



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 43

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, APRIL 8, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. R. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I have not up until now had the honour of presenting a petition in this honourable House. It never rains but it pours and today I am going to present five. I would ask the indulgence of the House.

The first, Mr. Speaker, is on behalf of the honourable member for Lewisporte. It says, "We, the undersigned do hereby urgently request that the section of dirt road from Loon Bay to Boyd's Cove on the Road to the Isles be upgraded and paved starting this summer of 1974. The aforesaid section of road is in a deplorable condition to the point where it is almost impassible at the present time. This section of road is part of the main thoroughfare from the Trans Canada Highway to the Town of Twillingate where the hospital for the area is located.

"We, the Local Improvement Committee of Birchy Bay suggest that you present this petition to the House at your earliest convenience. We anticipate a favorable and early reply from you and your colleagues."

That, Mr. Speaker, is signed. I have not counted them all but it seems to me, I would suggest that there are close to 1,000 names of residents of the area affixed to that petition.

Before saying a word or two on the petition itself, Mr. Speaker, I propose to read the other petitions as well and then I will come back to this matter of roads.

The second petition, Mr. Speaker, reads: "We, the undersigned citizens of Kilbride, in the electoral district of St. John's South -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would agree to separate the petitions because we may or may not on this side of the House want to comment on the individual petitions. So, I think it would be in order, Sir, if the petitions were presented separately.

MR. WELLS: Well, I am in a good mood and if that would help the honourable member I would be delighted.

MR. E. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: Is that so? Very well.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not a matter of grace. It is a matter of principle.

MR. W. ROWE: The honourable the Leader of the Opposition is graceful as usual.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, on the question of the road from Loon Bay to Boyd's Cove, and the Road to the Isles, this is a road of course that has been built now some years. It carries a lot of traffic because it has I suppose almost the status of a trunk road really. It carries a lot of traffic from these islands, the island of Notre Dame Bay, in through Boyd's Cove and in of course to Central Newfoundland, to the branching out to the areas of Gander, Grand Falls, all of Central Newfoundland and the rest of the province.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that when a road carries a certain amount of traffic - this has been proven over and over again in practice - that no matter how well it is attempted to keep up a road, a gravel road that is, when a certain amount of traffic uses it, it is a failing proposition, a proposition that one cannot win. The amount I suspect in some of these cases spent in maintenance exceeds, over a period of four or five years, the cost of paving.

So, that road, the Road to the Isles, as it is called, there is no question about it that the traffic over that road is sufficient to warrant paving. The people who have to use it suffer what people who have to use unpaved roads always suffer in terms of damage to motor vehicles. It is not just a question of comfort. It is a question of dollars and cents when you have to have a new muffler, a new tail pipe, a new car perhaps two or three years sooner than one otherwise ought to have.

I would in the case of this petition, Mr. Speaker, refer it or ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates, which of course is Transportation and Communication, and urgently ask all

members in the House to support this petition on behalf of the member from that area.

MR. GILLETTE: Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for everybody on this side of the House and in fact on both sides of the House when I support this petition. I would also add that apart from the road between Loon Bay and Boyd's Cove there are three miles beyond Boyd's Cove, still on the Road to the Isles, that needs upgrading and paving. I believe that this section if not worse, is equally as bad as the section between Loon Bay and Boyd's Cove.

Both these sections, particularly in the spring, become just about impassible. They both are bad, really bad. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Transportation and Communication along with his colleague, the Minister of Finance, together will be able to see fit to upgrade and pave this section of the road. It is needed very badly, I assure you.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, the second petition which I have is from the citizens of Kilbride in the electoral district of St. John's South.

It says; "We, the undersigned etc. respectfully petition the honourable House of Assembly and the Government of Newfoundland to accede to the request of the St. John's Metropolitan Area Board that a guarantee be provided which would enable the St. John's Metropolitan Area Board to construct phases two and three of the water and sewerage project of Kilbride.

* The first phase of the water and sewerage project was completed in 1972 and for reasons of health and public convenience the second and third phases are of extreme urgency and importance.

Respectfully submitted by 300 residents of Kilbride."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the scheme of things it is hard for one to say which is more important to the given time in Newfoundland today or in a given district, roads or water and sewerage. But I think that when the density of population reaches a certain point then it seems to me that it may be that water and sewerage is even more important than pavement, because pavement is a matter of convenience and money. In other words, the damage to vehicles you get without it, but water and sewerage is even more serious because without water and sewerage you come to the health hazard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Kilbride has now reached that point. The first phase was completed more than a year ago. The second and third phases are planned. They are ready to go. The Metropolitan Area Board is ready to let the contract. The price has been arrived at or at least what it ought to cost. Everything is ready to go. The Metropolitan Area Board intends and proposes to borrow the money to construction it and the people of Kilbride will then pay for it as part of a regular assessment by the board.

So in other words, the people of Kilbride, Mr. Speaker, are not asking the government to dip into general tax revenue and pay for this. They are asking the government to guarantee the loan by the Metropolitan Area Board which over a period of years, twenty years I think allowed by law, will be repaid by the citizens of Kilbride.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Metropolitan Area Board has asked for this

commitment. The answer has not yet been given but it is a matter of extreme seriousness to the people because Kilbride is growing very, very rapidly. There are three or four new subdivisions that have gone there in the past year. People are building, residents of Kilbride and people are moving into the area and building. If water and sewerage are not provided there then within a matter of a year or two, in fact already there exists a health hazard. This is something, Mr. Speaker, which is of vital concern and as I say, it is not a case of asking the government to provide the money, these people will pay this back just as the people of the first phase are paying it back. It is simply guarantee. I would hope that I would have the unanimous support in presenting this petition of every member of this House because it is vital and necessary that this work be done.

So I will table this petition, Mr. Speaker, and ask that it be conveyed to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman for Bell Island.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that on this side of the House we support the petition on behalf of the residents of Kilbride who are anxious to proceed with the second and third phases of their water and sewerage, Sir.

But I may point out to the member who presented the petition that his philosophy that he mentioned about the Metropolitan Area Board borrowing the money is not new. All petitions that have been presented in this honourable House, Sir, concerning water and sewerage, are financed in the same way, and this has been going on for years.

The municipalities borrow the money on a guarantee from the government and it is financed under the Municipal Loan Board. There is nothing new in that. That is perfectly normal. The member is absolutely justified, of course, in asking to have it done. I just want to point out to the House, however, that this is not a new concept at all, Sir. It is something that has been followed in this province for years and years and something that concerns probably the Minister of Finance greatly because the Municipal Loan Fund is climbing rather rapidly in this province.

We support the petition, Sir, because, as the member rightly pointed out, the area is becoming heavily built up down there. There have been a couple of new subdivisions down there in the last couple of years. It is almost as bad now, Mr. Speaker, as the South Shore of Conception Bay. It will be if something be not done about it. I noticed the minister, when he was presenting the petition, did not tell us if the controversial situation that arose there a year or so ago, that the member got caught in the middle of, concerning water and sewer rates down there, has been cleared up or not.

AN HON. MEMBER: That has been resolved.

MR. NEARY: That has been resolved. Well, I am certainly glad to hear that, Sir. We do support this petition. We hope that when the Minister of Finance brings down his budget on Wednesday or Thursday, whenever it is, (My understanding is Wednesday of this week) that there will be money allocated to do this work down at Kilbride and all the other municipalities in Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I have here a petition which reads:

"We the citizens of the Old Blackhead Road, living in the area one mile beyond Shea Heights, hereby petition the honourable House of Assembly and request that one mile of pavement be laid on the road fronting our properties as the amount of traffic on the said road is heavy and the road condition is very bad during most times of the year, especially in spring and summer.

"It is respectfully requested that the honourable House of Assembly and the government take steps to correct this appalling situation." That is signed by in excess of one hundred residents who live along that road.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, by way of an explanation, that that is the road which is still unpaved and it begins where the development of the new Shea Heights ends. It goes on out to the Community of Black Head, which is a distance of about five to six miles, and then from there goes on out to the park at Cape Spear. It is very unfortunate that it is now 1974 and twenty-five years of Confederation have passed and that road has not been paved, although it is a federal park, out at the end of it. It is a very scenic spot and it is a very necessary spot in my view for a very necessary road to be paved.

The one mile from the end of the Shea Heights Development out that road, which has houses on both sides of it, near the area of Beaver Pond, for that one mile not to be paved, is absolutely appalling, Mr. Speaker, as the petition says. There are people living on it. It is rough, it is dusty, it is dangerous. I do not think a great deal would have to be done by way of upgrading and I imagine that pavement could be laid up that road at a cost of approximately \$100,000 or \$150,000. Whereas the road to Blackhead and to Cape Spear is important and deserving of attention, this particular piece of road for the convenience of the residents who live there, is absolutely vital, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask that this petition be tabled and referred to the Department of Transportation and Communications to which it refers. I would hope that I will have the support and sympathy of all members of the House in this matter.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House in support of the petition presented by the Member for St. John's South. I certainly agree with the prayer of the petition, especially at this time of the year when the roads are practically

almost impassable, that is the dirt roads in the province. I had the experience just this weekend of driving over the road from Eastport to Buraside and the road is practically impossible for any ordinary car, one would almost need a four-wheel drive vehicle. One of the roads going down into St. Chad's was washed out altogether. One could not travel over it. I imagine the road that the member is speaking about, at this time of the year, is possibly in the same condition as are many other roads throughout the province. Of course, the only answer for this is to have these roads paved.

Mr. Speaker, I fully sympathize with the prayer of the petition, when I realized the hardships that these people go through, especially during the summer months because of the extreme dusty conditions.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House certainly support the petition and we trust that the Minister of

Transportation and Communications will see fit to have this little bit of pavement laid during the coming season.

MR. NEARY: An anniversary present.

MR. THOMS: An anniversary present, yes.

MR. WELLS: This petition which I have here is virtually on the same matter and I will present it without much comment because I have already commented on the position. It says:

"We the undersigned residents of Blackhead Road and vicinity request immediate attention be given to the condition of Blackhead Road from Shea Heights to Blackhead," and in that sense it is different from the other petition.

"We understand that this road is due for upgrading and paving this year and we hope that this work will start as soon as possible."

So having made my comments I can present that without further comment and perhaps nobody else would care particularly to comment or would they? Well before the honourable member gets up, the points that I made are such, Mr. Speaker, that this is not only for the Community of Blackhead but to the park. It is one of the most beautiful areas in the whole greater St. John's Area and I think deserving not only of sympathetic consideration but deserving of practical consideration in terms of taxpayers dollars for upgrading and subsequently paving.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for White Bay South.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise on behalf of my colleagues to support the petition presented by the member for St. John's South. We think the road he has referred to should be upgraded and paved. I have considerable sympathy for his problem. I have been in contact with some residents of my own constituency. Members may have heard on the radio today one particular instance, the road from Fleur de Lys to Baie Verte, twelve miles long. It is taking people one and a half hours to traverse that distance by car, Mr. Speaker, because of the condition of the road, which

is less than ten miles an hour; it comes to about eight miles an hour I believe.

So it is with considerable sympathy that I rise to support the honourable member's petition in respect of his own district. I do hope that the government can find the money to look at the roads that he is so concerned about and at the same time find some money to reinstate the project I just referred to which had been commenced some four years ago, an upgrading programme for that section of road. When this present administration got into power that particular project was deleted, taken off the list, Mr. Speaker, and no further work was done on it and as a result you have 150 workers going back and forth the road every day to Advocate Mines who are being bogged down, people going back and forth to the hospital, school children going back and forth to school, over nothing short of atrocious, deplorable road conditions. So while supporting the honourable member's petition, I also throw in a word or two on behalf of my own constituents, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, the last of these petitions comes also from that one mile between the present Shea Heights out toward Blackhead where the mile with the residents live along is. It says:

"We the undersigned ask for water and sewerage to be put in our homes this summer." It is not perhaps the normal wording of a petition but it is very clear what the residents are concerned with.

This is not too difficult a project. It would be a project I think that ought to be undertaken and would be undertaken in the normal course of things if the guarantee were available by the Metropolitan Board. The services have already been put in Shea Heights at considerable cost but I think that it has been justified. Shea Heights, and I do not know if members have driven up there recently but Shea Heights is turning into and will become a very worthwhile and beautiful community. Some very fine homes have been built there and

there is no question about it, it has improved out of all recognition in the last four or five years.

To provide water and sewerage for the people that this petition concerns, which is approximately a mile of road, would require tapping on to the present system which technically as I understand it would pose no difficulty and which can be done and I earnestly submit on behalf of these residents, Mr. Speaker, should be done.

I hereby ask that this petition be tabled and referred again to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Placentia East.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the sheep breeders in the St. Bride's Area. There are a number of individuals on the Cape Shore who in accord with a long time historic custom in Newfoundland keep sheep. But this particular area, Mr. Speaker, is well adapted to sheep raising and in fact they have a very, very large community pasture in the St. Bride's Area and the prayer of this petition is that a road be constructed, an access road, from the area

where they round up these sheep to an auction pen. Last year they brought in a system of auctioning the sheep on the Cape Shore. It was very, very successful and it brought some great prices or more attractive prices to the sheep breeders in the area.

Now, the petitioners bring to our attention that while it may be considered a minor matter and a very short road yet the sheep have to travel through bog for a distance of approximately one mile. During this time they become very, very dirty and as a result when they reach the auction pen they look very, very dirty and they feel that the prices they receive at the auction is certainly detrimentally affected by the appearance of the sheep after travelling through this bog. They have estimated their loss at approximately two dollars a sheep.

Now there were eight hundred sheep there last year, raised in the area. This year it is estimated that there will be one thousand sheep and these one thousand sheep will produce approximately fifteen hundred lambs.

