last several months in the Minister of Industrial Development's Department who helped instigate a programme with Norway. Right, Sir, for many reasons.

This is the kind of thing that we just cannot allow to happen. We cannot have people coming into this province - there is your planning. Some guy comes down and goes up on the eighth floor, walks in, got a wonderful idea. He wants to make some spools. "I do not want to make them here. I just want to get the wood here. The 'labour intense' part of the whole deal is still going to be in New Brunswick or Quebec somewhere. Well, we will give you a few jobs. Guarantee us a couple of hundred thousand dollars and we will wipe you clean. You give us three or four years and we will wipe you clean." "Fine. That sounds great to me," and away goes our birch.

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that under our policy, as it is devised right here, it cannot happen again. It will not happen again. We have all learned from our mistakes. Hopefully members on both sides of the House have learned from projects that have been started in that manner and have shown just how shallow they really were for this province.

Mentioned in the Speech from the Throne that the member for Labrador South apparently was not aware of, unless I misinterpreted what he said, is the access road programme which has been accelerated over the last two or three years, I do not know, a couple of hundred per cent in dollars from what it was previously per year. This is a wonderful thing.

This is a fantastic thing. What crown lands we have got left, if the timber is there and it is over-matured and it is falling down and it is getting rotten, it is about time for somebody to cut it. The only way it is going to be cut by individual operators is if the government comes in with a programme to help put a road into that block of timber so that they can get at it. For an individual operator to try to build an access road to any distance, it is going to cost him a bit of money. Of course he is responsible for offshoots on that road. That is his responsibility but in the main - we in Green Bay last year cut about 10,000 or 15,000 cords of wood in Halls Bay which some supposed experts in Green Bay, at the time, thought was not there, was on crown land. Right now there are about four or five sawmill operators on that access road, right now.

So, by the help of an access road programme by the government, by the help of the Rural Development Authority Programme, with their machines, we are in business. We had sixty or seventy people employed there for seven or eight months, continually. The sawmill operators are still there. Most of the pulpwood has been cut out by an operator and he has moved to another block of land. You see what it did - I mean, there are a lot of indirect effects of this. Because you put an access road into an area just does not mean you are going to get a contractor with twenty men in there. It also means that you need more foresters for this to distinguish what is pulpwood and what is saw log material, what is good for lumber.

Another thing that has gone on too long which I think this forest policy might help to remedy is that the companies have been over the last few decades cutting wood that should never be cut for pulpwood. It is ten times more valuable as lumber or processed product of some sort. It is in the interests of the companies and in interests of this province to stop that kind of thing going on. It is nonsensical. If you are allowed to do it and if a company is in the

there in that area and has 100,000 or 200,000 cords of the wood and a lot of it is lumber and they are not into lumber, they are only into pulpwood, well, sure they will cut it. Sure, it is good wood but how many dollars have we lost over the last twenty or thirty years like that that should have gone into lumber? Millions of dollars we have lost simply because a company was allowed to high-grade its forest, allowed to just swipe it all down. I am almost finished the forest policy.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we move on from forestry although I would like to stay on it a little longer, to the fishery which is on the third page of the Speech from the Throne. Here, I might know something about forestry. However little I know, I know ten times less about the fishery. I know hardly anything. I am only a very, very, very crude layman at this business of the fishery. I have read lots of reports and I have listened to people who are supposedly learned in the field and there does not seem to be any great consensus as to what is needed, especially as it applies to this province.

I do know, for instance, about the trawler programme that was announced and that is now in the process of trawlers being built, that we have not been getting the - have we got enough

here? If we have too many, Sir, if we got too many you better leave.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: You just consider yourself lucky I am giving you the opportunity to say something because you are supposed to be ~~quite~~^{et} right now. You just keep ~~quite~~^{et} now. That is all you can do. You just consider yourself lucky that I am liberal enough, with a small ^{"L"} to listen to you.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the honourable gentleman carry on with it.

MR. PECKFORD: When you keep quite I will. All right? Is that a fair game?

MR. F. ROWE: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is an honourable member supposed to refer to another honourable member as you, or not?

MR. PECKFORD: I withdraw that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to a further point of order. I ask the honourable gentleman to withdraw his vicious and unwarranted attack upon me. I was merely ascertaining whether there were enough of his colleagues present.

MR. PECKFORD: I was giving you the opportunity to do so.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am making a point of order. The honourable gentleman has accused me of a horrible crime and I do hope that he will repent and don sackcloth and ashes and I ask you so to rule.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel that the honourable members are merely involved in a slightly heated debate between each other and it is not really a point of order. Does the honourable member for Green Bay wish to continue?

MR. PECKFORD: I am very sorry. Any comments that I made that were derogatory -

MR. F. ROWE: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member rising on a point of order?

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am. Did the Speaker rule on my original point of order, Sir? I am asking the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Green Bay withdrew his remarks.

MR. PECKFORD: As I was going to say, if I said anything derogatory about the honourable member for White Bay North or the honourable member for Twillingate or the honourable member for Fogo or the honourable member for St. Barbe North or the honourable member for Hermitage, I withdraw them all, every one, every single one. I never would, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to ever get into any kind of this petty business of referring or being derogatory towards any other member. I just would not do it. I mean, that is not what we are here for, Mr. Speaker, is it? No, definitely not. We are here for higher things than that and I am sure the honourable Leader of the Opposition would agree with me.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, back to the fishery. I was just saying that I did not know anything about the fishery.

MR. ROBERTS: And making it quite obvious.

MR. PECKFORD: Exactly. Right. Now, Mr. Speaker, am I allowed to have the floor without hearing from the other side? Could you make sure that these honourable people over there are quite?

It seems to me that if we have banks off our shore where there is fish and we are not catching the quota that has been set, well then it is logical to conclude after that that we must build something to try to catch that extra fish that needs to be caught which legitimately belongs to us under the terms of the agreement signed. Hence, it would seem to me that the continuance of this trawler programme is entirely in order. Hopefully we can look to the day when a lot of these trawlers are completed and it will enhance the fishery of this province a great deal.

Of course, besides that, as is mentioned on the next page of the Speech from Throne, there is some mention here of marine service centers. It is no good having sixty and seventy or eighty foot boats, long liners and mid water trawlers out in the mid water and beyond fishing if we have no centers on shore when they come in

to make sure they are able to be repaired, that the various equipment aboard them is able to be maintained. So, hand and hand with that must be the development of marine service centers and hence that seems to be a programme worthy of note.

Of course, the whole problem in the many areas of the inshore fishery is that you must have fish. It is no good to have your boats and no good to have your marine service centers and all the rest of it unless you have the fish. Of course, perhaps the more we can get into multiple species of fish, the better many of our fishermen will be.

