



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

---

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 45

---

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

MONDAY, MAY 5, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

The House met at 11:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the galleries today seven grade ten and eleven students from Labrador City Collegiate, Labrador City, with their teacher Mr. Cole. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you to the galleries and trust that your visit here is most interesting and informative.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

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

HON. J. ROUSSEAU, MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS: I rise on a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, in respect to certain statements made by the honourable the Member for Bell Island which were carried on the electronic media and in The Evening Telegram over the weekend and I think it is time that we laid before the House all the particulars in respect to "water bomber contract".

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to that and the insinuation of the weekend that Mr. Jamieson or his office was not aware of any agreement, I think I will have to go back and, I think for everybody's sake, that the details of this be laid before the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Point of order, I do not for a minute wish to impede the honourable gentleman if he wishes to make a ministerial statement with respect to this matter but surely a point of personal privilege is not an occasion for a long statement on what may or may not have transpired in connection with some official correspondence and official actions.

The honourable gentleman seems to me might be more in order, Sir, if he would, you know, if he is going to make a statement if he makes it on the point when Your Honour calls ministerial statements.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair was pretty well of the same opinion. I was willing to hear the honourable minister if he was establishing a point of privilege but I perhaps feel at the moment it might be better if it were on a point of a ministerial statement.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I accept whatever way I can get this on the table of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the honourable minister in making a ministerial statement.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Okay, then. I will make a ministerial statement, Sir. And I am going to make the statement and I am going to complete it, you know, with everything here because I think it is to everybody's benefit and I am going to go back in time if I may.

Last Wednesday the honourable Member for Bell Island asked a rather innocuous question and I replied to the question. Then the honourable the Leader of the Opposition spent some time persuing the question. I can understand why the honourable Member for Bell Island did not. But on Friday at five-thirty or a quarter to six, the honourable Member for Bell Island gave, and I quote the news media, a "hot tip", from, it was mentioned in the media, a federal member for the riding involved who had checked with the office.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on Thursday the honourable the Leader of the Opposition was not satisfied with my reply in the House on Wednesday and on Thursday he asked for it to be debated on the late show. And as the honourable Speaker knows, I wanted to make certain that on the late show I had my five minutes on Thursday and that it was not two or three minutes left. And I mentioned to the honourable the Speaker and to the honourable the Deputy Speaker, or Deputy Chairman of Committees that I wanted to make sure I had five minutes. But unfortunately, as I understand it, the Leader of the Opposition could not make it on Thursday. So on Friday I thought about it, myself and my colleague the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, said no, we will let it go and we let it go. It is not making mistakes, Mr. Speaker, that hurts you politically, it is repeating them so I do not intend to repeat the same mistake and let this go but I intend to lay before the House the facts.

Now, first of all, Mr. Speaker, I have a number of things that I am prepared to table today. This is done in conjunction with the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture but I had the question posed to me and we have discussed it and everything here that is given from his department or anything on his behalf is with his compliance.

Now first of all I would like to clear one little item and I think that somehow or other the honourable Leader of the Opposition who is not in his seat but I am sure can hear me, questions the fact that a subsidiary agreement in forestry was signed, questions the fact. Now I am not prepared to table the agreement. That is the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture and the honourable Don Jamieson to agree on and should the honourable members across want that they can pose their question to the appropriate minister.

MR. NEARY: The letter of consent was signed Friday.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am prepared - it is correct, let me get to it okay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Now, Mr. Speaker I am prepared to lay on the table of the House the press release, the story from The Evening Telegram dated April 27, I believe it is, and The Daily News story, there is a picture there of Mr. Jamieson and the honourable the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations signing the forestry agreement.

So I will lay these on the table of the House. The agreement was signed. There was no question about that. Furthermore in what I passed out this morning there were certain selected items on the forestry agreement but I have included on the last page -

MR. NEARY: That has nothing to do with the -

MR. ROUSSEAU: One second now, I am trying to allieviate first the fears of the honourable the Leader of the Opposition. On the last page of the information -

MR. NEARY: People down there -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, can I have -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I want to show this House today and I want to show the press who have been extremely responsible on Friday, had they not come to me, the threat of scandal and everything else, I want to show the people of this Province how a politician uses the weekend media, how he uses the weekend media to insult the minds of the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Now, Mr. Speaker, on the last page of the hand out this morning -

MR. NEARY: What about the personal references?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. RODSSEAU: The signatures which were put on the agreement on that date, the honourable Minister of Regional and Economic Expansion, Donald Jamieson, and witnessed, and the honourable the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations and a witness.