As you can imagine, Mr. Speaker, this will be a large number of sheep and, at the price of meat today, it brings a fair amount of income to the people in the area. In fact, it says in terms of income the sheep referred to will represent an investment for them of \$37,500 and divided amongst the number of sheep breeders, which is only approximately fifty, it would mean a substantial income for those people who supplement their other income from the fisheries.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is not a very, very costly matter and I sincerely trust that the department concerned will see fit to provide the funds for the construction of that road.

If I may be permitted another reference, Mr. Speaker, that the petition also brings to my mind, and that is that this year there is a substantial increase in the pasture feed. This has presented a heavy burden to these individuals. The prayer of the petition is as well as for the construction of this road is to ask the minister to have this House request the Minister of Agriculture to review his

decision respecting the increase in rates paid or expected to be paid by individuals who use these pastures to raise their sheep.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates. I anticipate the support of all members.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member from Bonavista North.

MR. P.S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we have no hesitation whatsoever in rising to support the petition from the cattlemen of St. Brides. We believe that the government of the day and of course any government should do all in its power to encourage our farmers in Newfoundland to raise more livestock so that we may in turn produce more meat for the people of our Province.

I also support the portion of the petition which would like to see the high pasture fees revoked, which have been invoked by the minister in the past couple of weeks or so. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that these fees are exorbitant. They will drive many of our people who are in the livestock business out of business. I would also like to have my word that I would like to see the minister review these fees with the idea of withdrawing them before the rents are paid for the pastures during the coming season.

MOTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Finance.

MR. J.C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move The House Resolve Itself Into A Committee Of The Whole to consider a Certain Resolutions For The Granting Of Supply To Her Majesty."

Mr. Speaker, I will also move That On Wednesday next priority be given the government's motion on Ways And Means And Supply."

It was planned, Mr. Speaker, to bring the budget down on Wednesday, with the concurrence of the official opposition. I have not had a chance to ask the member for Labrador South, as a matter of fact I forgot but he nods his consent, I think. With the consent of the Opposition, we plan to bring the budget down on Wednesday and the budget speech will be delivered then. I therefore give the above notice of motions.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, for our part, we have agreed that as far as we are concerned

Sir, any private members business will not take priority on Wednesday and that the minister, as it is tradition I believe and the way in this honourable House, the minister will give his Budget Speech, his rendition of the Budget Speech on Wednesday coming. The minister might like to also like to inform the House what he intends to do thereafter because I understand there is going to be an adjournment to give members a chance to study the speech on the estimates.

MR. CROSBIE: If our House Leader concurs - Does he concur, Mr. Speaker?

I understand that it has been agreed that the House will adjourn after the Budget Speech until a week, the following day, until a week, the next day, Thursday 18, for the Easter adjournment. Actually there is so much food for thought in this Budget that it will take at least one week for everyone to digest it.

QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. B. ROWE: I would like to address a question to the Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications. Have tenders been called for the reconstruct and paving of the local roads in Flat Bay and Highlands, in the provincial District of St. George's?

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

HON. T. P. HICKEY (MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS): Mr. Speaker, I will advise the honourable gentleman later this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Labrador South.

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Hon. the Minister of Health. It is a matter of some urgency at this time because I have been informed by certain officials in the civil service that the funds in question have to be disposed of one way or another in short order, in a matter of days I believe it is. It concerns the proposed clinic at Port Hope Simpson. Now the question is in two parts really; Does the minister intend that his department administer this fund for the construction of the clinic? If not, will the minister undertake to have this money deposited to the account of the Community Council at Port Hope Simpson so that the council may get on with the

job? One or the other?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Health.

DR. A. T. ROWE (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the honourable member, we will have to speak to him outside of the House and try and get the details and ascertain the situation. I am not cleared up on the details at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. ROWE, F. B. Another question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Approximately one week ago the minister undertook to find out whether or not a plan for the proposed road has been drafted up by the officials of his department, through the provincial District of St. Barbe North. I wonder whether the minister has the answer to that question yet.

MR. HICKEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not.

MR. ROWE, F. B.: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate when he will be able to get this information, Sir?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, just as soon as I am in a position to inform the honourable member what is to be done in his district, I will do so. That is what I told him that day and that still stands.

MR. ROWE, F. B.: Mr. Speaker, just to straighten out the question, I think the honourable minister might have misinterpreted my question. I am asking the minister whether plans have been drawn up for a proposed road to go through the District of St. Barbe North. I will be only too happy to hear whether there is any actual work going to be carried out but the question I am asking is; have there been plans drafted for a proposed road?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, there are always plans to attend to roads in every district in the province. I am not aware of any district that is not represented in terms of an overall roads programme. It is something else what is approved and what eventually ends up in any particular programme for any given year. This is why I would advise the honourable member, when I am in a position to advise him what would be done in his district, I certainly would. I cannot confirm. It is certainly not my knowledge that at any time that St. Barbe North, indeed any other

district in the province where there is a need for road work, it is not represented in an overall programme by my department.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Twillingate.

MR. H. W. C. GILLET: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question that I would like to direct to the Minister of Tourism, Mr. Speaker. That is, what amount of the \$113,800 will go to the Clarvenville Shipyard for the restoration of the motor vessel "Norma and Gladys"?

HON. T. M. DOYLE (MINISTER OF TOURISM): I will have to take that as notice, Mr. Speaker. I will get the answer for the honourable member.

MR. GILLETT: Well I have a supplementary question, if I may, Mr. Speaker. I am just wondering whether or not tenders were called for the restoration and if not, why not? Or how the work of restoration was awarded?

MR. DOYLE: I will include all of that in the answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Fogo.

CAPT. E. W. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Fisheries. Once again I have to ask him if he can tell the House when the fishermen of all the Strait Shore and along the Northeast Coast expect to be paid for storm damages which occurred last June? Now I am thinking mostly of the lobster fishermen. I understand very few, if any, of the fishermen have been paid even though the minister had stated that it would be paid several weeks ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

HON. H. A. COLLINS (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is referring to payments for lobster pot losses, I can tell him that all the claims have been processed through our department. Many of the cheques have already been issued by Finance and I would suspect they are all in the mail now. They were processed through us into Finance and I believe that they have all gone out.

MR. WINSOR: I have a question for the Hon. Minister of Education. I wonder if the minister can tell us if it is true that students who are attending classes sponsored by the College of Fisheries and who are not eligible for payment through Canada Manpower are receiving the sum of \$1.50 per day?

HON. G. R. OTTENHEIMER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker, the students at the College of Fisheries, provincial students, those who

are not in Manpower, receive the same amount as students at the College of Trades and the various district vocational schools and there is a differential, whether they are married or unmarried or living in the area, if the school is in the area, their home or not, but it is approximately \$25.00 a week.

I am not aware of any formula the honourable gentleman referred to.

MR. WINSOR: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Maybe I did not make myself quite clear to the honourable minister but there are classes held in certain areas of Newfoundland and where students who have - or I do not know whether you would classify them as students or not but men who are attending those classes and are not eligible because they have not been out of school for one year, but maybe for eight or ten months. This is the fishery classes which are sponsored through the College of Fisheries. I understand that they are paid \$1.50 a day plus seventy cents per day if they live beyond fifteen miles.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Is the honourable member referring to the travelling schools, presumably. The schools of two, three, four weeks duration in engine repair and netting repair, in that area? Right! I thought that the honourable gentleman was referring to what we call the provincial students, that is those who are there of various ages including people in their forties and fifties, they do not have to be necessarily young, where there is a regular fee and there is a regular payment schedule for all of them.

I would have to check on the rates for the travelling schools. Rather than give inaccurate information, I will check on that, the rates, for people attending the travelling schools.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minister's reply. But surely if that be the case, then they are paid far less than the minimum wage.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Until I check on the fee, I cannot really comment on that.

MR. WINSOR: Could the honourable member let me know?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for White Bay South.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications, concerning which we have already had a private exchange of views. I want to ask the minister what steps are being taken to relieve the people of Fleur de Lys and Coachman's Cove of the deplorable road conditions which they are now suffering, that is on the road from Fleur de Lys to Baie Verte?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the latest information I have is that additional equipment is being moved into the area to correct the situation as quickly as possible. However, there is a limited amount that can be done as long as the road remains soft, in certain sections it is quite possible that there are some sections which are not being worked at even though there is equipment available. I am told to place equipment in those particular areas would make the road worse. So

it is hoped that the road will either dry up or freeze up to some degree where the equipment can go in. I am advised that additional equipment is in the area or at least on its way to attempt to look after it.

MR. W. N. ROWE: A supplementary question, Sir. My understanding is that this condition has arisen in the last few days because of the thaw and I have not had a first hand look at it because the House is in session. From the minister's reports, from his officials, is this an extraordinary situation compared to other roads around the province? Is it a generally experienced situation or what is it? What do his officials report on it, Mr. Speaker?

MR. HICKEY: No, Mr. Speaker, my road report today, for the entire province without exception, each district, from District 1 to District 4, is experiencing this problem. It has been a very unusual year in as much as there has been heavy frost and very soon after the heavy frost a lot of rain or moisture resulting in washouts and water cannot penetrate the ground; as a result our roads are taking quite a beating. It is estimated that our maintenance cost as a result of this is going to be very, very high during the coming year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. S. A. NEARY: While the Hon. Premier is in his seat for a few minutes, I wonder if he would be good enough to inform the House how many Newfoundlanders will find employment on the construction in the development of the Lower Churchill this year, this calendar year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier.

HON. F. D. MOORES (PREMIER): As many as possible, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Well a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Hon. Premier then inform us when hiring will actually commence for work on the construction of the Lower Churchill?

MR. MOORES: As soon as possible and as quickly as we can, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: The same old answers, Sir.

I wonder, Sir, if the Minister of Justice, maybe we can get a little more information out of him. Would the Minister of Justice inform the House, if his department has undertaken an investigation into the sudden flurry of activity on the stock market, especially involving 82,500 shares of BRINCO that changed hands immediately prior to the government's announcement that they were going to take over BRINCO?

AN HON. MEMBER: Ask Joey.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that question should be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: I think the Minister of Justice would like to answer the question.

HON. T. A. HICKMAN (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, this has not come to the attention of the Department of Justice. I would imagine when it does it will be a very serious jurisdictional question as to whether we would have the right to conduct that sort of an investigation on the stock exchange. But I have to confess, not being an investor, I do not know very much about the stock exchanges in Montreal or Toronto, but I doubt if we would have the right to carry out that sort of an investigation in Toronto or Montreal. But to my knowledge it has not come to the attention of the Department of Justice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, does the honourable minister not think that it is the duty of his department and him, as Minister of Justice, to find if there were a -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, I am asking a question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister to find out if there were a leak or if it were just a coincidence that this activity took place leading up to the government taking over or offering to buy BRINCO?

MR. HICKMAN: That is not -

MR. NEARY: Does the minister think -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable member's question is argumentative and as such it is out of order.

Hon. Minister of Finance.

HON. J. C. CROSPIE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): On that point, Mr. Speaker, there should be a correction of fact here. There was no unusual flurry of activity in the trading of BRINCO shares

in the four or five or six weeks leading up to the takeover of BRINCO, that I have already told the House and told the press, that the 82,500,000 shares that the member for Bell Island refers to, that were transferred towards the end of February, have absolutely nothing to do with this government or anything to do with the takeover of BRINCO.

The government, despite its inquiries, cannot learn who sold those shares or who purchased them since the sale was arranged through one investment brokers and they of course are not going to reveal the names of their clients. So it has no relation at all with this government. We can get no further information on it apart from what I have said. There was no unusual trading in the BRINCO shares. If there had been any unusual trade in, we would have expedited the takeover because of that very reason. It was watched every day and there was no unusual activity.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on the same subject, since the Minister of Finance has gotten into it now and opened it up somewhat, has the government, the Minister of Justice or the Minister of Finance communicated with the Ontario Securities Commission or the Quebec Securities Commission with their request for information on that particular sale?

MR. CROSBIE: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, will the minister undertake to get in touch with the security people in Ontario and in Quebec to find out if there were a leak or if this is just merely a coincidence? It may be all well and good but we would like to know.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation undertaking that. Whether or not they can get the information is another question. I have to contact them and ask and see if they will.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Would the minister care to comment on a statement made today by the Construction Association, that they were shocked to learn from a statement made by the minister last week that the reason more work did not go ahead in Newfoundland last

year was because there were no contractors to do it. Does the minister wish to comment on that statement?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! That question seems argumentative. If the honourable minister wish to comment on it, I shall permit him to do so.

MR. T.P. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the only comment I have to make is that I am not necessarily surprised. I am sorry to learn that they have been shocked but if facts are going to shock them then I guess that is just one of those things.

MR. NEARY: I wonder, Sir, if the Minister of Manpower, Sir, who I am sure is anticipating a question about the strike in Labrador City, could the minister inform the House if his department is involved or he, as member for the district, is anyway involved in the strike in Labrador City?

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

MR. J.G. ROUSSEAU: Yes. It was a quiet weekend. Saturday and Sunday there were no wildcats but this morning there was. The union phoned me this morning before the meeting. The union phoned me this afternoon after the meeting, early this afternoon. I have been contacted by them, indirectly and informally by the company. I am aware of the situation, yes, and I have been in contact with them. That is all I can say right now on the matter.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. First of all, Sir, I would like to ask the minister if he would inform the House of all the work or if all the work will be completed on Shea Heights before it is turned into a municipality or before it is taken over by the City of St. John's? Because there is a lot of outstanding work that has to be done there? Will it be all done before any move is made to turn it over to the City of St. John's or to have its own municipality?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. H.R.V. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, work is proceeding as quickly as possible on the Shea Heights. There has been no decision as yet as to whether it

will or will not be turned over to the City of St. John's or to any other body. Some meetings are about to take place in which these very subjects will be discussed.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, will the minister tell us if he has met with a delegation from the Town of Mount Pearl in the last day or so?