On to energy, Mr. Speaker. I have here something which was in the VOCM news thing today. "Second chance for Newfoundland," says the honourable Leader of the Opposition. "It says the provincial government should not adopt a position at the next Federal/Provincial Energy Conference. That is in Newfoundland's best interest." Mr. Roberts says, "The Progressive Government made a terrible mistake by backing oil-rich Alberta." The point about all of that, Mr. Speaker, that is only crazy. That is only foolishness. That is silly. That is the craziest thing ever I heard because nobody - the energy policy is announced by this government, Mr. Speaker, simply that we are trying to back ourselves, that we are interested in a showing that if and when oil is discovered off our shore that we are going to get a cut of that revenue. To me you are not arguing. It is not a point whether you are going to erode the authority of the Federal Government so that that central government because of this policy is suddenly going to find itself on its knees. Newfoundland, from the way the opposition are speaking, that the Federal Government is soon going to find itself at its knees, that its authority as a central government is going to erode because Newfoundland is saying that we want a fair deal on the offshore resources.

The question is not whether we are backing Alberta. The question is whether we are backing ourselves, whether we are announcing a policy which is going to be in our own best interest.

I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, when some of the honourable members get up on the other side what their policy would be on offshore oil if tomorrow morning it was firmly established by experts that there were substantial commercial finds of oil off there. I would like to know what their policy would be then. I am sure that they would be crying to Ottawa, that under Term 37, under the Terms of Unions and under the British North America Act we have some right to resources off there.

I believe that our stand on this energy thing, especially as it applies to oil, is a right and proper stand. Let there be no doubt that that does not mean - you see the opposition got it planted some how like this, that now government if you go ahead and go up there and you get nasty with Ottawa, you get nasty with "Uncle Ottawa" up there you know because we used to go up there years ago under the previous administration and you have to be very careful. If you go up to Ottawa now after telling them that you are not going to go along with exactly what they say, that now they are going to start cutting off grants to this province. Hogwash! That is the silliest thing ever I heard, that suddenly now we are in trouble with Ottawa, Ottawa is going to clap our fingers and say, okay, Newfoundland, for you taking that stand - you know, it sounds like something that you see almost in the playpen - that because you took that stand now we are going to cut. They cannot do it. We have agreements with these people. We have agreements with these, under equalization. They cannot just suddenly cut us off.

Too long in this province, over the past twenty years, fifteen years at least, we have taken the stand and an attitude with Ottawa which was totally obsolete, which was Victorian, which was almost medieval and that we saw those charades at the energy conferences and at the federal/provincial conferences were we were continually reminded of how desperately poor we were. We could not even stand on our own two feet and make a good argument, legal or otherwise.

We could not stand up and say, sure we are poor off, sure we have one of the lowest per capita incomes in Canada, sure our wages are not that good, sure we have a lot of problems but because of this and this and that, therefore we want something. We want it in a reasonable fashion but not to be continually reminded, as we were for so long, that all we were were this piece of rock stuck off the East Coast of Canada that somehow or another, by historical accident, got into Confederation and now you must keep us forever more. That is not the stand we take. We are individuals and we are people and we have a tradition and a heritage and if we think under a Term 37 or a something else that we have a stand, a legitimate stand with Ottawa, it is our place within the Canadian Confederation to be able to stand up and say, look, we have this Term 37 and we have this and we think we have a good case. So, therefore we should get so much revenue from it. Is that too much to ask? Are we suddenly then to be - could I get some more water please?

I would like to see, Mr. Speaker -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Are you sure it is water you are drinking?

MR. PECKFORD: That does not warrant a comment, Mr. Speaker, I am trying to expound my feelings and ideas as relate to the Speech from the Throne, as relate to certain comments that were made on that speech. I will relegate my comments to a more loftier place were I hope one day the honourable member for Bell Island will reach although it is sometimes very doubtful.

Mr. Speaker, the whole question here on this offshore oil business - I think the opposition have been very wrong here and I was really surprised at one gentleman over there, perhaps two. That is the honourable leader and the House leader for over there, that they would announce the kind of stand that they have or opposition to. I would not say that just because we have

this term and so on that they should support the government completely on this. I think that politically and otherwise that they have made a real mistake. The only problem is that there are quite a few people in this province who are not well versed in energy and so on, and they do not really know the difference between the government's attitude on the energy or the opposition's. If we had a concentrated populace in this province, urban population in this province and they were all following what was going on in the last two or three months they would be in serious trouble with the stand that they are taking. It is too bad they really have not gotten away from their old leader of a couple of years ago because their attitude is exactly the same.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Ask Prime Minister Trudeau.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: He knows. He did not even deal with the purpose of the conference.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was a con job by the federal government.

MR. PECKFORD: It was a con job by the federal government is right. That is neither here nor there. All I am interested in is not the energy conference, I am interested in what this province and what this government are trying to do for the people of this province.

The honourable the member for Bell Island in his keen sensitivity for the humanity of the poor classes of this province should also be keenly interested in that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: This is not consolation - this is where you - this is where, Mr. Speaker, if I can speak in silence. This is where the opposition are wrong, they suddenly interrupt because this province wants to make a firm stand on one policy of many related to the federal government then we are playing consolation politics. We are not permitted to say to Ottawa; look here Ottawa we have some legitimate rights that we want taken care of if oil is ever struck here on the offshore. That

is all we are saying. It is as simple as that.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was the purpose of the conference.

MR. PECKFORD: I am not talking about the conference.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well why are you talking about it then.

MR. PECKFORD: I am talking about our energy policy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes and in which you got copies of it just a little while ago. Let us not get into - I mean at least give me credit enough to know what you are up to now, Mr. Speaker, because what they are getting on with now is absolute hogwash. They are trying to say, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose now - the purpose of this conference of this federal provincial energy conference in Ottawa was to subsidize various parts of this province on oil. So therefore the enunciation by Newfoundland at that time of an energy policy or certain aspects of it was completely irrelevant and completely out of line. That is what they are trying to say.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Well I know that, that is why I had to say it for you, Mr. Speaker. I mean I am quite aware of that.

I have already mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the business of mining and although we often hear and we make political hay out of Buchans and St. Lawrence with its problems in health and so on, nevertheless I would just like to reiterate once again that I think that it is important, that it is very important and significant that this government are trying when concessions are coming due on certain tracks of land, mineral concessions, that it is this government's desire to see that in future these tracks of land be left open for free staking rather than just passed over to some other company under another concession and let it lie for another so many years. If we are going to get some kind of development then we must have a time limit on the concession and allow other individuals besides just big corporations or companies to look for it. In this way hopefully we will be able to explore a lot more of the potential mineral reserves in the province, find them and exploit them.