Now I would like to go through, if I may, Mr. Speaker, what happened in this situation. Number one, and the first page of the hand out is a Minute-in-Council, Minute-in-Council number 744, 1974, approved on 26th. of June 1974, ordered that the following action relating to the Forest Fire Air Fleet of the Department of Forestry and Agriculture be and it is hereby approved, provided the necessary funds to meet the costs involved are available in the department's vote for 1974-1975, the reconditioning of two Canso aircraft at an estimated cost of \$150,000 per aircraft.

The - excuse me I have to go back and forth, Mr. Speaker. Now, following that, Mr. Speaker, following the Cabinet approval to proceed, our aircraft experts reviewed the capabilities of many firms to determine who might be able to do the work. To our dismay we found that no company in the Province was licenced at that time by the Federal Department of Transportation to undertake the highly complex and technical task that was required. At that point in time there was nobody provincially licenced.

Several firms on the Mainland were invited to submit tenders on August 30, 1974. And those firms, Mr. Speaker, were as follows: Atlantic Aviation of Canada, Field Aviation, Weston Aviation, C.A.E. Aircraft Limited, St. Louis Aviation Incorporated, Aircraft Metal Specialist Limited, Eastern Aviation Contractors Limited, Cross Canada Flights Limited. I am sorry, Eastern Aviation was not first invited.

Tenders were called on August 30 but because Eastern Aviation wanted to have the opportunity, the tender date was extended to

September 6th. and 11th. to allow Eastern Aviation to have the opportunity to bid on this contract.

MR. HICKMAN: Who is Eastern Aviation? They are -

MR. ROUSSEAU: They are in Gander. That is a Gander based company.

So seven companies were invited because the Newfoundland company did not have federal licence to do the kind of work that we wanted but we had the contract date extended from August 30th. to September 11th. to allow Eastern Aviation to bid.

Now that bid was looked at with all the other ones. Now I can read here a few notes I have. In respect to the Field Aviation, here is what the technical experts said, "Field Aviation Limited, Calgary, Alberta quoted \$307,896.35, for both aircraft with fabric covered training edges or \$326,902.15 with metal. This firm made the most thorough inspection of the aircraft and the most comprehensive report. This is an ideal work package. Field have also committed themselves within these figures to twelve items which none of the others offer. Included are furnishing and installation of wing strob lights, a desirable safety item, provision and installation of new cabin warning lights and illuminated signs with batteries, engine instruments and transmitters and the other ones were also indicated."

Here is the reading on the Eastern Aviation one. Eastern Aviation Contractors Limited, Gander, Newfoundland quoted a total of \$186,128 for both aircraft. They did not quote separately for metalized trailing edges. Their bid is qualified by the statement and I quote, "In the event extensive repairs are required due to corrosion or damage not evident until after dismantling parts of the aircraft, we would like to reserve the right to negotiate further based on the extent of these repairs!" This is in effect asking for a blank cheque because they do not specify in clear terms how much they are prepared to do at the price. Whereas

the other ones were firm bids. So this - and unofficially the airplanes were dispatched, the two Cansos were dispatched without approval to Toronto. There is no question about that. And they were held in Toronto for approval. But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, it came to the attention of the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture and myself that this situation had occurred, and we had the background of the story and the airplanes were kept in Toronto for ten days, twelve days or somewhere in that area and the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture and myself went back to cabinet. We explained everything to our colleagues in cabinet, and it was cabinet's wish, and before I say that I should read, and that is in here, the minutes of the Joint Federal-Provincial Committee on Forestry. The committee agreed to the establishment of a new project under programme item six, rebuilding four Canso water bombers at an estimated total cost of \$800,000. It is estimated that expenditures on this project will total \$400,000 during the present fiscal year. If necessary funds for the project will be transferred from item four in the agreement and an exchange of letters between the minister will be arranged by Mr. Sheppard if required. The committee approved the method of the tender call whereby eight firms were invited to bid on project. It also approved the awarding of the tender to Field Aviation Limited, Calgary, this firm being the lowest evaluated tender.