MR. EARLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I met with Mount Pearl.

MR. NEARY: Sir, a supplementary question: Would the minister inform the House then if the government has acceded to their request to extend the boundary of the Town of Mount Pearl?

MR. EARLE: No, Mr. Speaker, we have not acceded but that is also under discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed to Orders of the Day, on Friday past the honourable member from Port au Port rose on a point of personal privilege in relation to statements made by the honourable the member for St. Barbe North on CJON. I think it was that same day. I took the matter under advisement and I received a transcript of the remarks made on Friday by the honourable member from Port au Port.

As no motion was made as to what the action should be, I feel I have to rule it not a point of privilege, but I am sure the honourable member from Port au Port rose to make his feelings known to the honourable House, of his disagreement with the statement made by the honourable member.

MR. F. STAGG (Port au Port): I just hope there is no ambiguity in that. The substance of my remarks was not dealt with by Your Honour. It was just merely the framing of the point of privilege and on the technical point that there was no motion contained in my request. This is the reason for it being ruled out of order. Is that so?

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and say that I assume that this is the same reason why my point of privilege the day before was ruled out of order. Is that so, Sir?

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order on this whole matter. If the honourable member for Port au Port, the Deputy-Speaker,

want to make a motion, that is one thing, or any other member, the House Leader, but the rules of order are very clear, Sir, and I refer Your Honour to page 57 of Beauchesne, whatever edition we are using here, the fourth edition or third, the fourth edition, Sir, page 57, paragraph 68 (1), down at the bottom of page 57, "The Speaker's jurisdiction does not extend to words outside the House".

So I would submit, Sir, that Your Honour's ruling was eminently correct. Your Honour does not have the jurisdiction to deal with the matter. If the member wish to make a motion himself or if the House Leader or any other member want to make a motion, let the House deal with the matter. That is a different question. The Speaker does not have the jurisdiction to deal with words spoken outside the House.

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

HON. L. BARRY: If I could just speak to that point of privilege, just to avoid confusion arising in the future. That is total nonsense. If there be a statement made outside the House which reflects upon conduct of members inside this House, that can be a subject of a motion of privilege and there are situations from Beauchesne to establish that.

I will refer them to the honourable member if he should wish me to.

MR. W. ROWE: What the honourable minister says is absolutely true. Maybe if he listened to what was said instead of being consumed with what he himself is going to say he might learn something. I have said that there is no reason whatsoever why a member of this honourable House cannot at any time make a motion to any effect after having giving notice of motion thereto, no question there at all, whether that effect privilege or anything else. Usually the House Leader will do it.

What I am saying, Sir, is that page 57 of this book is clear as an authority in stating that the Speaker does not have jurisdiction over words spoken outside the House. The Speaker is a servant of the House and of course will do what the House orders him to do by way of a motion but that does not detract from what I submitted as my point of order to Your Honour.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, what the honourable member from White Bay

South says has absolutely no relationship or relevancy to the point of order as I see it, Obviously, the Speaker does not draw attention to matters or statements said outside of the House as he would on statements said in the House itself but the fact of the matter is that statements can be made outside the House which are a breach of privilege.

I understand that this is not the basis of Your Honour in ruling, that Your Honour's ruling is based purely on a technicality and it certainly is not on the merits of the case itself.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. If I may speak to this point of order, Mr. Speaker, because I think we have touched upon an important point. I think that all three gentlemen, my friend from White Bay South and the members for St. John's East and Placentia West, are in agreement but I think it is worth stating so that we could be clear.

There are certain matter that Your Honour notices on Your Honour's own initiative. For example, if I were to use an unparliamentary phrase Your Honour would not need any motion or any prompting. Your Honour would merely call me to order and then if I did not come to order the inevitable and proper consequences would follow.

There are other matters which Your Honour may notice only if the House directs Your Honour, as our spokesman, our Speaker, to inquire into and matters outside this House fall within the latter category, Sir. That is the situation to which my friend, the member from White Bay South, refers. The situation from Beausnesne is quite clear.

The ruling under discussion, although that is not under discussion, a ruling is a ruling, as I understand it is predicated upon the fact that the gentleman from Port au Port did not have the courage of his convictions, was not willing to put the matter to the test, that he merely used an underhanded way to try to get a dart in at the gentleman from St. Barbe South. That is fine. Your Honour has not made a ruling, as I understand it, on the substantive matter of whether or not there is a prima facie breach of privilege in the remarks alleged to have been made by my friend, the member from St. Barbe South.

If Your Honour wish to rule on that point, then I would submit that Your Honour would invite submissions from us and our submission would be that because the matter is outside the House, in the absence of a motion from the House, Your Honour has no jurisdiction, no authority for those words. I think the Beauchesne situations are correct and they are full, and the schoolboy debater from Placentia West and the House Leader

from here -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, as I said the schoolboy debater who insists upon proving his schoolboyishness and the House Leader for the government side and the gentleman from White Bay South have all made essentially the same point, but I think it is a point well worth making.

MR. SPEAKER: I think honourable members will remember that on Friday when I was speaking about the matter, I said that if the House directed me to obtain the tapes from CJON, I would hear them and rule on this. I was not directed by the House to obtain such tapes.

I said if the honourable member for Port au Port were to bring me the tapes - he has brought the tapes to me but I understand that the facilities up in Hansard are not such that they can be played or replayed on that. So, I have not actually heard the tape with the honourable member for St. Barbe North's statement.

I did rule that no motion was made on the matter and I think it should end right there unless the honourable the member for Port au Port wish to bring in a notice of motion about the matter.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

On motion of the Honourable the Minister of Education a bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland Teachers' Association," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

ADDRESS IN REPLY:

MR. SPEAKER: Address in Reply: It has been a while since we have done that. I think the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy rose and adjourned the debate last time.

HON. L. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Lots of notice.

Mr. Speaker, I am caught off guard here but if the honourable members will give me an opportunity to check into my voluminous research -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: No, I think we can, as soon as we get our motions right here, determine what we are speaking on and carry on.

Mr. Speaker, do you have any idea how long I spoke before?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Too long.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member merely rose in his place and adjourned the debate.

MR. BARRY: Just adjourned the debate. Okay, thank you.

I wanted to make certain that I did not start at the beginning and if I had already given you these words of wisdom before, Mr. Speaker. Now, this is not on the motion of non-confidence or anything, is it?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Oh, it is.

Mr. Speaker, that motion of non-confidence has been hanging over our heads like the sword of Damocles for so long that I had forgotten about it, forgotten that it was still up there.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to find it necessary to vote against this motion of non-confidence. That may be of some surprise to Your Honour but when I sat down and after much agonizing thought, analyzing the substance of this motion and I concluded that it was merely another bit of mechanical politicking on the part of the opposition. We saw the Leader of the Opposition on television a couple of days ago talking about how it was time for the House of Assembly to stop talking and to get down to business and do some work. Still when we go back over the last month or so and look at what has been happening in this honourable House, we find examples such as this, of mechanical devices used by the opposition for no other reason than to ensure that the House is diverted from the important affairs of government, diverted from being able to get down and do what the people elected us to do. Instead, we have to waste the time of the House in discussing motions, such as the motion that is before the House today.

I wonder if I could get a copy of that motion, by the way.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A quorum call, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY: While the quorum is out, could I get a copy of that motion, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: (MR. STAGG): Would the clerk count the House please?

We have a quorum.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the substance of this motion is that this administration has failed to introduce adequate programmes to lessen the impact of the rapidly rising cost of living, that we have failed to introduce programmes to reduce the number of unemployed and that we have failed to introduce programmes to bring public services up to an acceptable level throughout all parts of this province.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Could we have a quorum call, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: We have a quorum.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I will not raise this matter as a point of order but if I could have a minute just to point out with respect to the question of quorum calls and just to bring it to the attention of the honourable members opposite and ask them to consider whether perhaps they are not, if not flying in the face of the rules of this House, literally they are at least flying in the face of the intent of the rules.

I draw your honest attention to Standing Order 80, if I could have a moment here, which says that every member is bound to attend the service of the House unless leave of absence has been given to him. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you - again I will not raise it as a point of order, this could perhaps be done at a later time. I ask the members to consider whether this device that has been used by the opposition as we have seen on numerous occasions, generally to -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Relevant to what, Mr. Speaker?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Relevant to debate.

MR. BARRY: Relevant to debate. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. ROWE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We are speaking on a debate which is a vote of non-confidence in the government on the grounds of the price rises of foods, etc., on the grounds of no public services, on the grounds of the rising unemployment.

Now, the honourable minister says that he is not rising on a point of order. He is rising to just make a general observation which is not at

all relevant to the motion under discussion. I would submit, Sir, that he should be ruled out of order for being irrelevant.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to that point of order. To the contrary, my comments are directly relevant to this motion because, Mr. Speaker, this government is being criticized for failing to bring in programmes which could have the effect of doing certain things. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am pointing out a reason why if there has been any decrease in the amount of legislation that has gone through this House or any decrease in the number of programmes that we have seen come before this honourable House to be dealt with, I am giving you one reason as to why that has come about. I am saying it is because of these mechanical, artificial devices that are used by the opposition in a totally hypocritical manner, in a manner that is totally callous, totally unconcerned with the needs of the people of this province and designed for one thing and one thing only, that is to harass this government and to attempt to embarrass this government and to attempt to prevent this government from doing the work that the people of Newfoundland elected us to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like you to rule as to whether or not that is relevant.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A bunch of babies.

MR. NEARY: May I speak to that point of order, please?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): If the honourable member wish, he may speak.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the whole point of raising the matter of a quorum, Sir, is to try to keep the government members, not -

not only the government members but members on either side of the House but especially the government members, if the quorum happens to be called on this side of the House, to keep them in their seats. Absenteeism, Mr. Speaker, has been rampant during this session of the House. The Premier has been absent from the House continuously, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): Order please!

The honourable member's point has been heard and understood. We are debating the Address in Reply. The debate is certainly wide-ranging. I think it is extremely difficult to be irrelevant.

MR. W. N. ROWE: It is not the Address in Reply, it is an amendment.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): The amendment to the Address in Reply, yes. It is extremely difficult to be irrelevant. I suggest that the honourable member may be extending it to its limit in order to make this irrelevant. However, he is attempting to speak and his speech is being interrupted by the quorum calls. I suggest that the honourable member may proceed and make his point, and he is in order.

MR. BARRY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not question the importance of having this rule in there with respect to a quorum, Mr. Speaker. All I am saying is that that rule was never intended to be used in situations whereby the opposition, while having members on the other side of the House sufficient to make up a quorum, get together and conspire to frustrate the workings of this honourable House by combining into a mechanical move to harass the person who happens to be speaking at the time by getting in concert, I would point out, leaving this honourable House and calling over their shoulders as they go, Quorum! Quorum! These honourable members on the other side of the House, vacant as they may be and as insignificant as they may be, can still be used, if for nothing else, as bodies to count in a quorum call, Mr. Speaker. That may be the only useful function they perform in the House but I would ask them to permit us every now and then to use them for that particular function.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I could get down to the substance of this amendment, although I find it very difficult to find any substance in it. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give you a few examples of what has been taking place in one of the districts in this province and to indicate just how ridiculous and how completely false are the allegations contained in this amendment introduced by the Leader of the Opposition. It is alleged, Mr. Speaker, that we failed to introduce programmes to reduce the high numbers of people who are unemployed. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am aware that there are many people in Newfoundland who are unemployed. I regret this very much and our government regret it very much. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Newfoundland accept that this government are not doing anything about that fact. I think that the members opposite merely lose credibility when they come out with allegations such as they are making that there are no programmes brought in to reduce unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, the Marystown Shipyard, in the District of Placentia West, is an example of how this government are determined to reduce unemployment wherever possible. I do not attempt to say that this government built the Marystown Shipyard or had the original concept for it, but, Mr. Speaker, I would say that this government have done a lot more than the previous administration to keep that shipyard viable, to keep it going, to keep it going in the right direction. Mr. Speaker, we saw - the Hon. Leader of the Opposition can say nonsense - the Hon. Leader of the Opposition I understand is going down to the Burin Peninsula soon. He should have a talk to some of the people down there and he will find out that the Marystown Shipyard almost went under. There is nobody down there who would deny that this was the case. It almost went under, under the lack of leadership of the previous administration.

MR. ROBERTS: It was saved by the previous administration.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it was not saved by the previous administration.

although I give them full credit for attracting the services of a man like John Rannie. There is no question that John Rannie performed, as it was hoped he would perform and he did a good job. But, Mr. Speaker, John Rannie did not do it alone and John Rannie could not have done it if this administration had continued the practice of the previous administration where there were political appointments, where there were political appointees stuffed into the yard, where there were apprentices, three, four or I do not know how many apprentices for each working man in the yard, where there was a situation where politics interfered with the efficient operation of the shipyard, Mr. Speaker. This is where I criticize the previous administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk in the media and in this House about not looking back to the past, about forgetting about the past. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not accept that. I am going to refer back to the past whenever in my opinion it is relevant to do so. There are a number of different reasons why I think it is important that we should refer back to the past, what has happened in the past in Newfoundland. Because, Mr. Speaker, first of all, reference to the past enables us to compare where we are at the present. It enables us hopefully to determine where we are likely to go in the future. Mr. Speaker, reference to the past actions of honourable members of this House is also relevant; actions to the past policies of honourable members.

Mr. Speaker, when we analyze what honourable members on the other side of the House have supported in the past, when we analyze what their present statements are with respect to policy brought in by this government, then, Mr. Speaker, there are only two inferences; either the honourable members on the other side totally lack sincerity or, Mr. Speaker, they are just plain stupid. Now I do not mean to insult them.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: They saw the light. They saw the light.