Mr. Speaker, there is mention as I go on through the speech something that I have referred to already that is simply that it is a policy known by many people they can see it of this government as far as industrial development goes that our policy is twofold. That we at once go ahead with those large projects which are feasible and viable in this province but simultaneously with that to try and uplift those rural areas of the province that we feel have a right to be there and have a future economically and then hence to put funds through the rural development and other avenues in there. Sir, a policy is not one of just second refineries and Lower Churchills but it is of second refineries and Lower Churchills when they are feasible and to the best interest of this province and to try and develop those areas of the province in the fishery or agricultural or forestry where they can be developed. Hence this is why the rural development was set up in the first place.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: No, that is a Green Bay tie. We make our own ties. We have another little industry going out there, the honourable member did not know how that one did he?

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I talked about the business of forest policy coming from a fair amount of planning by this government. One could also talk about the recent general agreement, the development agreement that was signed by this government that was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne the day before it was signed by the Premier and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, the other night on television the Liberal Leader of the Opposition over there in Ottawa, the Hon. the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, spoke very kindly of the planning process that this province have seen in the last couple of years. Contrary to comments erupting from some people on the other side from time to time that we are not taking full advantage of some of the programmes that are available that this attitude has existed for sometime in the past, not only in the past two years.

The honourable minister did speak, that was the Liberal Minister in

Ottawa, of a Liberal Government, who was speaking kindly about a Tory Government in Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Unbelievable.

MR. NEARY: He is hoping to get into the stampede.

MR. PECKFORD: Unbelievable. One would think -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: It is very strange to me. Somewhere in "Hamlet" or something, there is something rotten in the State of Denmark, there must be something good about the Province of Newfoundland. Something must be going right that even a Liberal Minister in a Liberal Government in Ottawa will say publicly on television that the Tory Government in this Province is doing something right. He is pretty satisfied with the way things are going. We are not a bad bunch of fellows at all. We have been doing a few things right. Perhaps that is about the best compliment we could get to indicate to the Opposition the intent and the action of this government.

MR. NEARY: The best compliments are down in Hermitage.

MR. PECKFORD: The honourable member does not have to worry about Hermitage.

AN HON. MEMBER: The honourable member does not have to, we won it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Come to Green Bay the next time. I would dare the honourable member.

MR. NEARY: Get the honourable member's Leader to call an election.

MR. PECKFORD: Come down to Green Bay. If the honourable member is interested in talking about things like that I will challenge it. I will challenge the honourable member to come.

MR. NEARY: Get the honourable member's Leader to call an election.

MR. PECKFORD: There will be an election called in due course. Of all the programmes that have been enunciated so far there is still more to come, you see. So therefore we cannot -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: There is no way.

There is constant action over on this side. Constant action.
It is just unbelievable.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes that is right. That is right. Exactly. The action is just tremendous. I am glad the honourable member is beginning to appreciate it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are words erupting from the opposite side which are extremely off colour to say the least.

AN HON. MEMBER: that is what made him do it.

MR. PECKFORD: Then, Mr. Speaker, we come to the part of the Speech from the Throne dealing with the Royal Commission on Local Government. I do think there are many areas of this province which would benefit substantially from a more reasonable form of government than we have at present, perhaps with a more regional form of government, where it might be possible, I am sure it would be, for smaller communities to become involved and in-the-know for progress as it effects themselves and as it effects the provincial government and their relations to and fro.

So I am hopeful that when this royal commission for local government is brought in there will be some recommendations in it concerning regional government. Now I do not think there should be a blanket policy saying that we believe in regional government throughout this province (full stop) So, therefore, everybody has to go hurly-burly and try to do it. There might be some areas in the province where a regional government is a good thing. There might be other areas where you are going to have to more or less maintain the kind of local government that you have there right now. So

you know, one blanket policy would not be of any consequence, I do not think, but I look forward with eagerness to that report and hopefully that it will have and of course through the planning process of this government it will then be enacted into legislation after the experts have had a look at it. Hopefully it might have some effect on my district and how local government in the future will be carried on.

There is also in the Speech from the Throne - how am I doing. Mr. Speaker, what is the time on me now?

MR. SPEAKER: You have twenty-three minutes left.

MR. PECKFORD: Twenty-three minutes left.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne, also, there is mention of housing and although as a rural member of this honourable House, housing does not, it is not one of my foremost priorities or anything although there is one community of over three thousand people where there is a housing problem, I do appreciate, as a member of the honourable House, that there are many areas, urban and some semi-urban where housing is a big problem and that something has to be done about it. One of the things which affect me and affect the district is that it is very difficult for a very average person with an average wage to build a house. that is right now is going to cost \$20,000 or \$25,000 for anybody to build a two or three bedroom house with a basement and being comfortable and heated well.

So, as you hear, coming out of Ottawa many times, reports and so on that something has to be done about it and I do not profess to know very much about it but I hope, as mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, the government does come to grips with it and that some policy or programme can be announced to subsidize people on middle incomes, well, real low incomes and those even of \$7,000 or \$8,000 a year because it is impossible for anybody on that income to build a house.

It is also pleasing to see, Mr. Speaker, that in the area of education, that the government is trying to get another extended teaching day in vocational schools to increase the enrollment there.

Most public figures are aware and I have read the statistics about various vocational schools and how it is a real problem for somebody coming out of high school or even somebody to come out of the work force to find a position in a vocational school to do a trade, unless, sometimes he has to wait two and three years. This kind of thing has to be remedied because if we are going to continue to have more construction in the Province, if we are going to have more construction, we are going to need more skilled people to do that construction. Then we are going to have to increase the enrollment in these trades to provide for it. Of course, that is one of the ways it can be done. Obviously, there is another way it can be done, that is a larger expense and perhaps it will take a couple of years before that will be a reality and we will see a larger polytechnic or something established to accommodate the extra influx of students.

Of course, mention was also made of the pupil-teacher ratio and that the government intends to try to lower it somewhat. On that pupil-teacher ratio, it always seemed to me and still seems to me that a lot of this pupil-teacher ratio thing depends a lot upon the school, of the administration of the school and particularly the principal of the school and how that is arrived at. A lot can be done, I think myself, talking objectively and completely honest, in a lot of schools now and even for the last ten years if you have a good administrator and a good principal who knows what the scheme is all about and he can usually do a pretty good job with the teachers he has. What the problem is and especially in respects to the high school- now when you get down to the elementary school you are in the problems. There is just no way a teacher can - because in the high school you can get into group participation. You can get into a lecture type thing where you have sixty or seventy grade tens or elevens. You cannot do it where you are talking about grade fours and fives because they have not got the attention span and they are not mature enough to do it.