MR. NEARY: The federal boys approved.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The Joint Federal-Provincial Committee approved it.

Now it was government's wish that this committee re-evaluate its recommendation. And even beyond that the committee was told that it was government's wish that if there was anyway that the Eastern Aviation Limited could have the contract, government would like to see them have the contract. They were told that, the Federal-Provincial Committee verbally in a meeting held in the Hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture's office at which I was present.

The group, the Federal Management Committee, the Federal-Provincial Subsidiary Agreement on Forestry on October 28,

and I showed the Hon. Member for Bell Island this letter on Friday, to the Hon. H. Collins, Minister of Forestry and Agriculture after we had requested that they re-evaluate and attempt to give it, if at all possible, to Eastern Aviation .

MR. NEARY: The minister showed me the letter after.

MR. ROUSSEAU: At your request the Federal-Provincial Management Committee of the Forestry Subsidiary Agreement has re-examined its approval of an award of tender for the rebuilding of two Canadair water bombers. At the request of government and at the further request of government that, if at all possible, it should go to Gander no question. And the committee, I am sure, will verify that fact. The decision to award the contract to Field Aviation in Calgary was made within the terms of reference of the committee and was based on information presented by the Department of Transportation and Communications. That would be by Mr. Leland, the Chief Engineer and other technical people. The committee, after reconsideration, confirms its decision. And that is co-signed by R. Sheppard, who is the co-chairman provincially and J. Baker, who is the co-chairman federally. And that letter is being tabled this morning.

So on November 6, a Minute-in-Council was passed, which is here, ordering that the contract be given to Field Aviation as per the recommendations of the Joint Federal-Provincial Committee.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is the date correct?

MR. ROUSSEAU: October 28, oh, I am sorry, November 6.

Now I must stop for a minute, Mr. Speaker, and give an indication of what the Forestry Agreement is. The Forestry Agreement, in effect, consists of eight different programmes, number one to eight. Now we, provincially, can change any one within any one of the eight programmes. Any one of them can be changed back and forth. But according to what I have tabled as well here today, Section 7 of the agreement says this, and this is going to be tabled: Each of the ministers, that is the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture and the Minister of Regional and Economic Expansion, shall designate one or more senior officials to be responsible for the administration of this agreement.



These officials shall constitute the Management Committee whose function it shall be to oversee the implementation of the programme specified, to find infrastructure components and projects for the purpose of this agreement and to fulfill responsibilities identified for the Management Committee elsewhere in this agreement. The federal minister and the provincial ministers shall respectively appoint one federal and one provincial official from the members of the Management Committee to act as co-chairman. And Section 19, which has also been passed out, says this: This agreement and Schedule A thereof, which lists the programmes and the amount, may be amended as agreed from time to time by the ministers and relevant amendments to be made by an exchange of correspondence between the two ministers. Each programme item added to Schedule A shall form part of this agreement and shall be governed by the terms thereof as fully and effectively as if it had originally been included in this agreement. It is expressly understood and agreed, however, that any amendment to Section 6 shall require the approval of the Governor-in-Council. Well anyway.

So in order to have the bombers refurbished and money had to be diverted from one programme to another where there was an excess then it requires the joint signatures of the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture and the Minister of Regional and Economic Expansion. I did that last year in respect to the LaScie Road and the St. Anthony contract. You cannot wait until they are signed. We are men of honour. The federal government are men of honour. As Mr. Jamieson said, yes, we are going to sign it. On an item of that amendment we go ahead and do it, because you cannot wait and time is of the essence in the refurbishing of the water bombers. Good.

So in the meantime on October #6 the Deputy Minister of Forestry and Agriculture wrote the Secretary of the Forest Agreement Management Committee and he says, an integral part of this new Forest Management Programme is the development of an adequate fire protection system. One of the elements of this system was not adequately identified at the time of the signing of the agreement and that is the water bomber fleet. It has now been decided by the Province that the most practical approach to providing a fire suppression service is the refurbishing of

the Canso water bombing fleet. This is estimated to cost \$200,000 for a machine and it is planned to do two machines per year starting this winter.