This is why I say that when an honourable member comes out and makes allegations about what this present administration is failing to do and how if he were in government he would do such and such. Mr. Speaker, it is a useful exercise to analyze the conduct of that honourable member in the past. It is a useful exercise, if he were not a member of this House in the previous administration, to question whether or not he supported the policies of the previous administration. Mr. Speaker, if we find that he is doing a one hundred and eighty degree turn on just about every issue as we find many of the honourable members on the other side are doing, then I submit it is fair game to ask the people of Newfoundland to consider whether the honourable gentlemen are being sincere.

Mr. Speaker, if the conclusion is that they are being sincere, then we have to ask the next question which is: If they are taking this position now, which is a one hundred and eighty degree difference from the position they took a year ago, two years ago, three years ago, why should we put any faith in what they are saying now? They are not consistent. Are they saying that they were wrong before? Well if they were wrong before, it is a good chance they are wrong now.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason, I have no apologies in looking back to the past. I think it is a useful exercise and every opportunity I get, I am going to ask these honourable members on the other side to consider what went on in the past in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, just look at some of the allegations contained in this motion of non-confidence. I refer to the allegation that this government are failing to introduce programmes to reduce the high numbers of people who are unemployed.

MR. NEARY: A quorum call, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): We have a quorum.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I will just cite you some of the things that are occurring in the District of Placentia West to show you how erroneous are the allegations contained in this motion of non-confidence.

We have, Mr. Speaker, in the last two years we have seen the Marystown Shipyard under proper management and under encouragement by this government and through the co-operation of the management of the yard and this government we have seen the yard come to a position where it is making a profit, Mr. Speaker. We have seen our government recognize this fact, recognize the competent workmanship and the efficient workmanship that is being done in the shipyard at Marystown and we have seen our government pinpoint this as an area where further benefits can be obtained for the people of Marystown, the people of Placentia West, the people of the Burin Peninsula and the people of Newfoundland generally, Mr. Speaker.

We have seen our government decide to expand the Marystown Shipyard, commit itself to expansion of the shipyard at a cost of anywhere from \$1.7 million to \$2 million, that is initially, Mr. Speaker, it was estimated at \$1.7 million but I am sure that inflation has caused that price to rise now but at least \$1.7 million cost and I give credit here, of which \$250,000, about one-eighth of the total cost will be borne by the federal government at the request of our administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this expansion to the Marystown Shipyard, work on which has already commenced, will increase production at the shipyard from three and a half ships a year to six ships a year. In addition, Mr. Speaker, it means in excess of an additional one hundred jobs at the shipyard. Mr. Speaker, if that is not something that will reduce unemployment in my particular district then I do not know what will.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not the only action that is

being taken by our government with respect to the shipyard, to reduce unemployment. We have seen just recently, Mr. Speaker, just a couple of weeks ago, a decision by our government to contract with the Marystown Shipyard for the construction of six trawlers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that this is a gift to the Marystown Yard, I am not saying that this is a make-work programme, this is not, Mr. Speaker. The Marystown Shipyard came in at a competitive price on tenders called for these trawlers. But, Mr. Speaker, were it not for the imagination of this government, were it not for the decision of this government to construct these trawlers then this is work that the shipyard would not have. As it is, Mr. Speaker, we see the order book of the yard getting to the stage where you have guaranteed employment at the shipyard for well into 1976 at least. This does not count the normal work that the yard will pick up as a matter of course.

Mr. Speaker, this again is something that will directly reduce unemployment in my district and in the Province of Newfoundland generally. There are other decisions that have been made by this government that will have the effect of reducing unemployment in my district significantly. For example, Mr. Speaker, we have the five trawlers that are being built at the shipyard for Atlantic Fish Processors, five new trawlers, Mr. Speaker. This deal was negotiated with Atlantic Fish by this government and it was through this government's negotiations, Mr. Speaker, that the Marystown Shipyard got those five trawlers.

MR. NEARY: Who put Atlantic Fish there?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, those five trawlers not only are they providing employment at the shipyard while being constructed, not only will they provide employment for additional trawler crews for five extra trawlers, they will also, Mr. Speaker, lead to additional jobs in the processing plant at Marystown. Mr. Speaker, this in turn will as you know, lead to other indirect jobs. I refer now only to direct employment created in one district in this province by decisions of this government.

MP. NEARY: We really laid the foundation.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if I could pass on to another step that has been taken and a step that, Mr. Speaker, I do not think has been fully recognized in this province, if not creating jobs at least encouraging people to get out and either find jobs or use their imagination to create their own jobs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I refer to the new Social Assistance Programme that was brought in by this administration. A programme, Mr. Speaker, which no longer has a disincentive for people to work. Doing away with the distinction between long term assistance and short term assistance, Mr. Speaker, is to anybody who has had experience with what was happening a very significant move. What was happening, Mr. Speaker? Well you had a situation where people were qualifying for long-term assistance, validly so because of illness or because of accident or whatever. They were then assured of a monthly cheque coming in regularly. They had security to feed their wife and children or their husband and children, but they did have a guaranteed annual income, Mr. Speaker. So you then had a person being very reluctant, being very reluctant indeed to get himself stricken off the roles of long-term assistance, where he might be able to find a job but not a steady job, he might get a job say for a couple of weeks, a month or two months, then when that job was over he would not automatically go back on long-term assistance. He would not go back on long-term assistance at all initially, he would go on short term assistance. He no longer had the security of his guaranteed annual income that the long-term assistance provided and therefore, Mr. Speaker, you had a situation where people did not have an incentive to get off long-term assistance. They were afraid to take a job because they were afraid they would be able to requalify for assistance once the job was lost, if it were not a very secure job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this new policy, one of the elements in this new policy of social assistance being brought in does away with the distinction between long-term and short-term assistance,

in my mind, in my opinion will mean a great deal towards getting people off assistance altogether, Mr. Speaker. It will go a long way towards having our people get out and to find employment and not just to rely on the taxpayers dollar for support.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another allegation in this motion of non-confidence is that this administration have failed to introduce programmes to bring public services up to an acceptable level throughout all parts of this province. Now there could be a hidden hooker here, Mr. Speaker, this could be a loaded sentence. What is an acceptable level of public service?

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we will never see the day in Newfoundland in our lifetime when we will be able to say there is an acceptable level of public services, that people are satisfied with the level of public services and are prepared to accept them at that level.

Mr. Speaker, here again, this is just a generalization. It means nothing. This government are determined to bring public services up to as high a level as is possible with the limited financial resources at our disposal. This is not government money we are talking about, this is the taxpayers money. Mr. Speaker, I would submit that if this administration had not gotten into office when it did, that there would be a much lower level of public services being provided now, Mr. Speaker, because the province was on the rocks, on the brink of bankruptcy, Mr. Speaker, before this administration got in. You do not bring a province back from the brink of bankruptcy by lashing out money heedlessly without any attempt to determine priorities and to determine the way in which it can be best spent.

That is why I had to laugh, Mr. Speaker, when honourable members opposite get up and accuse this government of trying to run government as if it were a business. Mr. Speaker, if what they are trying to say there is that there is no feel for human need, that there is no human element in this government then, Mr. Speaker, I say that programmes such as our social assistance programme fling that false allegation right back into their teeth, Mr. Speaker. If they are trying to say on the

other hand that you should not run a government in a rational manner, determining what the cost of programmes are going to be, determining how the people's money will be best spent then, Mr. Speaker, I say that, that statement is total rubbish. It is nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I would take it as a compliment if it be the latter obligation that the honourable members are saying on the other side of the House, that we are trying to get the best for every dollar that is spent, that we are trying to determine the costs of programmes.

MR. NEARY: What about Nutbeem?

MR. BARRY: What about nuts?

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any point in trying to beat this dead horse. This amendment was dead by the time the Hon. Leader of the Opposition finished stating it. The records of this government, Mr. Speaker, is there for the people to see. It does not do anything. It does not harm this government, Mr. Speaker, for the honourable members opposite to attempt to pass over onto the shoulders of this government the failure of their Liberal colleagues in Ottawa to do something about the inflation which is ravishing this country. Not just in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, but from St. John's to Victoria, in every province of Canada, Mr. Speaker, there is a problem with rising prices, with the rising cost of living.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Is it worse here though.

MR. BARRY: It is worse here, Mr. Speaker, and I give you one reason why it is worse here and it is because of the lack of interest by the bureaucrats in Ottawa in Newfoundland, in the lack of appreciation of the need for better transportation services, Mr. Speaker, for lack of appreciation for how far we are, Mr. Speaker, from the sources of many of our supplies. A lack of appreciation, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Could we have a quorum call, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: (STAGG): Could the Clerk call the House?

We have a quorum.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, in closing I will give you an example of one programme of this government which will do more to reduce the cost of living than I submit any other programme that any administration have ever brought in or that any administration could bring in at the

present time in Newfoundland. That is, Mr. Speaker, the programme which this government have underway to bring power, hydro electric power to the Island of Newfoundland from Gull Island in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, you only have to see the projected cost curve that the financial experts have done, where they have shown, as Your Honour is undoubtedly aware, of how the cost of energy based on petroleum, Mr. Speaker, has gone like this over the last year. This cost curve, Mr. Speaker, will continue to increase, if we continue to rely on petroleum products.

But when, Mr. Speaker, you determine the cost of bringing hydro electric power from Gull Island to the Island of Newfoundland and, Mr. Speaker, to Goose Bay and Happy Valley and the Coast of Labrador, which is a necessary part of this programme, Mr. Speaker, when you determine the cost of that power, that hydro electric power brought across to the Island, you will see where the curve has, instead of continuing to rise like this, Mr. Speaker, it drops abruptly and dramatically and levels off at a level lower, Mr. Speaker, than where it is today and continues like that up until 1985, I believe is the date, in the mid-eighties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, anybody who is aware of the many ways in which low cost energy influences the cost of living.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there are only twenty-four vacant seats over there now. Could we have another quorum call -

AN HON. MEMBER: Twenty-four.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Could the Clerk count the House please?

We have a quorum.

MR. BARRY: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, anybody who stops to think will see the many ways in which electricity is directly involved with our everyday life, not just for heating homes, Mr. Speaker, but

for manufacturing articles that we use and that we have to buy and that we have to pay a portion of the cost of the electricity when we buy that article. Contained in the price of every product, Mr. Speaker, that our people buy, is a cost for energy.

Mr. Speaker, if we can keep the cost of that energy portion down insofar as products manufactured in Newfoundland are concerned, our industry will be more competitive. If we can keep that energy cost down, Mr. Speaker, the cost to our Newfoundland consumer will be less. This, Mr. Speaker, is why, as I said earlier, that this decision to bring hydro electric power from Labrador to the Island of Newfoundland is one of the most magnificent steps that any government could make to reduce the cost of living for our people of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I think that with these few comments I have given you just some indication of why I find that I am going to have to vote against this non-confidence motion.

MR. W. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was looking over a few notes I put together, like the Minister of Energy put together about six months ago. I must say, Sir, they no longer make too much sense. I hope I am able to pick some sense out of them as I go through them and to convey some sense to the House. I am afraid the Minister of Energy did not have that advantage. He could not pick much sense out of his notes when he got up and I am afraid when he sat down he had not picked much sense out of them either. I will try to do a little better if I can.

Three matters, Sir, contained in the no-confidence motion, prices, the inflationary spiral affecting Newfoundland, Canada generally, Newfoundland particularly, and the lack of action taken by this government to cope with that inflation and the consequent rising prices. The unemployment situation in the province, Mr. Speaker, which has risen under this administration's tenure of office, risen to an all time high, I believe, in absolute terms and probably in percentage as well, in percentage terms as well -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Not in percentage.

MR. W. ROWE: Not in percentage. It was higher at one point in percentage. But numerically the highest that this province has ever reached in numbers of people actively seeking employment who cannot find employment. This is a legacy of this particular administration as well, and the fact that over the past two years or so this government has an abysmally bad record in providing our people across this province, the Island and the Labrador portion of the province, an abysmally low record in providing public services to these people, communities, areas of the province.

Three main things contained in the no-confidence motion: The Leader of the Opposition, I believe, and other members on this side of the House dealt effectively with the prices issue. The government in its usual squirmy fashion tried to snake its way out of any responsibility whatsoever for rising prices, tried to blame it all on Ottawa as is their wont on everything that affects this government, tried to blame it all on Ottawa, took no responsibility whatsoever for rising prices, none.

Other provincial premiers and provincial governments assume responsibility, Sir, and try to do something about it but this government no. They lie down like an old dog and roll over, Sir, and say; "We are not responsible for this, will not do anything about it. We will take no action whatsoever on the single most crucial issue affecting the ordinary man and woman in the street or in the home." The single most crucial issue, namely the completely uncontrolled and uncontrollable perhaps, for all I know, rising prices in this province, not only across Canada but in this province and to a greater extent in this province than anywhere else perhaps in North America.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Trudeau should resign.

MR. NEARY: It is not Trudeau's fault.

MR. W. ROWE: Trudeau should resign?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Absolutely.

MR. W. ROWE: I am not saying that Mr. Trudeau and the government in Ottawa are not responsible to a great extent. I will even admit that. But what about if Mr. Trudeau came out and said; "We will do nothing about rising prices, we will do nothing about unemployment because it is the world situation that is causing it all. We are better off in Canada than they are in Great Britain or in Europe or in the United States." For example; if they took that attitude, Sir, "It is out of our hands," Because to a great extent it is out of their hands, Mr. Speaker, but they are trying to do something about whatever is under their control, whatever they can do about it within their jurisdiction.