As it affects certain areas in education, the present pupil-teacher

ratio is not all the fault. A lot of the problem lies at the school level. Of course, that is always the problem in those things in education. Whether the quality of education is going to improve depends so much, not upon the curriculum that is given by or made available by the department or by the government or by the board, it depends to a large extent on the school unit. Very often a school unit, a high school or an elementary school, can on its own introduce other programmes different from what has been offered by the Department of Education or the traditional one that the board usually recommends.

So, a lot of it comes back to the teacher, it comes back to the individual school and that is hard to remedy and it depends a lot on the local level, as far as I am concerned, even though I realize that in primary and elementary schools there must be a lowering of the pupil-teacher ratio in order for any way near teaching and learning process to really be effective. There is no question about that. You cannot teach fifty grade threes, one teacher, keep them in the class all day. It cannot be done. It is impossible.

Mention was also made and a fair amount made out of it by some members about the public tender system. It is suffice to say that, of course, I am in total agreement with that kind of an idea. It is nice to see it coming in now and I am sure that most honourable members of the House would heartily endorse it.

Another area of great advance by this government over the past couple of years is in the area of minimum wage and I know from various people that I have been talking to who usually work on the minimum wage that they felt happy about it. Now it is up to \$1.80 an hour. When we took office in 1972, I think the minimum wage was \$1.25 and then it went to \$1.40 and now it is up to \$1.80 and it is going to continue to go up. That is only in two years.

On the Labrador highway question, I did not understand completely

the ideas that were being expounded by the honourable member for Labrador South but I think he said something along the line that he was not in total agreement with a full scale Trans-Canada standard highway linking up Labrador. Was it something along that line?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. PECKFORD: I do not know what kind of a highway it should - this has been bandied around for quite a few years by politicians and other people and it would seem that if we can get the Quebec Government and the Federal Government along with us putting in our share to build a good gravel road to connect up Labrador - I think it is a good idea. I think it is a great idea. Now whether it should be \$800,000,000, I do not know, I just picking figures out of the air, or \$900,000,000 - what the graded highway should be, I do not know. It would seem to me not knowing too much about Western Labrador, some of those areas, that it would open up a lot of areas and I do not know if you could ever see the day when it would increase the population of the area, I do not know. If we are going to do anything down there and there has always been talk over the years of isolated and so on - this is one way we can bring them out of their isolation and perhaps help -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Enhance some of the areas down there.

MR. PECKFORD: So, anyway, my only comments on the Labrador highways and I am glad to see that we have started negotiations with Quebec and with the Federal Government to try to work out some agreement by the three parties to fund this project. I think it would be in the long run a beneficial thing for the people of Labrador, for the people of Quebec and for the Province of Newfoundland.

On labour, I think we remember hearing last year a fair amount from the honourable Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations about

his work concerning a Labour Standards Code and how he was working on it and I know that he has been. Hopefully, when he returns to the honourable House he will be able to introduce it and that the consolidation of all of these things will be of great benefit, I am sure, to the Province.

Nobody has mentioned very much or taken notice of that part of the Speech from the Throne concerning with Wildlife and I do not know how other members - how much they get from their constituents about Wildlife but I know I do a fair amount and about something that needs to be done here. It says here in the Speech from the Throne that the present government

intend to do something about it, the Wildlife Division of the Department of Tourism will be enlarged.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no quorum, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Clerk please count the House.

MR. PECKFORD: "Mr. Throat is going boy!" I am nearly in but I am going to recap it all again now.

MR. SPEAKER: There is a quorum.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. PECKFORD: It has been said that there is a quorum.

In the area of wildlife, Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, if we are going to continue to have the correct or the right population of wildlife, moose, caribou and so on, we must look after them. I think it is a very good step on the part of the minister here and of the government to enlarge this area. If we are going to continue to have an attraction for tourists, an attraction for our own people into the lesser known areas and the lesser accessible areas of the province, we cannot have it if we do not have the wildlife there to make it attractive.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, there was a programme announced by the Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, called the Capital Assistance Programme, dealing with agriculture, whereby a farmer under this plan, it is an ARDA agreement between the federal and provincial governments, can make use of it. There is already the Farm Loan Board and now there is the Capital Assistance Plan which enhances the chances of anybody who is interested in farming getting into the field. One of the problems in this province with farming, beside the fact that we do not have too much fertile land, but what good agricultural land we do have - it is awful difficult for a man to say tomorrow morning that after he surveys the situation and gets a piece of land for himself to start farming, he wants to go farming full-time. The market is there for the produce, he can see how he can make a living, any economist would pass it, definitely the man can be a farmer, he can make a living at it but how does he live in the interim? Between the time he gets his land

and he wants to go into it, he has to quit his job, from that time until he can get some return on his produce, how does he live? How does he do it? That is the most difficult thing about farming right now in a practical sense in this province. How does he get into it? How can he maintain himself? He has to be a fairly wealthy person to be able to do it. Hence, merchants and so on can do it as an option to their main business and get into it but there is one of the main problems.

Even the Capital Assistance Plan, with all its lucrative grants, well some grants and so on, and two hundred dollars an acre for clearing land rather than one hundred and twenty-five dollars an acre offered by the provincial government, even with that, even given that, it is still difficult in this province to go into farming on a full-time basis from year (1) and be able to maintain a family and maintain a house and so on. I think that is one of the things that has still to be grappled with to some extent.

Perhaps under the new General Development Agreement, it will be possible for anyone going into farming to take advantage of the Capital Assistance Plan but at the same time obtain assistance under the Rural Development Authority with a ceiling of \$30,000 or whatever it is going to be. Then he might do it. Then he might do it. It seems that a farmer very often, although I do not think he is now, has been left out of the scheme of things because there has been less of them but he still is important and we can become self-sufficient in many root crops and in many other areas of agricultural produce just with the land that we have in this province now.

It is unfortunate that we have not up to now, been able to bring more people into farming. I know that in my district, right now, about five or six individuals who want to go into farming full-time and have the land, find it very difficult to do it because of the money involved, the capital expenditure they have to make themselves beside what they get from government. Then they have to live besides about a year or so before they get any produce, before they can sell

anything. It is a difficult job, Mr. Speaker. It is one that I think some more work could be done on.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes left.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I was just about to recap. The whole theme and tenor of my address this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is simply this; that rather than just a change in style as indicated by the honourable member for Labrador South, that this party that now forms the government of this province is a government that have changed in substance from that which came before. By indicating the various aspect of the Speech from The Throne which indicated departure from the past in forestry, in rural development, in mining and in the whole aspect of government for that matter, to plan and then to put those plans into action, it is unquestionably true that this government in its first two years in office have attempted to grapple with many of the problems.