May I request the committee approval on this as a project under programme six. (October 16 now) This will require an adjustment of the budget, and I would suggest the following, and he suggests a transfer of funds. I would be pleased to attend the appropriate committee meeting to discuss this matter if necessary.

So, Mr. Speaker, as it happened, and very surprisingly so on Friday afternoon after this myself and the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture went down to his office and met with the deputy minister. And lo and behold on my way into the minister's office what should I see right on the top of the letter pile on his secretary's desk was a letter from the Hon. Mr. Jamieson, the letter referred to by the Hon. Member for Bell Island. So I am not prepared to table that letter. Again it is here but you take my word for it. If Mr. Jamieson wants to do it, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture will do it. That is up to him. But it is private correspondence between them but they may.

MR. ROBERTS: What was the date on it?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Just let me, I am going to do that. But the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture and Mr. Jamieson if they want to. The date was April 30, 1975.

MR. MORGAN: That is, years ago.

MR. ROBERTS: Wednesday.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Right.

Now remember what I previously said. I previously said that any change in programmes has to be signed by both ministers. It does not mean that it takes effect when it is signed. You know, we have done many roads and many other programmes have been carried out under the same aspect of the agreement. And I got all of the supporting evidence right here that the Federal Provincial Committee agreed with it. But the first line of the Hon. Don Jamieson's letter to Mr. Collins, I am prepared to read into the record of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Read the whole letter.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I do not want to. I just want to get dates.

And if the Hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture with the concurrence of Mr. Jamieson wants to it is quite all right with me.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Jamieson's office told me that the letter is public.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Okay. I am going to wait and check and find out what we will do. But anyway, the first line, The Hon. Harold A. Collins, M.H.A., Minister of Forestry and Agriculture -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, just the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Dear Harold; This refers to your letter of February 13 -

MR. ROBERTS: Three months after the contract had been awarded.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, but that is what we are saying. The point I am trying to make is that you do not wait for signatures on the appointment of the job. This job of refurbishing the water bombers had to be done. Time was of the essence. The Federal-Provincial Agreement was acted under by the Joint Federal-Provincial Management Committee, co-signed by both. The letter is here. So to say that Mr. Jamieson's office knew nothing of it is not accurate. That Mr. Jamieson did not know, but it is quite possible because it is done at the officials' level. The authority is in the agreement for them to act at the officials' level.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing under the table.

There is no scandal nor scandalous acts in respect to this. I think the government did everything in its power to ensure that the contract went to the company which in the belief of the people who were involved it was the best deal. The government bent over backwards to give the contract to Eastern Aviation to the point of holding those water bombers for ten or twelve days, I forget what it was, in Toronto to ask the Joint Management Committee, the Federal-Provincial Management Committee to re-evaluate its decision in the letter here of October 28 which says, no, it confirms its decision. It is a joint federal-provincial agreement. The recommendation of this group to the minister is normally a situation which has to be accepted, and it was accepted in this case.

And you know, I lay on the table of the House the pertinent information. And with the facts, I said, you know, there is no doubt in our minds in government that there is any scandal or anything else involved in the awarding of this contract for two water bombers to field aviation in Calgary. Now, I think that it is unfair that any suggestion of that take place. I think it is unfair that the honourable Member for Gander-Twillingate did not check further. Quite possibly the gentleman he spoke to in DREE may not have known it but that does not mean that nobody in the office knew it.

And Eastern Aviation, I am surprised that they would bring their complaints to the Opposition. They could have had the same answers here. If the honourable members across the House had asked at any point in time in the past six months or three months, we would have laid all of this on the table of the House. On Thursday I offered, Mr. Speaker -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MOORES: Brother-in-law of the Member for Bell Island, is he not?

MR. NEARY: So what! He is also the father of two children, a Roman Catholic -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROUSSEAU: So are a lot of other people.

MR. NEARY: A resident of Gander.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: So what!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: So what. Cut out the slime you guttersnipe.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: So, I will -

MR. NEARY: Go on you slime.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, if you -

MR. NEARY: So what!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: If there is any slime, it is yours and nobody else's.