This honourable crowd, Mr. Speaker, this honourable government has taken the position that as a government it can do nothing about rising prices. Now, maybe out of the whole pie there is only two per cent that this government can effectively deal with. Well, then they should go ahead and do that. I am not trying to blame all rising prices nor does the motion of no-confidence blame all rising prices and the effects of that on this particular government. What we are saying, Sir, is that this government are not doing their fair share about that problem affecting our Newfoundland people.

I am not going to get any further into it, Sir. The Leader of the Opposition made, I think, all of the points affecting that and the record on that speaks for itself. I think I will concentrate mainly today on the unemployment situation and what the government has not done about it, mostly in terms of federal/provincial programmes, how they have not done their best in that regard. They might have done their best but they have not done much about it, and on the question of services for our people.

The first point, Sir, I want to mention should be dear to the Minister of Finance's heart. I am delighted to see him in his seat today. It is this question of DREE, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. W. ROWE: I wish I could afford it, Sir. If the honourable minister would give me a loan of his copious sources of financing wherever they

came from.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Better not go to Panama; one could get kidnapped.

MR. W. ROWE: If I go to Panama, I will get kidnapped. If I go to Florida, I might be assassinated. I do not know what to do, Mr. Speaker. Maybe when the Minister of Finance goes around the world as he does two or three times a year, sometimes at his own expense, sometimes at government expense, he will consent to bring me along as an expert adviser.

The point I am now going to make is on DREE, the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, and the abysmal failure once more of the Minister of Finance and his colleagues to really take advantage of that situation, number one, on the one side, and their devious attempt, Mr. Speaker, to mislead the people of this province on DREE and all that DREE has to offer to this province.

The Minister of Finance, when he was speaking in this House on this speech, on this debate, raised the question of DREE and started talking about my own role in DREE when I was Minister of Community and Social Development. He mentioned this General Development Agreement which the Premier signed with Mr. Jamieson with great flourish, and my attack on this government's purveying of wrong facts to the people of Newfoundland in their news releases on that General Development Agreement under DREE.

Before I go into that, Sir, I would like to mention the drop balance aspect of the DREE agreement, that fact that monies that have come from Ottawa or committed by Ottawa under DREE have not been spent totally by this government or the previous government in the financial year for which those monies were in effect. The Minister of Finance came into the House and said, "I do not know why the member for White Bay South is talking about this at all. When he was Minister of Community and Social Development, the amounts left unspent were far greater than they are now, Mr. Speaker, far greater than they are now." That may be so. I do not know if it is true. The Minister of Finance has had his little minions and drones down in the department scurrying around getting these facts. "Ah, we will clobber the member for White Bay South now! Look at these

facts that we have dug up," his little gnomes - That is what Wilson used to call them, the Gnomes of Zurich - down in his department, Mr. Speaker, going around getting these facts together to buttress the weak argument of the Minister of Finance. So, I do not know if it be true or not.

Let me say this that in 1969 when DREE came into effect, DREE was a brand new programme across Canada and in Newfoundland. As a matter of fact, when the first estimates were presented to this honourable House, Mr. Speaker, we did not know, we had no idea at that particular point how much money was going to come from DREE, how much was going to be committed from DREE in the first agreement. Not only that, Sir, all procedures set out under the agreement were completely untried, unproven, no experience at all to draw from, no practice at all from which we could derive some knowledge as to how much money could be spent or how much money was feasible in any given year.

Also, Sir, the Department of Community and Social Development like other departments

was simply a line department. It had no overall authority over the other departments and this was a problem and a mistake and one which we had hoped to remedy but we were unfortunately, depending on your point of view, flung out of office and this government came into power.

Now, Sir, five years later, five years later the Minister of Finance has the unmitigated something or other, probably not parliamentary, Sir, what is going through my own mind, but he has the gall to come into this House and to compare, five years later, compare the lack of ability of his administration to spend DREE money with the lack of ability of our administration five years ago in a brand new untried programme to spend certain amounts of money under DREE.

After five years of experience, after five years of procedures developing, after five years of all kinds of liaison committees and this, that and the other thing set up in order to expedite financing, he comes in and compares his abysmal lack of success and the Minister of Industrial Development who apparently heads up the committee negotiating with DREE, the lack of success of this government in spending the money under DREE, compares it to the situation five years ago and expects the people of Newfoundland to fall for that, Mr. Speaker.

By now all the bugs should be ironed out of the DREE Programme in this Province. This government should have no trouble whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, in spending the money which comes to this Province from the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. Yet at the time when the minister spoke, nearly one half of the money which came from Ottawa for that financial year still remained unspent. Eight or ten million dollars, well over one-third, remained unspent at that particular time. Maybe the Minister of Finance can tell us now how much remains unspent under that agreement.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. W. ROWE: That would be telling, Mr. Speaker, that is right, and there is enough nails already in the minister's coffin. That might be the final telling blow. Oh, yes! It is all going to come out on

Wednesday, Mr. Speaker. Maybe we will find out about Mr. Saunders on Wednesday and the funny situation affecting him. Maybe we will hear about 82,000 shares of BRINCO transferred days before the BRINCO deal is finally consummated. Maybe we will have the Forestry Task Force. Maybe we will find out how much money MacLean is going to get out of the Confederation Day, the Confederation Year, twenty-fifth Anniversary rip-off, \$2 million, maybe we will get all of that information.

I hope the Minister of Finance is true to his oft-stated, tediously repeated convictions about well honesty in government and giving out information. I hope that he does stick to that in this particular budget speech on Wednesday.

In any event, Sir, after five years this government is so hopelessly inept and incompetent as not to be able to spend nearly half the money. At the end of the financial year nearly half the money they got from DREE in Ottawa, they have not even called tenders on up to a month or so ago. If that is not ineptitude and incompetence, Mr. Speaker, I would like Your Honour to describe to me what is. They are not only incompetent, Sir, in spending the money, they are also somewhat inept in obtaining the money, getting the money from DREE to start with.

The second DREE agreement when we were in office was signed in August, 1971, nearly three years ago. The second DREE agreement and the first DREE agreement together accounted for \$130 million, Mr. Speaker, new money for new projects into this Province. That did not count the Mineral Development Agreement or incentive grants from Ottawa.

The Tory Government, Mr. Speaker, got into power on January of 1972. They should have signed a third DREE agreement in the spring of that year and that DREE agreement, if they were going to be consistently following our record in office, should have been \$60 million but no, Sir, no DREE agreement spent that year nor signed that year. Another full year went by, no third DREE agreement was ever signed. An amendment was signed last year, I believe, at this time or shortly thereafter, for \$25 million, \$25 million, a year late, and even when it did come was less than half

of what it should have been under the third DREE agreement.

Sir, to add insult to injury, in spite of the fact that they got only half of the money from DREE that they should have had, they signed a decent, sensible agreement with DREE, after another full year has gone by, we find that fully one-third of the small amount they did get either has no contract called for it, no tenders called for it, no contracts entered into or the money has not yet been spent.

Now, Sir, if that is not a chapter, a book of incompetence and ineptitude, as I said before, I would like Your Honour to describe what is because that is a dismally poor record in negotiating with Ottawa and getting money from Ottawa to spend for much-needed public services in this Province, schools, roads, water and sewer systems, the basic bread and butter issues affecting the people of this Province.

Now, Sir, this was all done, remember, or mostly done when our minister in Ottawa, Mr. Jameison, one of the most powerful ministers in Ottawa, by universal consent, one of the most powerful ministers in Ottawa - The Minister of Tourism would agree with that - Mr. Jameison got the winter games for St. John's over a great political objection in respect of St. John, New Brunswick. There is no doubt about the political clout the man has in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker.

Yet, in spite of the fact that we have this powerful minister in Ottawa, Don Jameison, willing and eager to bend over backwards in order to help this Province, with his political clout and power, in spite of the fact that Mr. Jameison is the very minister of the very department we are talking about, DREE, Regional Economic Expansion, Mr. Speaker, in spite of all that, this government has fallen down completely and absolutely on the job of getting some money from Ottawa under DREE.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. W. ROWE: What is the yahoo from Bonavista South saying, Sir, if you would care to translate it for me?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. W. ROWE: Other ridings have benefited, including the honourable members.

Now, Sir, another year gone by, great hullabaloo, great hullabaloo Mr. Speaker, about a general development agreement some weeks ago. Still to this moment, no specific agreement signed with DREE yet for either a roads programme or a forestry programme which was in the offing although I do understand that finally, finally Mr. Speaker, after months of waiting, years of waiting, this government is finally coming to the point and after all its planning task forces, after all of its great reliance on expertise and rational planning and all this sort of thing, nearly three years later, Mr. Speaker, this government two-and-one-half years later, this government is finally coming around where it can sign a few specific agreements with DREE and get some money to be spent on some necessary things in this Province.

They wonder why, the Minister of Mines was up a minute ago wondering why we brought in an amendment of no-confidence in this government. That is one reason why, Mr. Speaker.

While I am on that subject, I wish the Minister of Finance were here. This general development agreement, there was a great - Oh! there he is, his beautiful physiognomy appeared in the doorway like a vision, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The angel of death.

MR. W. ROWE: Here he comes, the angel of death, the kiss of death, Sir, certainly to any political party. Mr. Speaker, here he comes.

I want to make my position clear on this general development agreement signed between this government here, I believe represented by the Premier, some weeks ago, under DREE and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, Mr. Jameison.

I made a point then when that agreement was signed of saying that this government had deceived the people of Newfoundland concerning the fact that they were going to get rid of special DREE areas; DREE areas no longer existed in this Province. The Throne Speech, Sir, had a reference to it when this present session opened. The Throne Speech had a reference to the fact that DREE special areas were going to be done away with. A release was put out by Mr. Jameison and the Premier

which is a peculiar kind of release if Your Honour have had the opportunity of reading it. It is sort of disjointed. Mr. Jameison says this and Premier Moores says this.

The Premier noted, the Premier now, not Mr. Jameison, the Premier noted the main impetus for the agreement for this Province came from the work of the Provincial Planning Task Force. Then he goes on to say, "The new agreement provides for the establishment of numerous subsidiary agreements to undertake broad and flexible programmes related to the social and economic development of the Province." In addition, Mr. Speaker, he says, the Premier now in a release to the general public says, "Unlike previous agreements which

tended to be limited to special areas, the new agreement may apply to any part of the province including Labrador."

Now, Mr. Speaker, looking at that as an ordinary individual anybody who has heard that or read that, unlike previous agreements which tended to be limited to special areas or sectors, the new agreements may apply to any part of the province including Labrador. That is the Premier's release, his own publicly uttered words.

Members on the government side of the House have risen one after the other, Mr. Speaker and said, "Hallelujah for this government! We have done away with special areas." I was on a television programme with the honourable House Leader on the government side in which he stated publicly, "Hurrah! We are not like the old government which had special DREE areas. We have done away with special areas." I believe he even said it in this House, although I am not sure on that point. Government members, publicly and privately have been stating that the DREE special areas are done away with and have given the impression to this province, to everyone in this province, that everybody stands on an equal footing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suspected and so did my colleagues at the time, that this was a cheap attempt to try to make political points or political marks in this province at the expense of the truth. There was mention of \$100 million at the same time so the general impression given to the people of Newfoundland was that here special areas had been done away with, all communities and areas in this province stand on an equal footing with every other place and that there is \$100 million a year to be lashed out by this government as a result of the largess of Ottawa under DREE alone. We suspected a certain amount of deception on the part of this government, Mr. Speaker, in making that kind of an asertion, that kind of a public statement to the people of Newfoundland.

So Sir, I as a member of the House somewhat familiar with the DREE programme, decided I would try to smoke the government out. I put out several releases over a period of a week or so in which I said if the government statement means anything it can only mean that

there are no more special areas in this province, that everybody qualifies, every community qualifies equally for DREE help for public services such as schools, highway construction, water and sewer systems, industrial development parks and all that sort of thing. That is what I said, Mr. Speaker. If the government statement means anything, it can only mean that.

As a result of that release I got all kinds of flak from different members of the government. Then I decided, Sir, that I would once more try to set the record straight in the public eye and try to call the bluff of this government. I therefore sent out a letter, referred to in sneering terms by the Minister of Finance, sent out a letter to every single council in this province. Nearly 300 of them, dated February 12, 1974. I stated; "Your Worship:" A letter signed by myself, in my own hand. It was not just typed nor zeroxed nor anything like that it was a personal letter sent out to every single council in which I said: "The government" -

AN HON. MEMBER: The honourable member made a fool of himself.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Made a fool of myself? Mr. Speaker, you should see the letters on my desk in there, which I will bring into this House when the estimates come through in order to see what kind of a deception this government practiced on the people of this province. I said, Sir; "Your Worship: The government have announced that there are no longer any DREE special areas in this province." (If they did not announce that, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what they announced. Everyone of them said it.) The DREE special areas had been done away with so I conveyed that information to the people of Newfoundland. "The government have announced that there are no longer any DREE special areas in the province. This announcement" I said, (and I sent it as a member of this House and I stand by that letter) "Can only mean that every town and community now stands on a completely equal footing in getting money for DREE projects such as water and sewer systems, road construction, paving, schools and so on. I am therefore calling, as a member of the House and as the opposition spokesman on matters

concerning DREE, I am therefore calling upon every town council and every community council in the province to contact immediately the Minister of Municipal Affairs who is with us now' (and I named him)' the Minister of Highways" (and I named him)" the Premier (and I named him)" to get commitments now for municipal services and other projects needed in their areas.

" The provincial government can no longer say they have no money for these things. With \$100 million a year available to the province." I never made that public, Mr. Speaker, this was made public at a famous news conference held in the city. I never dreamed up that figure.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who dreamed it up?

MR. W.N. ROWE: I do not know who dreamed it up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who said it?