I am quite aware, sensitive too and know all about the problems, especially because I have an affinity with it with the member for Labrador South, in Fox Harbour, Mary's Harbour, Cape St. Charles, Indian Harbour, Williams Harbour, George's Cove, Port Hope Simpson, Square Islands, Charlottetown, Tub Harbour, Snug Harbour and all the rest of them, then on down through the Straits...

AN HON. MEMBER: Cartwright.

MR. PECKFORD: Cartwright is north of that. I know all about them but at the same time in the practical sphere of politics we find ourselves in, I am content and prepared to say honestly and conscientiously as a citizen of this province and as a member of this government, that this party is attempting to grapple with many of the problems that exist and being aware of the tremendous burden placed on us when we took over, both financially and otherwise, and with a lot of disorganization that existed, we have done a fair job in those two years. With the departures into rural development and into forestry, I am optimistic that the next one or two years or three years, whatever the case may be, that this party holds power, that we will pursue some of these ideas

February 7, 1974, Tape 113, Page 4 -- apb

that are mentioned in the Speech from the Throne and make this province a better place in which to live and to stand on our own two feet when we are talking to Ottawa or whomever we are talking to.

Mr. Speaker, after saying that I shall retire. Thank you kindly.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

X
Before I recognize the honourable the Leader of the Opposition; yesterday the honourable Leader of the Opposition gave notice of a motion. I do not have a copy of it here but in gist it was asking the government to appoint a public accounts committee. There was some discussion, and the honourable Government House Leader thought that it was an anticipatory motion and something about the motion not being given in writing.

Going through Beauchesne, I could not find anything which said that a notice of motion had to be in writing although it is very clear that a motion has to be in writing. Therefore, I suppose the Speaker is expected to rule on a notice of motion. It is basically understood that a notice of motion should also be in writing. With regard to the motion being anticipatory, I feel that it is not anticipatory. The only thing that I could find in Beauchesne dealing with this is Standing Order (200), subsection (3), page (168), which says; "A motion dealing with the same subject matter as a bill standing on the Order Paper for second reading cannot be considered." The honourable House Leader gave notice of a resolution I guess, so I found the motion made by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition to be in order.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The House Leader is a shaken man.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The House Leader is a broken man.

X
MR. ROBERTS: I as always accept your ruling and I can only hope that the honourable gentleman who from time to time leads the House, the member for St. John's East, is once again ready to learn a little about procedure. If he lasts long enough, he may learn something.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Minister of Finance is in a jovial mood because the first thing I want to say today is to offer him an apology. On opening day when I addressed a few genteel remarks on the subject of the Throne Speech, I quoted or purported to quote

February 7, 1974, Tape 113, Page 6 -- apb

the honourable gentleman with reference to a statement respecting the Churchill River and its development. Of course that would be the Lower Churchill. I had made the statement earlier, I believe, outside the House, in a press release, so of course I obviously have no desire to claim parliamentary privilege.

The honourable gentleman, on opening day, interrupted me quite rudely but accurately as it turned

out, to say that he did not make the statement. I have checked with the research and I have gone through his statements and so forth and may I say that I accept his word because I have not been able to find any report of where he did in fact say it. I withdraw my remark. I believed he had said it. I think it is an accurate summary of his position on the matter.

MR. WM. ROWE: It is certainly the impression he has given.

MR. ROBERTS: It is certainly the impression he has given and I believe it to be a most accurate summary of the government's position until it was summarily changed by the Premier recently, but the fact remains, I can find no authority, I can cite no reference at all for the proposition that the honourable gentleman made the statement and while I still believe, I can only concede that I must have believed in mistake, so I offer the gentleman an apology. I do so quite wholeheartedly.

MR. CROSBIE: I will explain what I did say when I speak.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that will be fine because the development of the Lower Churchill will doubtless occupy a fair amount of our attention in this session of the House and perhaps indeed we might arrange to have a special debate on it. A good time might be during the debate on the estimates of the Energy Department or perhaps on the Finance Department.

In any event, I want the record to stand corrected. I have no hesitation when I do make mistakes in admitting them and like everybody, I make mistakes. Having said that, do I qualify for a glass of water? Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset, let me set everybody on the other side at rest, the administration, the government which the partisan or nonpartisan, the partisan gentleman from Port au Port told us he thinks it is over the jitters, let me rest him easy by saying I have no intention in my remarks today and tomorrow and Monday and Tuesday and Thursday; on Wednesday of course I shall be speaking

on the amendment which I moved to the debate on Private Members' Day, but in my remarks on the other debate currently on the way, the Throne Speech Debate, I shall not be moving an amendment of no confidence in the government. But I hasten to say, Sir, that this should not be taken as any lack of nonconfidence in this government because I have no confidence at all in their ability to handle the affairs of this province wisely or well.

I have chosen this course of not moving the amendment myself at this time for simple procedural reasons. At some point before the debate concludes, I venture to predict that one of my colleagues, and there will be one left to second it, Sir -

MR. WM. ROWE: Not like that crowd when they were over here.

MR. ROBERTS: One of my colleagues will, I venture to predict, move a motion of no confidence, an amendment to the Address in Reply. I was glad the Address in Reply finally got presented. My colleague, the member for Bell Island will be able to make a speech on the main motion yet. He will be able to make a speech on the amendment and then when we move another amendment and another one and another one, he will be able to make speeches on each of them.

MR. NEARY: That is if my lungs hold out long enough.

MR. WM. ROWE: There is a liability to that. The member for St. John's South has the same privilege.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is a consideration. We will take that into account. In any event, let it just be said the fact that I shall not move a motion is no indication of any lack of nonconfidence, it is no indication of any confidence in the present administration. They have shown even in this session that they cannot even manage the House properly. They could not even get the Throne Speech debate underway properly. This is the same House Leader who could not figure out, he asked you how to adjourn the House really, and now has consistently been ruled out of order on points of order by the Speaker. I have lost one or two tussles myself, Sir, but that is just the luck of the odds when you are at bat constantly, as we valiant few have to be against

those mighty hordes, then we are bound to lose the odd tussle.

So, Mr. Speaker, we shall be having a motion of no confidence and I hope to have a few more words to say then, to express my lack of confidence in the government.