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable members must be reminded of the rule that when a member is speaking he does have the right to be heard in silence. If honourable members have differences of opinion, then they should not be

talking across the House as such.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, on Thursday when the honourable the Leader of the Opposition was not here to carry on this debate in the Late Show, I offered to read it out and lay it on the table of the House. It was not permitted. I did not have the consent of the House. We were prepared to lay that on the table of the House. There was nothing underhanded in it. I hope once and for all that the matter is now clarified -

MR. NEARY: No, not quite.

MR. ROUSSEAU: - that it is a closed matter and beyond what we have said and beyond the word of the joint federal-provincial committee, beyond the word of the Ministry of Economic Expansion, Regional Economic Expansion, and this government, that the matter has now been laid to rest, I hope to the satisfaction of all. I would hope - and I presume that I was not permitted to do that on Thursday and lay it there because nobody is looking for the truth, but the honourable members across the House were looking for some publicity. You know, they had the government with their grimy little hands in the cash till somewhere. You know, it is a fine suggestion. But, there is nothing underhanded, nothing scurrilous about this awarding of this contract. I would hope that the documents laid on the table of the House would substantiate that suggestion from the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately we are not allowed to debate the minister's statement. Of course the minister has taken advantage of the ministerial statement privilege, and I submit has in fact abused it because we are not allowed to reply to him. Let me say simply that I shall examine the documents with some care. The minister has given us a carefully edited version of documents which do not make his case, do not support his case. The fact remains that the government did not award this contract to the lowest tender and the fact remains, despite what the minister may have read from a carefully selected version of documents - I would hope the ones he lays upon the table of the House are complete. If not, it will speak for itself. But, the fact remains, Sir, that the government have adopted a very

curious approach to this. I do not mind the personal attacks on the fact that one of the principals in the company happens to be the brother-in-law of the gentleman from Bell Island. That is typical of the government's approach on this whole matter, a government that held themselves out as somehow not being interested in personalities.

There are four or five other principals in that company, Mr. Speaker. Some of them have been very active in the Tory cause. Some have not. So what! The fact remains, Sir, that the company in Gander was capable in the view of many people, including the company, of doing the work. The minister - all I will say since I cannot debate it, very simply, is that where there is smoke, there is fire. Now, the minister has put up a great cloud of smoke over this. For a man who maintains that the government have acted properly throughout and with propriety and with regularity, he is making an awful great deal of noise and an awful great deal of being wounded and somehow offended.

All I will say is that we have not had the full story yet. We shall get the full story. Whether or not these documents contain it remains to be seen. When we have the full story, there will be a great deal more to be said. But, I maintain that everything the minister has said supported it and everything he did not say supports it, that where there is smoke there is fire. There is a great deal of smoke about this matter. I am convinced there is some fire there yet.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other ministerial statements?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I have a very simple one here, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: I would like to announce the appointment of Thomas B. Grandy to the position of director of communications. Mr. Grandy is a Newfoundlander, was born in Carnish. Mr. Grandy received his early education in Newfoundland and graduated from Memorial University with a Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science and Master of Science degrees. He received his Ph.D. at the University of Alberta. Until recently he has been employed with Bell Northern Research. He will be assuming his duties immediately and in fact he has been working for the past week.

They will include responsibility for the planning, organizing,

co-ordinating and developing of a telecommunications policy for the Province and the government's position and policies in the telecommunications field, for example, in radio and television broadcasting, educational television, general radio, television services, cable and special services, video, data transmission systems, computer communications by cable, telephone and telegraph services, and the use of the Telestat Communications Satellite.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in connection with presenting petitions, Sir. The Minister of Rural Development has a petition now for five or six weeks that he was asked to present in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I have a copy of it, Sir -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - that I would like to table.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair did call presenting petitions and nobody rose to present a petition. I called Reports of Standing or Select Committees.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, you have done it with notices of motion time and time again.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island was out of order and certainly he is probably aware. Only the original petition really is really to be presented in the -

MR. NEARY: So, the minister will not present the petition. So -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - the people have asked me to.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He is scared to.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

HON. E. MAYNARD (MINISTER OF MANPOWER AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question no. 48 asked by the honourable Member for Bell Island on the Order Paper dated April 24, 1975.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a four barrel question, I guess it is, to the honourable the Premier, Sir - pardon?

MR. MOORES: Could we take them one at a time?