MR. W.N. ROWE: I do not know who said it. It came out of this news conference, \$100 million. "With \$100 million available to the province and with the announcement that DREE special areas have been done away with" Who said that? The Premier of the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who was at the conference?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Jamieson and the Premier were at the conference.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well, I do not know if he did or not. I did not hear him demur, did I? The honourable member did not hear him come out and say what Mr. Jamieson just said about \$100 million. Absolutely untrue. I for one am willing to take Mr. Jamieson's word for it that there is \$100 million a year to come into the province under DREE. If the government do not chose to do that, then that is their problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: The honourable member will have to take his word for it. Certainly the Premier is the one who came out and said; "No more special areas." What does that mean? If there are no more special areas there are no more special areas. Everybody is the same. Everybody is to be treated equally. If it do not mean that, Sir,

then I should suggest that the grossest kind of deception has been perpetrated by every member of the government who has not set the public straight.

I say, Sir, that with the \$100 million a year available to the province as announced and with the announcement that DREE special areas have been done away with, there can now be no reason why every community should not get immediate commitments for full municipal services and other services to be constructed within the next couple of years. What is wrong with that?

"I urge your council as well as every other council in the province to demand your fair share of this DREE money and to insist on getting a commitment from the government now, before the budget is brought into the House of Assembly." Because I know the cheap tricks that are played, Sir, on councils that are coming in looking for money. What happens is this: They come into the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Deputy Minister or the Minister of Highways and they all say to the councils; "Well, we cannot give you a commitment now, we do not know what is going to be in the budget." Off go the councillors, back home again, saying: "Well, we will find out when the budget comes down." The budget comes down, Mr. Speaker, the estimates come into this House, we ask the Minister of Highways or Municipal Affairs what communities are going to be paved or get water and sewer systems this year and they refuse to divulge to this House.

Is that not the record of this government since they came into the House two and a-half years ago? It is, Sir. So I said to communities throughout this province; "I urge your council as well as other councils to demand your fair share of this DREE money and to insist on getting a commitment from the government now, before the budget is brought into the House of Assembly." Then we could not have the Minister of Finance saying; "Well, boy, we did not know about your need. We brought the budget in. We do not have money committed for that now." He would not be able to be heard to say that nor any other

member nor minister in the government.

Sir, not wanting to mislead the people, because I suspected the worse kind of deception was being perpetrated on them, I put in this letter; "I sincerely hope that the provincial government did not raise hopes falsely when they announced that special areas were to be done away with. I sincerely hope that the people of Newfoundland and their councils, who all have the impression that every community in the province now stands on an equal footing with regard to DREE money, are not let down by this government. The only way to find out for sure is for councils to demand commitments from the government now."

Take the government at their word, in other words, Mr. Speaker, a shameful thing. The government have made an announcement: "Special areas done away with. \$100 million a year." "Take the government at their word." I said, "And get your commitments now." I also said; "If you wish to do so, please do not hesitate to send us copies of your proposals to the government for DREE projects. We will certainly do everything in our power to demand publicly that the government keep their commitments to the people of Newfoundland." Then I ended up that letter.

After sending that letter out, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, particularly, came into this House, Mr. Speaker, as if he had just been struck by a bolt of white lightning. He came in here with a hastily prepared press release in which he said everything. He accused me of misleading the people of Newfoundland. I did not, Sir. I forced this government to tell the truth to the people of Newfoundland. We had this release, draft press release or ministerial statement is the title of it, given by the minister in every attempt made to try to keep me from replying to it at the time, because they knew they were caught in a vice. They had to come out and try to save the day for themselves.

When that release came out, Sir, I then wrote another letter to the three hundred or so councils in Newfoundland and Labrador. Another letter. This letter was dated February 22nd., ten days later, following the press release

or the ministerial statement by the minister where he had suddenly realized that - not himself personally but his government had deceived the people of Newfoundland, that he was now going to have a barrage of requests from the people of Newfoundland that they surely invited when they said, "Special areas were done away with." We are going to have this barrage. They had to save the day somehow, so he came out with a ministerial statement in which an unprecedented thing was done, a member of the House, namely, myself, was attacked by the minister in an attempt to save the day for his department and his government.

I sent another letter, Mr. Speaker, which I have no fear at all to read into the records. In my letter of February 12, Mr. Speaker, I said - in my letter of February 12, 1974, I wrote to the councils, I said that I sincerely hoped that the provincial government did not raise hope falsely when they announced that DREE special areas had been done away with. As a result of my letters to councils the government have been forced, and I chose that word carefully, Mr. Speaker, the government have been forced to give the people of Newfoundland the real story.

If the Minister of Finance or any member of the government think that that is politically, Sir, or partisan politics being practised by myself, I would dispute it. I was interested merely in trying to get the facts home to the councils of this province.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs, I said in this letter, was forced to make a ministerial statement in the House of Assembly on February 18, in which he said that public services will be provided under DREE only where such services relate to specific development opportunities. In other words, I said, Sir, in my letter, the municipal services will only go into and I have in quotes, for the humorous effect of it, "Will only go into development opportunity areas." It is clear therefore that there will be special areas but the provincial government will be calling them by a different and fancier name. Nothing is clearer than that, Mr. Speaker.

It has now turned out that the announcement by the provincial government that special areas were to be done away with was an attempt to mislead our people. "As I referred in my earlier letter to you, the government did raise hopes falsely and now councils have been letdown savagely."

In his same ministerial statement the minister was also forced to admit that in spite of the fuss that government members have been making about \$1 million a year from DREE, thereby raising hopes and expectations all over the province, the actual amount that DREE is in fact prepared to spend on water, sewerage and highway works will be very limited. That is a statement made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs when he came into the House with his ministerial statement.

When the truth was forced from the government they had to admit that they cannot hope to meet the demands that will be made by the councils as a result of the government's deception, and I use that word, Sir, advisedly and after consideration.

In addition, in my letter, as a result of my letters to the council, the provincial government have also been forced to admit that not one new specific agreement has yet been signed by DREE for the spending of one single dollar in this province. Not one dollar, Mr. Speaker, was forced from the government in the ministerial statement, not one dollar had been committed by Ottawa to this government for spending in this province under that general development agreement which was just an umbrella agreement, not one dollar had been committed, in spite of the fuss and the hullabaloo and the publicity given to it by the Premier and all the other members and ministers who spoke in support of it.

I said in my letter, Sir, that I am personally disgusted at this turn of events but at least now the councils and people of our province have a better idea where they stand with this government. They can make up their own minds as to whether or not they have been misled. From my own experience with DREE and the Minister, Mr. Don Jamieson, I know that Mr. Jamieson is bending over backwards to help

this province, with federal money. If only the provincial government would take advantage of what DREE has to offer and negotiate good agreements for our province, instead of violently attacking the government in Ottawa. at every opportunity, we would be all much better off.

I then urge the towns and community councils to keep the pressure on the government to get their just desserts, Mr. Speaker, under the DREE agreement that was initially announced by this government.

So what does it all amount to, Sir, the savage attack by the Minister of Finance and myself, the attack by a minister in a ministerial statement when he knew there was no opportunity for any of us here to reply in debate? What does it all mean, Mr. Speaker? The hullabaloo about the general development agreement, what does it all mean? It means this, Sir, that in spite of the fact the government had said that special areas are to be done away with, they still exist and that any infrastructure, water, sewer, industrial development grants, not grants for industrial parks, school construction still have to be related as they were under the old agreements, have to be related to an industrial development that is going on. There are still special areas, in effect. It amounts to the fact, as the minister admitted in the House, \$100 million is not available. A certain amount, not much for services, as the minister said in his ministerial statement, and no specific agreements to spend one cent of money have been signed by this government up to now, although the rumblings are that in a matter of days there may be some agreement signed, and I certainly hope so, in various areas in the province.

My second letter, Sir, my first letter called this government's bluff. My second letter to the councils tried to put the thing in perspective and to show that they should not be misled by this mischievous attempt to make cheap political points at the expense of the people of this province. Then the Minister of Finance accuses me of trying to deceive the people of Newfoundland. "The worst example in history" says the Minister of Finance, "of political deceit."

Well if my attempt were political deceit, I would say it was political realism, trying to bring home to the people of Newfoundland the

brutal reality that not everything that this government tried to get across to them was going to be available. If there were any deception, Sir, it was on the part of this government, It was not to this House. Very little had been said to this House and the members I do not believe were deceived, except as members of the general public, they were deceived by the public statements made by this government.

I am personally pleased with the role I have played in trying to straighten this matter out in the peoples minds and to make sure the people are down to earth, that their expectations are not raised beyond realistic level and that they know the kind of government that they have been dealing with.

That, Sir, I believe is enough on the Area (3). We will get into other aspects of it when the estimates come into the House. I did want to set that matter straight for the record and not to allow the Minister of Finance. I am sorry that I had spoken so long after he spoke in the House, but not to allow the Minister of Finance to get away with what he did get away with - trying to throw the deception aspect of it over on me rather than over on his own colleagues where it belongs, not the Minister of Finance because I happen to know or I believe anyway that he was disgusted as well at the way this thing was handled.

The fraud, I suppose, for the want of a better word, that was perpetrated on the public, under this general development agreement, he was disgusted at it. I am sure he was. He does not have any desire to raise peoples' expectations, if anything he wants to dampen down and try and make people take a realistic view of their needs in the province, vis-a-vis the amount of money available to them - not raise them by this nonsense about hundreds of millions dollars a year coming in, everybody, every little community in the province is going to have its own share of the DREE money, not to do that, Mr. Speaker. He wants to dampen down this type of enthusiasm and I do not blame him, as Minister of Finance, I do not blame him for trying to do that. So I am sure he was disgusted, as well at the way this was overplayed.

Sir, this is one programme in which the government since it got into power has made a miserable job of it.

Let us look at another programme for which I had some responsibility as the Opposition's spokesman, namely: Justice, and I am glad to see that the Minister of Justice is in his chair today. What has not been done, Sir, in the Department of Justice or under the general idea of justice since this government got into power? Well, Sir, you name it and I am sure that it

has not been done. Any matter that you would care to name under the aegis of the Department of Justice, you name it, Sir, and it has not been done. Over two years ago or two and one-half years ago, I, as Acting Minister of Justice, wrote the then Minister of Justice in Ottawa in which I said that this province wants a court of appeal. It is the only province except one which has no court of appeal. This province wants a court of appeal. As a matter of principle and justice, we should have a court of appeal. We should not have appeals being heard by brother judges of a supreme court judge who heard the case to start with. We should not do it. It does not look good and justice may suffer as a result. I asked, as the exponent of the then administration, the Minister of Justice in Ottawa to consider the unanimous request of the Law Society for a supreme court judge in Corner Brook because of the great distance involved, 500 miles or so between here and Corner Brook, and the great need there was, for the adequate administration of justice on the West Coast, to have a supreme court judge in Corner Brook.

Mr. Speaker, I also asked the federal government at that time to consider, I believe, the appointment of two additional district court judges, one on the Burin Peninsula, I believe, and one on the Northeast Coast, up around the Bonavista Area. Why? So that the people who had need of justice or access to the courts in this province would not have to travel hundreds of miles, at great personal expense and inconvenience, to come to St. John's or in the case of district court judges to go to Corner Brook or Grand Falls, that they would have access to judges within reasonable driving distance of their own communities. The presence of judges in these areas would attract lawyers who could give legal advice to people. One of the things which are lacking in rural Newfoundland today is access to good legal advice by people. Half the letters I get in my office are legal matters, involving two constituents of mine. I cannot advise them on it. I cannot take sides between two constituents on a legal matter. Even if I were practicing law, I could not do that. I would have to refer them to a lawyer.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: I tell them there are lawyers in Corner Brook or in Grand Falls. Fifty, sixty, one hundred or in some cases one hundred and fifty miles away some person has a land problem or some person has a matrimonial problem, a custody problem, who do they go to see? They do not have any money; they cannot travel for miles. I wanted to try to bring more access to laws, courts, justice, lawyers and judges to the rural areas of this province and to have a court of appeal in this province. That is why I wrote the Minister of Justice a letter in December or in November of 1971.

What happened, Mr. Speaker? Well what happened was this: We were thrown out of office on January 18, 1972. Two solid years went by and nothing, as far as I can understand, nothing whatsoever was done by this government or by the Department of Justice concerning this matter.

Mr. Speaker, it is only now in this session of the House that we have some legislation brought in concerning some of these matters. I do not know why the government did not do anything about it. There was no need to delay on the matter. It was a straightforward, simple matter, legislation which would entail very little debate. There were some talk (I do not believe it) that this administration was waiting for a Progressive Conservative Government in Ottawa so that Tory lawyers could be put on the court of appeal. Now I do not believe that but that was the talk around town here. I do not believe the Minister of Justice would want to do that. Well, there was some talk.

Now when the election of October, 1972, was held and it looked like the Liberal Government in Ottawa were on very shaky ground and might go out at any minute and Mr. Stanfield and the Progressive Conservatives might come in - the story is that they were holding back and now that it looks like Mr. Stanfield has very little chance of getting in, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: I do not want to be sacriligious and compare the Minister of Finance and Heaven in the same breath.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, once it became clear that there was no Tory Government going in in Ottawa, then the government (this is the story now) relented and said, "Look, let us get some legislation before the House and let us get this court of appeal set up." How can you speak, Mr. Speaker, when you have this cherubic face looking across the House?

MR. NEARY: Not chubby!

MR. W. N. ROWE: No cherubic.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: Right on! Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, there is no other reason for it. Why the delay for two and one-half years? The Minister of Justice might have some reason and he might want to divulge it to the House when the estimates of his department go through the House.

MR. NEARY: I would not want to appear before the Minister of Finance.