Now, Sir, having made a couple of preliminary remarks, as it were to set the stage, before I launch into the main burden of my speech, let me touch on a few more things that are preliminary - my way of warming up. First of all let me make a brief statement with respect to the amendment of the rules; I believe I am in order so to do.

I shall anticipate the debate which presumably will come on in due course when, I believe it is motion (1), the motion standing in the name of the honourable the gentleman for St. John's East is called, but I believe I am still in order in touching in a brief way, because it was referred in the Gracious Speech, the Speech from the Throne.

My colleagues and I will support any change in rules which will improve the functioning of this House. I believe that most of the changes put forward by the honourable gentleman in his motion will represent such a change. I do not think they will represent very much of a change and indeed, Sir, one of the many disappointments (I was going to say one of the great disappointments but there have been so many it is hard to say this is greater than hundreds of others) of this administration, which started out two years ago with such promise and such promises, has been their complete failure to come to grips with the rules of the House, the question of the rules.

Our rules are outdated, they are antique-dated. They were adopted, the present rules, in 1951, (By the way, would somebody tell the Premier it is not a bill that brings in, it is a motion I believe. The Premier on opening, the poor confused fellow, talked about a bill again.) twenty-three years ago. At that stage, as I understand it, Sir, (I have no direct knowledge my knowledge obviously is hearsay) but at that stage, as I understand it, the rules were written by the then Speaker, Mr. Speaker Sparkes, whose portrait graces the chamber here between (that is Harry Winter? Is it?)

MR. W.N. ROWE: I do not know who that is.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that is Mr. Speaker Sparkes; Mr. Speaker Courage, and Mr. Speaker Clarke and in due course our present Speaker will be hung as well. I hope he is hung for a sheep and not a lamb but he will be hung or hanged. Is it hanged or hung?

MR. DOODY: Hanged is proper.

MR. ROBERTS: No, he will not be hanged on the wall he will be hung.

MR. W.N. ROWE: He will be hung. The Deputy Speaker will be hanged.

MR. ROBERTS: Now we are getting there. That is like the difference, Sir, between a disaster and a catastrophe. If the Deputy Speaker were to fall into the harbour that would be a disaster but if somebody were to pull him out that would be a catastrophe. That is like the difference between hung and hanged.

Mr. Speaker Sparkes aided by intervention, divine or otherwise,

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: He is settled into somnolence again. Mr. Speaker Sparkes and whatever powers came to bear upon it drew up a set of rules which were modelled essentially on the rules of the Pre-Commission House. Much has changed since then, Sir, much has changed. When the government announced that they intended to appoint a rules committee to deal with this matter, we welcomed it. I volunteered to serve myself on the committee because I have an interest in it and because I think it is so important. I asked my colleague, the House Leader, my friend, the member for White Bay South, who has great experience and also has the benefit of a legal mind and legal training, and I asked the gentleman from St. Barbe North, who has been experienced in many forums and many tussels and who would have a great deal to bring to bear.

The other side put up their heavyweights, Sir. They did not ask the Premier to serve, quite properly. They asked the gentleman from St. John's South, erudite and not experienced in the House perhaps but experienced in adversary proceedings, experienced in debate and experienced in the courts and in dealing with complicated matters involving wording. They asked the House Leader; (I suppose they had to) they asked the gentleman from St. John's West, who has made and broken as many rules as any of us and who bears the scars of a period in opposition as well as the scars of a period in government. He has a great deal to offer. They asked the gentleman from Placentia

February 7, 1974, Tape 115, Page 3 -- apb

West as he then was, now the Minister of Mines and Energy. (I do not know why they asked him but they asked him anyway.) He is a bright young fellow.

MR. W.N. ROWE: He was Deputy Speaker then.

MR. ROBERTS: He was then Deputy Speaker. Who was the other one? Oh! Of course, the Minister of Education, as he now is. He was then the minister of something-or-other. They never did define his portfolio.

That was okay because he at that time was spending most of his time in Cambridge pursuing his legal studies. They came to a successful conclusion and, of course, he has now been welcomed to the Bar. He is a counsel with the well-known firm of Marshall, White and Ottenheimer, a very leading firm downtown, a very prestigious firm, one that I would recommend to any honourable gentlemen who needs consultation or counsel or even legal advice. As a member of the union, Sir, I will say that they are in the union.

I understand, as a matter of fact that when the Hon. Minister of Education went to the Bar, the precedent cited for those who may have questioned; well how diligently he articulated, was the precedent of your humble servant, Mr. Speaker, who articulated in a unique fashion with Senator Cook, as he now is, and at that stage a practitioner with the firm which was then, Cook and Bartlett. Indeed the House Leader was a very junior member of that firm but he has since risen in the world. He also articulated with the Hon. Mr. Curtis, who was then Attorney General. I think anybody who has been at all involved in the world of law would know that anybody who can claim to have been a bridge between Senator Cook and Mr. Curtis on a legal matter or almost any other is in a somewhat unique position.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible).

MR. W. ROWE: You have hurt "Bill's" feelings.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry if I have hurt his feelings, Sir. I was trying to praise up his firm and I hope that the press will report today that the firm of Marshall, White and Ottenheimer - I am not saying that they need the business, Sir, indeed I have no reason to think they need or do not need business. I have no hesitation in recommending it. If anybody should want at any time some legal aid or legal advice they could do a lot worse than Marshall, White and Ottenheimer.

MR. NEARY: A few more inquiries, I could use them myself.

MR. ROBERTS: My colleague from Bell Island is one of the largest

consumers of legal services in Newfoundland. At any given time, half the Bar are either investigating him or defending him and at least half of the high courts are involved in hearings.

MR. NEARY I still come out smelling of roses.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, I detect a note of levity creeping into my attempt to log the gentleman from St. John's East. I am nearly as hurt as he is, Sir. I am standing on my dignity, he is sitting on his. I am deeply offended and hurt at the note of levity which is creeping into this debate, Sir. I would think that after the levels of contributions which we have had - the gentleman from Green Bay, the gentleman from Bonavista South, in an earlier debate and the general level of contribution that we should not have any witticisms or any levity. I am sure Your Honour would agree. Your Honour nearly bit off your honourable Honour's tongue.

As I was saying, Sir, the rules committee was a very top group. I suspect that of the forty-two eligible members of that committee, the forty-two members of this House, without offence to any who are not on the committee, one could not have drawn eight men better qualified. Well, Sir, they laboured mightily, not quite night and day but there were many mornings, Sir, down in the board room of the Department of Labour, when they laboured. We laboured. Coffee came in, tea came in, unfortunately that is all. Nothing came out, Sir, because the report of the committee to which I subscribed was the most disappointing document that could have been imagined. Mr. Speaker, the committee refused to come to grips, completely refused to come to grips with the real problems of the rules of this House. The report which we now have, which stands in effect as a motion on the Order Paper, the results of the report, we shall support; with one exception (I will deal with that in a second) - we shall support

them because we think they are an improvement. It is essentially the formulization of some procedures which have become customary.

May I add, Your Honour, as Your Honour full knows, that many honourable gentlemen may not realize that the rules of this House are both written and unwritten. The unwritten rules, those which are enshrined in precedent, in Speakers' rulings and in decisions taken, are as real and are as binding as the codified orders of the House or indeed the Beauchesne to which we refer when our orders are silent. These rules are as real as are written. All that has happened in this motion, this report, is that we have dealt with a few minor matters, codified

notified them, set them on a more regular basis, that is good. I welcome it and we should support it.

Mr. Speaker, the report is a disappointment. It is a serious disappointment. My first positive suggestion for the day is to ask the government to reconstitute that committee with or without the same members, as they wish. We shall on our side name our share in the traditional way and the government on their side shall name theirs and the Speaker shall appoint. But let them reconstitute the special committee on the rules, Sir. A vast amount of work was done. We had a very capable staff. We had the services of Your Honour's chief clerk, the Clerk of the House, and we had access to other people as need be. Let the committee get back to work to deal with the real issues of this House, the issues of whether or not we should look at limiting debate. Should we or should we not? We hear on the other side a great number of complaints about how lengthy debate is and I must say on our side from time to time we do find it tedious. Should we deal with that?

Should we look elsewhere, other jurisdictions? Ottawa? Ontario? Other provinces have brought in new rules dealing with this question, dealing with a number of other substandard issues; all of which the committee came up against quite squarely and about-faced, marched away. It was a great disappointment.

MR. WM. ROWE: It is pathetic to see the House Leader try to take the credit.

MR. ROBERTS: Well let the House Leader take credit for it. I want no part of the credit for it, because there be no credit. It deserves no credit. It is a pathetic report.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did all members sign it?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes we signed it. Sure. We agreed with it. Of course we agreed with it.

AN HON. MEMBER: I will have to talk to the House Leader.

MR. WM. ROWE: It is all right as far as it goes.

MR. ROBERTS: We wanted it to go further. We pressed it to go further

and we are willing still to go further. If the government genuinely want to come to grips, the House Leader has come into this House, as I suspect many honourable members have and it is an honourable ambition to make a name for himself, an honourable ambition. Let him. Mr. Speaker, the House Leader has come in to win a name for himself, to add further luster to the law firm of Marshall and White and Ottenheimer, not quite as euphonious as Martin and Barton and Fish, Franklin Roosevelt used to talk about, but harmonious, euphonious.

Marshall and White and Ottenheimer, if Ottenheimer only had one less syllable it would be home free. It would nicely fit into a riddle. He chose as one of his topics the quite worthy reform of the rules. But it has come to nothing. We have laboured and laboured almost in vain, indeed, Sir, the only substantive point in the report is one to which we originally agreed but on reflection and upon seeing the conduct of the chairman of committees decided we could not accept and accordingly

the report has in it an addendum noting our dissent on that point. We will deal with this in great length when the motion comes before the House. We shall deal with it in great length but we do feel that that recommendation would give an unscrupulous and biased chairman an utterly unwarranted weapon and with regret I say that we feel that we have such a chairman of committees now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame!

MR. ROBERTS: Shame on him, yes, shame on him. We thought he was a fair gentleman. We were prepared to go and to submit to his rulings but his conduct in the Chair, Mr. Speaker, was such that we were forced to put down a vote of censure.

MR. WM. ROWE: His conduct outside the House as well.

MR. ROBERTS: His conduct outside the House and we regret that we no longer have confidence in his ability and accordingly we cannot support any change in rules.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it is unheard of to have a Deputy Chairman who is partial.

MR. CROSBIE: In what way?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I shall debate this when the time comes, but in what way, explain a man who reverses himself in the Chair on a major ruling and gives no reason for it, only a dinner break and consultation with his partisan colleagues, a

man who makes an attack, a vicious and as it turned out unwarranted and brutal personal attack upon another member. Fair enough for the partisan, for those of us who are partisan -

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

I feel because the honourable gentleman now being referred to is presently in the Chair, it is completely out of order to have an attack on that individual.

MR ROBERTS: Would Your Honour care to make a ruling?

MR SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg) Maybe the situation is not unprecedented in the parliamentary system. It is rather difficult to make ruling on such a matter as the honourable member for Bonavista South has brought up. In due course Mr. Speaker will resume the Chair and maybe the honourable Leader of the Opposition might resume his speech at that point. However, the Chair is quite willing to sit and listen in an impartial manner.

MR ROBERTS: I thank Your Honour. Let me say that I do not take any notice of who is sitting in the Chair as the Speaker, whoever is in the Chair. Sometimes it is the Member for Port au Port, sometimes it is some other honourable gentleman; and I have no control over whether one honourable gentleman or another would be sitting in the Chair at any particular moment. Gentlemen come and gentlemen go, and so be it!

As for the point of order: it was as specious as most of the honourable gentleman's arguments. What I have said I am saying in the open House and saying, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that every member of this House has rights and I believe that the opposition and the government have rights and I believe it is the duty of any leader of any opposition to fight for those rights. And we shall do so!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR ROBERTS: We shall do so. I hold no brief with personalities. I have made no mention of personalities. I have made mention of conduct of a member of this House, a man who was honoured with our unanimous support by being made deputy chairman, and in our view has shown himself unworthy of that office.

MR CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I move that Your Honour should vacate the Chair and let us get Mr. Speaker in to deal with this matter.

Oh! Mr. Speaker is in. Right!

Well then, Mr. Speaker, I want to object to the remarks now being made by the Leader of the Opposition. The first point I am able to look up here in the short time available: What he is now saying is a libel on a member of the House and is therefore a breach of the privileges of the House. He is attacking the conduct and the character of a member of the House in his capacity as Deputy Speaker: and I believe that is a breach of the privileges of the House.

In addition to which, it is unheard of to have these kind of remarks about an official of the House in this manner without a resolution before the House or a motion before the House, entirely improper. How are we to deal with it, when the honourable gentleman opposite makes these charges without us being in any way able to deal with them or vote on them? I mean, it is a serious abuse of the parliamentary position for the Leader of the Opposition to be making these remarks about the Deputy Speaker, in this Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. It is unheard of: all of which is reported. What he is attempting to do, obviously, is to make it impossible for the Member for Port Au Port to function as the Deputy Speaker of the House: although he has been elected by the members of this House as Deputy Speaker. I have been in this House since 1966 and I have never heard nor seen this happen before.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Oh no!