MR. W. N. ROWE: No, if the honourable gentleman had to appear before the Minister of Finance, he would say; "No trial. I sentence the Member for Bell Island to life imprisonment, now what did he do?" There would be no parole, the lash fifty times a day. "Now let us find out what he did. What is the charge?" Mr. Speaker, nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister what about the fifth judge for Corner Brook which was part of the package as well? I do not know. Maybe the minister could tell us about Mr. Lang. I would not put up with it if I were the minister. Why not? The legal fraternity and the people of Corner Brook are all in agreement that there is a need for a fifth judge in Corner Brook to be sitting there all the time so that people do not have to pay the cost of retaining lawyers in here or waiting for the court to get out on circuit. There should be, Mr. Speaker. It is not an important life or death matter but it is of some importance to those people involved.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, what about the district court judges we were asking for? I hope the Minister of Justice will take cognizance of the question I am asking. What about the district court judges? I hope that those two new ones, I believe, we asked for, will be appointed. Look, Mr. Speaker, this argument, that there is not enough work for a district court judge, is ridiculous, is nonsense. The fact of the matter is that if a district court judge went down to Grand Bank, i.e., the first six months he was there he might be sitting on his hands all day long but I would guarantee you that in one year or so he would be the most over-worked person in this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Labrador?

MR. W. N. ROWE: There should be a judge on the Labrador Coast.

MR. HICKMAN: As the honourable gentleman is aware, we do have legislation.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Yes, it is just a matter that was passed in 1950 or 1951 or something. I would suggest that the minister's officials get together on it with the fellows in Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER: The answer is no.

MR. W. N. ROWE: The answer is no?

The problem in rural Newfoundland is with the lack of access of people to lawyers, courts and judges and that is a real problem. It means nothing to anybody who is not involved. If you are involved in a car accident and the case is heard (if you live down on the Southern Shore somewhere) in St. John's and you have to travel back and forth with multifarious postponements and what not, if you are a witness in it or you are a defendant, it can be very costly and time-consuming to you. You would be off your head before it is all over as the Hon. Member for Bell Island says. There is no need of it. For the extra amount of money involved and Ottawa paying the salaries, there is no need of us to suffer that, just because this government

or the Department of Justice or the minister thereof suffers from inertia. There is no need for us to suffer from lack of access to the courts, Sir, as a part of rural Newfoundland.

Sir, there is a more serious problem besides that concerning the Minister of Justice, the ministry of justice generally. The Leader of the Opposition came into this House and laid out a case of circumstantial evidence concerning the mysterious resignation of Mr. William Saunders of Bay de Verde District, just before the March election of 1972, a chain of evidence, circumstantial evidence, (people have been hanged on circumstantial evidence) a chain of evidence strong in the inferences that had to be drawn from that evidence and the things that were implied in that evidence. I am not going to go into it at all. There is a tremendous amount of circumstantial evidence. There was a letter dated two days before the dissolution of this House, before that election. There were all kinds of stories going around about that and when certain members of the administration received that letter, had that letter come into their hands, before the House met on that Wednesday, Mr. Saunder's cash position before the election of March, 1972, if not his cash

position, his asset position after the election of March 1972, very funny business indeed, Mr. Speaker, his cash position before and after. Now, Sir, like another member, I forget who it was, the honourable gentleman who spoke in this House, I am not concerned about Bill Saunders. I could not care less about Bill Saunders. I could not care less. Poor, wretched individual, if he did what some people suspect him of. I am not worried about him. What I am worried about, as a member of this House, is that there is a stink of corruption about the whole deal and if money did change hands, Mr. Speaker, in respect of that, it is not Bill Saunders I am worried about but when money changes hands it is a two-way street. There are at least two people involved. If there were a bribe involved in that particular case, and I do not think the word is too strong, then I am not worried about Bill Saunders, poor deluded individual. But if there were a bribe I am worrying about where the bribe came from. That is what I am worried about as a member of this House and I am sick and tired, as a man who has been accused of everything because of association with another administration, I am sick and tired, Sir, of this stink of corruption that affects politics in this province, that surrounds politics in this province. If you talk to anyone about this, most of them will say, "Well, that sort of thing goes on in politics," which is bad enough. But most of them will also say, Mr. Speaker, that these things have to be looked into to clear the air in politics in this province. What I want to see as a member of this House is a royal commission of enquiry or the R.C.M.P., directed by the Minister of Justice, to look into it to see what happened there. If Bill Saunders be clean, then I am delighted. If no money changed hands, then I am delighted. If the Minister of Justice want to throw into that pot boiler, if he want to throw into that Mr. Shea and Mr. Burgess, I would be equally delighted. If there were any wrong doings there, then let it come out and if any charges are going to be laid, let them be laid.

As a member of this House, Mr. Speaker, so much has been said and assumed and bandied about in this particular issue that the

time for hearsay is over, the time for rumours is over and groundless or grounded accusation is over, based on circumstantial evidence. The people involved in these particular cases should be permitted to hold their heads high, Mr. Speaker, or to have charges lashed out against them. Something by the way, that this particular government has not hesitated to do in respect of anyone associated with the previous administration who might have been thought guilty of something or other, has not hesitated to do it, did not hesitate to set up a royal commission on the liquor stores, did not hesitate at all, Mr. Speaker.

On evidence apparently, Mr. Robinette apparently must have advised the government that there were no criminal breaches of the criminal code in that transaction or otherwise the government surely would have instructed the officials, the law officers of the Crown, to proceed with criminal charges - apparently not. But here we have a case in which the circumstantial evidence is as strong or stronger than the liquor store thing and if the circumstantial evidence is borne out by real evidence, by actual documentary and oral evidence, if it is borne out then you will not need a Mr. Robinette to tell you whether there are criminal charges involved, Mr. Speaker. Your first year lawyer downtown would be happy to give you a legal opinion on it. What is the section of the criminal code?

MR. ROBERTS: Section 108, I think.

MR. WM. ROWE: Fourteen years, is it? If the allegations which have been made are substantiated by evidence that would be acceptable in court, Mr. Speaker, you are talking about a fourteen year sentence, I believe mandatory. The Leader of the Opposition is going in to get it now. I believe mandatory:

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WM. ROWE: That is what you are talking about, Sir. What is it? A little bit of political chicanery, a few little sort of half dirty political tricks? No, Mr. Speaker, you are talking about the

real possibility of a serious breach of one of the most serious provisions of the criminal code, and a chain of circumstantial evidence that have been laid out by the Leader of the Opposition and we have all heard more about it than that. I do not want to get into the hearsay of it. 108 is it?

MR. ROBERTS: Section 108, yes, 108(b).

MR. WM. ROWE: Section 108 (1) (b), "Everyone who gives or offers corruptly to a person who holds a judicial office or is a member of the Parliament of Canada or of a Legislature, any money, valuable consideration, office, place or employment in respect of anything done or omitted to be done, or omitted by him in his official capacity for himself or another person." In other words, if you bribe somebody to do something that he should not do if he were not bribed in his official capacity as a member of the House, then that person, everyone who does that is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for fourteen years. The Parliament of Canada, Sir, consisting of politicians like ourselves, have considered that kind of a thing to be so heinous and so wrong that they have given it a sentence. I suppose if you were convicted of manslaughter the most you would get would be three or four years, unless there were something else attached to it, maybe four or five years at most. But fourteen years, Mr. Speaker, that is how the public, the politicians, the Legislature of Canada, the Legislators of Canada view that and I view it in the same serious light. It is a very serious matter and it should not be passed over lightly.

That is why I say now, as a member of the House, the Minister of Justice should instruct the R.C.M.P. to investigate this matter. If they come back and they say there is nothing at all to it, I for one will stand in this House and say, "I am sorry I ever brought it up. I am sorry I ever brought it up. Very sorry." I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would do the same thing but there was so much going around about it that it had to be done, it had to be exposed publicly. Or if the Minister of Justice will have a royal commission of enquiry,

although I must say that I think that a royal commission type of thing is a bad way of getting at the truth because of the form. It is not like in a court of law or anything, it is too much like a kangaroo court sort of thing where a person who might be grossly libeled does not even have a chance to cross-examine in the court of law.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WM. ROWE: What about Burgess and Shea? Throw them all in. Appoint a royal commission if the minister want to and throw in Burgess, Shea and Mr. Saunders. Throw them all in. Mr. Oldford, why did Mr. Oldford resign and go back to the magistracy under very funny circumstances? The Minister of Justice reappointed him, having several months before come out and condemned utterly the fact that we put Gerry Horan back on the magistrate's bench. One of the finest magistrates, I understand, to be on the magistrate's bench, condemned by the Minister of Justice. Mr. Oldford resigns under peculiar circumstances, goes right back on the bench.

I am not too worried about Gus Oldford. I think probably that he was just a fish out of water all the way along the line but these other three gentlemen, particularly Mr. Saunders. Hugh Shea has come out and said he will welcome a judicial enquiry or a royal commission. Burgess, I do not know where -

MR. ROBERTS: The first job is to find him.

MR. WM. ROWE: I do not know where Burgess is.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. WM. ROWE: Well I mean if Burgess can be found, by all means throw him into that but by all means let us clear the air on this Saunders thing. Saunders used to be a colleague of mine over there. I sat next to him for a while.

MR. NEARY: I shared a seat with him.

MR. WM. ROWE: Shared a seat with him, the member for Bell Island. So I mean if the guy be clean, if there be no wrongdoing here, then let that be shown by a police report for example where they go into

the evidence, have a look at some documents, accounts and what not in banks, or have a royal commission set up to look into it - do it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Saunders has not denied anything.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Saunders has not. Well he has not said much, he has hung up the phone when anyone has called him. I suppose anyone would hang up the phone. But what does this government hope to do about it, Mr. Speaker? If there be any wrongdoing there then sooner or later it will out. The old saying is that truth is the daughter of time. In other words, if something wrong has gone on then nobody who has any knowledge of it can hope that it is going to stay buried forever. Sooner or later as Mr. Nixon found to his chagrin, considerable embarrassment, sooner or later it will out. So I do not know what anyone would hope to achieve by not pursuing this matter actively, either through a police report. If they can come up with prima facie evidence that can be submitted to a court, to a magistrate, preliminary hearing that can go on then to a court of law, okay let them do it. If not then certainly the Minister of Justice and the Department of Justice are cleared of any charge that they sat on their hands on this whole thing. The Minister of Justice should take unilateral action on this Mr. Speaker. If he cannot convince his colleagues -

MR. NEARY: They sent them down to Joey's house.

MR. WM. ROWE: Right, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Justice or this government can instruct or tacitly approve raids by the R.C.M.P. on members of the previous administration,

officials of the previous administration, looking for evidence based on nothing but circumstantial evidence, looking for real evidence, hopefully, from their point of view, of wrong doings so they can prosecute. I am only telling them to do the same thing now. On a circumstantial chain of evidence there should be an enquiry, a police investigation or a royal commission of enquiry, exactly the same circumstances.

The Minister of Justice, Sir, he is a fine man, a fine honourable gentleman. I practiced law with him for two or three years. He was in his firm. He was in the Department of Justice in the Liberal Government at that time, but I must say, Sir, that as the Minister of Justice, he should have it investigated. I am not trying to accuse him of anything. The liquor stores were investigated. DOSCO assets were investigated. That was not even raised in the House, the DOSCO assets. They are being investigated. Welfare payouts on Bell Island are being investigated.

I must say, Sir, I once said in this House last year that the Minister of Justice, no matter what the political situation is, the Minister of Justice, as far as I was concerned, would be eminently, an eminently good man to go on the court of appeal or on the Supreme Court of this Province; an aspiration, I think, that he may take seriously. I mean, he may have that serious aspiration I do not know. I would have no hesitation in going along with it but Sir, I must say as a member of this House that if this government, particularly the minister involved, fail to act on the circumstantial evidence given, the irresistible inference is drawn therefrom. I must say, Sir, I have to alter my view and opinion of the gentleman - I have to.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. W. ROWE: I do not have any. You can only blackmail if you have some power over a man or over something. I do not have any power of any kind in that regard, Mr. Speaker.

I must say that as a member of this House and as an admirer, at least former admirer of the Minister of Justice, I do think he should as a minister and if his colleagues will not go along with him, let him do it unilaterally himself, of his own volition. I think Sir, that the

facts that have been elicited to date demand that. I think they do.

Now, Sir, getting away from justice, I got carried away on that: I have about half a dozen topics to cover here and it looks very much like I am not going through them today. So, what I think I will do, Mr. Speaker, is go into one more topic here and save the remainder of my notes for the budget speech when that comes up.

I would like to say something about the BRINCO deal, very briefly because it is late and I do not have much time to go into it but I will say something about that. The Lower Churchill deal, the BRINCO deal entered into between the Government of Newfoundland and BRINCO, and all I really want to say on it at the moment, Sir, is that I do hope that the government during the estimates, certainly when we are going through the various departments, the ministers concerned, I do hope that they spell out in some detail what they are up to. I hope they give us the answers to some questions and if we cannot think of the questions, if we do not raise questions which are important and they have important information I hope they, once more, shall divulge it of their own volition. I hope they do, Mr. Speaker.

How is the \$1.1 billion needed to develop the Lower Churchill going to be raised? The Minister of Finance is not in his seat now but I do hope that he tells this House how the \$1.1 billion, presently estimated for the development of the Lower Churchill, how it is going to be raised. Where is that money coming from? Is the government itself going to borrow that? Mr. Speaker, I do not mind speaking over the voices of the members of the House but when the officials of the House are drowning me out, I must say, when they go out and get elected, Sir, then they have the right to come in and be discourteous but not before they are elected.