MR CROSBIE: There was a motion moved before.

MR SPEAKER: ORDER!

MR CROSBIE: And this is entirely improper procedure, Mr. Speaker.

MR ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to that point of order:

I have not libeled the gentleman from Port Au Port because truth is a defence to libel and what I have said in this House I have said out. If he should wish to take a writ against me, he has the same recourse to Her Majesty's Courts as does any of Her Majesty's subjects.

My solicitors, of course, stand ready to meet his, at dawn or anywhere else.

Secondly, secondly, Sir, I am dealing with remarks made or arising out of remarks made by the honourable gentleman when he entered the debate previously. And he himself raised the subject, Sir, I did not.

Thirdly; substantive motion was put down last year. The government did not call it. It stood as a private member's motion and it stood in its proper chronological order and it was not called. Not my fault! I do not set the orders for the House nor do I have allocation of government time. If the government wished to deal with that matter, they should have dealt with it - they could have called it at any moment.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the conduct of an official of this House: The honourable Deputy Speaker is not an official of the House, Sir, he is our Deputy Speaker. Officials are the gentlemen who sit between the two

sides and have the misfortune to have to listen to both sides. I do not know if they listen but they are in the middle when the speeches are made. I submit there is no point of order and I submit that my remarks are in order. I do not find them very pleasant, I wish I did not have to make them. I only wish the Deputy Speaker was as one-half as impartial as Your has shown himself. We have no hesitation in accepting rulings of Your Honour. Sometimes they go against and sometimes they go for. Your Honour is impartial. I regret that the gentleman from Port au Port is not impartial. I submit there is no point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: I would like to give Your Honour a citation from Beauchesne, page (197), paragraph (232), sub-paragraph (2): "If a member wishes at any time to call in question the conduct of the Chairman in the execution of his duties, the proper course is to give notice of a motion to that effect in due course."

The motion has not been given. It is entirely improper, Mr. Speaker, for the honourable the Leader of the Opposition to be carrying on in this manner. We have become accustomed to this type of carrying on so we just barely tolerate it because we have to tolerate the honourable Leader of the Opposition who refuses to act in a responsible manner befitting his office in this House. Your Honour, there is no reason why we should have to tolerate this type of blatant attack when it is not authorized by the merchant of nastiness himself.

MR. SPEAKER: I was not in the Chair and I must admit I was on the telephone and I did not hear the origin of the remarks by the honourable Leader of the Opposition. From what I did hear I consider the thing to be a very serious matter. I am not ruling now if indeed charges were made but I would like to get the copy of the Hansard and read the whole thing and make a ruling on it or some decision on it possibly tomorrow. In view of this I would wish that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition refrain from making any more comments re this matter until such a decision has been made.

Certainly page (197), sub-section (2) seems to be quite in order as quoted by the honourable Government House Leader. I shall get the transcript of the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition and have some ruling on it, hopefully tomorrow.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, of course I shall abide by your ruling without any hesitation. I made no charges against the Deputy Speaker, I was explaining when I am allowed to, explaining our position with respect to the matter of the rules, the matter which was referred to in the Throne Speech and the matter which will come before the House, hopefully, in due course.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn very briefly, because the House will rise in four or five minutes, to some figures used by the Premier on opening day. Now, Sir, here I am prepared to make a charge. I regret that the Premier is not here but again that is not my fault. We would need a pot of glue to keep the man in his seat. Presumably he has other business more important than the House but he is not here.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Yes maybe he is in a nursery, it would be good practice. Mr. Speaker, on opening day, as evidenced in Hansard, tape 16, PK - 2, page (47), the Premier said; "It is also a fact that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics (by which I think he meant Statistics Canada, there being no Dominion Bureau of Statistics for the past two or three years) at the end of December, this year, there were 178,000 employed for an increase of 38,000 people. These are 38,000 new jobs. There are 9,000 more unemployed." There is no question about that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those figures at best, I do not accuse the Premier of lying, lying requires the intent to deceive and I do not think the Premier had such an intent. I do say, Sir, that the figures are totally false and misleading and I invite the Premier to retract them and to apologize to the House for misleading the House. The facts are, Sir, the facts are that the Premier said the end of December 1971, 139,000 Newfoundlanders employed, 177,000 at the end of

February 7, 1974, Tape 119, Page 3 -- apb

December 1973. This was not the first time the Premier had used these remarks, Sir. He made them in a number of prepared texts so I do not think he can be heard to say

say that these were off the cuff or an unfortunate slip of the tongue. I do not know if he had them written out on Opening Day or not but I say that the House was misled and I invite the Premier to withdraw them.

The facts are, Sir, the facts are to the contrary -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition charging and saying in this honourable House that the Premier misled this House?

MR. ROBERTS: Is the Hon. the Premier here?

MR. MORGAN: He should be made withdraw that statement.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I say the Premier did mislead the House. I have been saying it, and I will say it again. The honourable gentleman is so far to the rear of the Chamber that he could be excused not hearing what I said. But let me make it clear to him, the figures given by the Premier on Opening Day which he had used earlier on other occasions outside of this House were incorrect and they misled the House. I say that. I repeat it. It is true.

The facts are - the facts are, Mr. Speaker, and my facts come from Statistics Canada and from the Planning and Priority Secretariate and I will table them. The Hon. the Minister of Finance is familiar with them and he knows what has happened as well as I do. That as of December 1973 there were 151,000 people employed in Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: That is not a point of order. It is specious.

AN HON. MEMBER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman knows nothing about rules let him try and learn. There were not 177,000, there were 151,000, Sir. I invite the Premier the next time he honours this House with his presence, graces it for the few moments, finds a few moments in his busy day for the House of Assembly, to set the record straight. There were not 38,000 new jobs created, there were 19,000 between December 1971 and December 1973. I am prepared to table this information, if need be. I

am prepared to send it to the press. But I make the statement, I do not charge the Premier of lying. I do not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a moment or so before 6:00 o'clock, if the House Leader wishes - well. I shall move or if he wish to, I shall yield to him for the purpose of moving -

AN HON. MEMBER: Adjourn the debate.

MR. ROBERTS: That the debate do now adjourn, and then in due course if he want to make the motion that the House Leader traditionally makes at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been noted that the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition moved the adjournment of the debate and shall commence same if he so desires on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday at 3:00 P.M.

Motion, that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, February 8 at 3:00 P.M. , carried.