Mr. Speaker, how is the \$1.1 billion to be raised? Is the government going to borrow it on its own general borrowing programme as part of the general credit rating of money for the Province? Is this what is going to happen? In other words, are the government going to double the provincial debt in one fell swoop? Is this what they are going to do,

this government that gave the idea across to the Province, the people at large, that we were bankrupt? Do they now propose to go out and in one fell swoop after two years in office double our provincial debt? Probably more than double because \$1.1 billion is the present estimate. I understand it will probably be \$1.6 billion.

MR. NEARY: That does not even include the tunnel across the Strait of Bell Isle.

MR. W. ROWE: Well, on that now, that is right because the Government of Canada, even though it may provide the money, it will be by way of loan. It will have to be repaid at some point.

Is the government going to set up a crown corporation to take over these assets, CFLco shares and the other hydro assets in Labrador? And is that crown corporation going to borrow the money? Does the government think that this crown corporation can borrow over a billion dollars with its own signature without being backed by this government? Is that what they think is going to happen?

In other words, does the government think it can borrow the money for the development of the Lower Churchill without affecting the credit of this Province? If the crown corporation will not require the backing of the government, does the government now alter its opinions as to the liability of the government for crown corporations?

You may remember a debate, Sir, when they said that the government is responsible for bailing out crown corporations if they get into difficulty, if, though there is no direct guarantee by the government. This government said that and there is a lot of argument, pro and con, on it. Well, taking this government at its word, no matter what it does, if the government borrows the money itself directly, if a crown corporation borrows the money with the government backing, government guarantee, or if the crown corporation which borrows the money without any government backing, it affects drastically the credit of this Province.

Now, that might not be a bad thing but I am asking the government to give out some information as to how they propose to raise the money because as surely as night follows day, if this government affect the

credit of this Province to the extent of borrowing over a billion dollars, it is going to have an effect on the government's borrowing programme for ordinary public services such as money to school boards or to the DC's for the building of schools, for water and sewer systems, for building of roads, for all these things. It has to have that effect. Sir. it has to, as surely as night follows day.

That may be a good thing. Maybe the people of Newfoundland are willing to say to their government and to us as members of the House, "That is all right we do not want the road paved from Fleur de Lys to Baie Verte or we do not want the road paved -" I forget some of the places in the honourable Speaker's district - Loon Bay and all the places in the member for St. John's South's district, all these places maybe the people of Newfoundland are willing and ready, indeed eager to say to the government, "Do not bother with that. What you should do is borrow \$1 billion or more." Which is about what? Six or seven years of capital borrowing.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Well it is about four years at the current Crosbie rate.

MR. W. ROWE: At the current rate of the Minister of Finance who is in control of a bankrupt province, to hear him speak two years ago, you have \$200 million a year, you are talking four or five years or six or seven years of borrowing money at the present rate for nothing other than the Lower Churchill Development, with very little money being spent on public services.

Now is this the situation? I wish the government would tell us They will not tell us this. The Premier would not tell us on Saturday night when he appeared on television. He would not tell us anything about that. All he said was, "Now, feel secure everybody! This is not going to affect your public services." If it be not going to affect our public services, then I would like to know why it is not going to affect public services, Mr. Speaker. If there were a private company developing this, as BRINCO did with the Upper Churchill, then I would say, "They are raising the money. There is no government guarantee

That has no affect whatsoever on our borrowing money for public services." But if the government enters into a deal with BRINCO wherby BRINCO has a fee-for-service contract, build the thing, the Lower Churchill, make their money, a straight contract, either cost-plus or turn-key or something else and if the government is going on the back of any notes or borrowing directly the money for the construction of the Lower Churchill, then I would like to know how this government can do that without it affecting adversely our progress in providing public services throughout this Province.

Now will the government please answer that question? The minister of Mines, does he have the answer to it? No, he is not concerned about it Mr. Speaker. He does not have the answer to the question. The Minister of Education? No, he is probably does not have the answer to that question. The school board problems, the school problems in this Province are becoming a monstrosity, a Frankenstein monster, Mr. Speaker, the problems for providing schools in this Province. The Minister of Education is not thinking about the Lower Churchill, he is thinking about how he can extricate, honourably thinking how he can extricate himself from the possibly of sliding into a quagmire

and also doing his best for the school boards, the D.F.C.'s and the pupils, the students and parents involved. I am sure he is trying to do that. The Lower Churchill is the least of his worries unless it should turn out that he finds himself in the position where he does not have the money to maintain construction at even the present levels, or if the Minister of Highways finds that out or the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Now, I am not saying that the Lower Churchill should not be done. All I want the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Premier, all I want them to answer for us is this simple question. Will the government ownership of that asset and their announced intention of going ahead with it, will that adversely affect the provision of public services in this province? Then let the people of Newfoundland make up their own minds on it, Mr. Speaker.

If the answer to that be yes, then the government shall have to take the consequences of that decision they made. If the answer be no, the government shall have to take the consequences of the decision of the people of Newfoundland. The people of Newfoundland should know the answer to that question. We, as an opposition, should know the answer to that question. Otherwise, what can we say about the whole issue? What can we say? Maybe the government have some secret formula for finding the money and it will not affect the credit -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why are they hiding it?

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, this seems to be a strange reticence, Mr. Speaker, on the part of the ministers who normally will shoot from the lip at the slightest provocation. The Minister of Finance is not known for his shyness, his backwardness in lashing out, politically or otherwise, no reticence.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. W. ROWE: Oh, yes. Well, let us hear the answer then.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What is the answer?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. W. ROWE: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy undertake - not now

because I want fifteen minutes or so to finish this up - but will the Minister of Mines and Energy undertake to let us know when his estimates come through the House, when we are talking generally about it, will he tell us how this miracle is going to be achieved?

MR. ROBERTS: They cannot even sell their most recent bond issue, \$10 million stuck in the hands of the brokers, the current fire commission issue. It has dropped five points on the market.

MR. W. ROWE: See, that is the kind of information we should be in possession of. That is the first I have heard of that.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister might want to check it.

MR. W. ROWE: It is a good thing we have such a digging. I mean, that is the kind of information we should have, Mr. Speaker. Because can I as a member of this House or any other backbencher in the House come flat out in favour of this if we knew at that time that it meant that the capital construction and public services would be cut by seventy-five per cent or even fifty per cent? Can we do that? I would have to think awfully long and hard about it.

If on the other hand the government and the ministers involved can give us reasons why it will not affect the provision of public service, then I as a member of this House would find it awfully hard to oppose the government in what they have done. All kinds of questions, Mr. Speaker. How much money is Ottawa going to put into this? Half a billion dollars is the figure thrown around for transmission across the Straits, half a billion dollars.

Well, what are these terms? Is that a grant or is that a loan which has to be repaid, in which case it again affects the credit of this province?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A loan.

MR. W. ROWE: It is a loan.

MR. ROBERTS: Will it require take or pay contracts?

MR. W. ROWE: Will the minister tell us at some point, is it a deal which would be an analogy to the Come By Chance deal where the government

lends money for the construction of the wharf and it is going to be paid back out of user charges? This means that you have to show the Government of Canada that you have take-or-pay contracts or you are going to have enough use to pay it back. Is that the way it is going to work? In which case, will the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador tell us who is going to use the power, Mr. Speaker? Do they have people on the hook now, signed, sealed and delivered, take-or-pay contracts for the amount of power necessary? Or are they going to buy it themselves and use it for domestic purposes only, you know, domestic users?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Rotary.

MR. W. POWE: Oh, Rotary, the Rotarian Kid. It is all there, Mr. Speaker. One of the saddest moments of my days that I am not in Kinsmen or Rotary or Lion because I do not know what the government policies are. I am only a member of the House, Sir. I sit here stunned as an ox, day after day trying to get a government policy out of the minister. I have to pick up the paper and read a garbled report of what went on at Rotary to get some idea as to what the government is up to.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, are there take-or-pay contracts now? If so or if not, how does that affect Ottawa financing? How does it affect the financing from the bond market? What kind of a deal is being entered into with BRINCO? As the member for Bell Island said the other day, is this one of these sweetheart deals where the government, the holder of the public purse, the government takes all the risk of the thing never coming to anything? Although that might be a remote possibility.

The fact is that if you borrow a billion dollars there is always the likelihood you could lose your shirt on it. Some great breakthrough in technology, atomic or otherwise, could render that obsolete for all that we know. So, the government takes the risk while BRINCO takes the cream. Is that the situation? I do not know, Mr. Speaker, but how can the Minister of Mines or anyone else stand up in this House and say, "What is the opposition's position on this tremendous take over of BRINCO? What is it?" How can we as responsible public servants have a publicly

committed position without the answers to some of these very basic questions?

Another question, Sir, that the minister or the Premier might want to answer at some point, if they are not too embarrassed to do so? Why did the government allow itself to take a hosing in buying the CFLCO shares and the other assets from BRINCO? They could have had all the shares of BRINCO, including assets spread all over Canada, for \$171 million. The shares, 707 times whatever it was, came to what?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: \$171 million, \$172 million.

MR. W. ROWE: \$172 million. I mean, I am not any Einstein when it comes to mathematics, Sir, but I mean, it is a matter of multiplying the number of shares by 707. Then, you come to that kind of a figure.

Now, the government buys one large asset of BRINCO, CFLCO and the hydro rights, of course, that BRINCO owned outside of CFLCO, and they pay \$160 million for it, \$11 million knocked off from the price that they would have paid for the BRINCO shares. Now, I am no great negotiator with multi-national corporations or anything, Sir Val Duncan or anybody else, but that seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the government got ripped off, the government got an awful hosing in negotiations.

Apparently BRINCO started at \$164 million, if you can believe "Time Magazine" or some other newspaper I read and the government finally settles for \$160 million, \$4 million knocked off the asking price of BRINCO -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. W. ROWE: Well, maybe the minister can give us the information. Do not believe it! "Do not believe it," he says. Well, what is one supposed to believe, Mr. Speaker? We cannot get any information except milky toast, wishy-washy statements of, you know, "everyone have no fear, this will not affect the public services. Have no fear, we did a great job negotiating."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: How about the "Financial Post".

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier said it was \$164 million.

MR. W. ROWE: The Premier said they offered \$164 million as a purchase price or as a sale price, \$164 million. No wonder the Premier ended up in the - no wonder, Sir, one looked across the House and saw the Minister of Finance up tight and the Premier ill for a while and the Minister of Mines and Energy was a twitching heap for about a week there. No wonder, they were being hosed to death by superior negotiators. What percentage is \$4 million of \$164 million?

MR. POBEPTS: Oh, two and a half per cent.

MR. W. ROWE: Two and a half per cent. What negotiators, What a job they did for the people of Newfoundland. In I come with my big rosy apple and I say; "I want ten dollars for that apple," knowing that it is worth ten cents. I am beaten down to nine dollars and ninety cents. I come into the House and I say; or the other side come into the House and say; "We were able to knock ten cents off ten dollars for that apple." Mr. Speaker, the whole thing is very suspicious. We have already asked about the purchasers for power. None of these questions are answered, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Mines can stand up here and say; "What is the opposition's position?"

Let us know the facts. Let us know where they are getting the money. Let us know what kind of a deal they are entering into with BRINCO. Let us find out what the value of the assets that they let go, that BRINCO had were worth to see if they got a half decent deal on the CFLCo. shares and the other assets in Labrador. Let us see the public services that are going to be affected. Answer this question, Mr. Speaker, if the government will; What is the role of the Shaheen Organizations in this? The present great friends of this government. Once the most odious name that could be uttered on the face of this earth as far as the government were concerned, now the friends of this government. What is their

role in this? I notice the letter of agreement mentioned the government or its nominee. What clever individual stuck in the word "nominee" there, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that there was no slip up in the agreement there? A third party? What is the name of this corporation anyway? Northern Power Corporation?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, W. N. North Power Corporation. Why was that incorporated, Mr. Speaker, some months ago as a company in this province? A paper company as far as I can make out. Does anybody know anything about the assets of it? No assets?

AN HON. MEMBER: Doctor Peters.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Is Doctor Peters in it?

MR. ROBERTS: I think Doctor Peters is the chief asset.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Doctor Peters is its chief asset. What does that set up, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER: Old buddy Stu!

MR. ROWE, W.N. I mean why? Why was it set up? To do what? Maybe it is now all clicking into place. Maybe Mr. Shaheen's organization or this North Power thing is going to enter into this deal in some way or other, in which case, if that be so, the Government of Newfoundland, be it right or wrong, owes it to the members of this House and the people of the province to divulge that information.

These are only, Sir, a half dozen -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE, W.N. The questions keep tumbling out of one's head, Mr. Speaker, questions which not only have there been no answers, there has been no attempt to even delude the people on, talk about give information on. What is the deal with Quebec Hydro? Are Quebec Hydro going to purchase this power. In which case it would seem to be a little bit of a backing down as far as the Minister of Finance certainly is concerned, his words to the effect that this power will run to the sea until it comes to this province.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, these are a half a dozen questions. Do you intend to adjourn the House? Sir, you are going to come back tonight?

We will adjourn the House. In that case, I will now take the House Leader at his word. I will not bother adjourning the debate, I will just give up speaking, since I will not have a chance to speak in this debate again.

But these are some questions, Sir, concerning the BRINCO deal now that spring to mind without any analysis of the situation, without any pouring over the facts with the midnight oil burning over my shoulder. These, Sir, are just basic obvious questions which this government have made no attempt to answer. Sir, when the estimates come through this House, when the Budget debate is on, we will be making further speeches on this very important matter and we will be demanding the answers to some of these questions. At the same time, Sir, I hope to get the opportunity to deal with other areas of the government's lack of activity which support this non-confidence motion, in another debate, in the Budget debate and when the estimates come to the House. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question - On the amendment.

On motion amendment lost. On division, for the record.

MR. GILLET: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I note that the honourable Member for Twillingate has adjourned the debate.

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

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 9, 1974 at three of the clock.