MR. NEARY: Okay. We will do them one at a time. Could the Premier tell us now the situation concerning the Linerboard Mill? How much down time are we going to have? Will there be any permanent layoffs? What will be the effect on the economy of Stephenville? Is any effort being made by government to take up the slack? Will there be any new industries locating in Stephenville in the near future to take up the slack of this?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, before answering that question, I would like to say - I hope I am not ruled out of order here - to apologize to anybody in this House where I or anybody makes a personal reference to any relations. I do that gladly. I mean in the heat of debate I suppose things are said. But certainly when individuals who are related to either members of the House or any other individuals in this Province are referred to derogatorily just for a personal point I think it is wrong, and certainly I have no bones about apologizing for that sort of statement.

Regarding the Stephenville mill, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that as all members of this House know, the business of the pulp and paper industry and the linerboard industry, with the recession in the United States, are having difficult times. The linerboard mill, the objective is, as I understand it from the management, to do their utmost from their marketing agencies to keep the mill going as long as possible. As we know we have had an announcement of Bowaters having down time again at the end of May. It is a difficult time when you consider the recessionary tendencies in the United States today where unemployment there is probably higher than any time since the thirties, I guess it is, and when you consider areas like Detroit which are very heavily industrialized are having difficult times. These will correct themselves in time, Mr. Speaker, but it is going to take time.

Regarding the Stephenville area, the Minister of Industrial Development can answer this as well, we are continually trying to



encourage industry into the Stephenville area as well as other parts of the Province. All I can say regarding the linerboard mill at this time is that every effort is being made. The management and the staff of the mill itself are working exceptionally hard to do a good job. They are doing a good job. It is getting better all the time. I just wish that world conditions were such that the linerboard mill could, you know, be going full belt all the time the same as Price and Bowaters and other mills that are being affected where they have export products. But, the fact is the world recessionary situation whether it be in fish or these other products is having a tough time, and Newfoundland whilst we have not, I suppose, suffered as much as many other parts of the world, the fact is that we certainly also feel the effects of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Sir. I do appreciate the Premier's apology, Sir. It takes a big man to do that.

Sir, I wonder if the honourable the Premier could tell us the situation concerning North Star Cement in Corner Brook. How much down time they are going to have? Will there be any permanent layoffs as a result of this down time? Will any effort be made on the part of the government to employ the students who will not be able to find jobs this summer as a result of North Star Cement having to cut its production? What is the situation? Is it as bad as it seems? If so, what about the second cement plant that is due to be set up in Newfoundland? Will that now be going ahead? Just what is the situation concerning this?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take

notice of the first question to find out the exact detail because I am not as familiar with it as to be able to give a definitive answer. Regarding the second cement plant, I think the Minister of Industrial Development can answer that.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

HON. W. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, on the first part of the question as the Premier says we will get the information for the honourable member. I am not familiar with the situation. Unfortunately I have been out of the Province for some time. On the second cement mill, the new cement mill, the large one that was to have been built on the Port au Port Peninsula, it was originally conceived as a joint project of Lehigh Cement and the BRINEX people, a subsidiary of BRINCO. Unfortunately, during the recession, the building recession, construction recession in the United States, Lehigh Cement found themselves in an over-expanded position with regards to capital. The cash flow position is terrible. They had participated in the tremendous construction boom that had taken place in Florida on the Eastern seaboard, particularly in the condominium areas. When the recession occurred in the United States last year, this year they found themselves in a position whereby they were overextended and they have reluctantly had to withdraw from the joint project. The BRINEX people have already done with Lehigh a feasibility study on the plant and there seems to be little doubt that it is a feasible project. Unfortunately, as I say, the Lehigh people are no longer in position to participate and so they have invited several Canadian companies to join them in the construction of the plant.

A market survey is now being undertaken by these Canadian companies. It is in an attempt to move into the Canadian market and the Northern United States market. I do not know the results of the survey. We have not received it as yet but the indications from BRINEX seem to be that the thing is anything but dead. Unfortunately, they are not as active as we would like to see it. Our hopes were that the Lehigh people

and BRINEX would have had the thing under construction by now but the economic conditions are such that it is to preclude that possibility. But as I say, Sir, it is not dead and we are still hopeful.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, a supplementary to the Premier. I was really more interested in the cutback of the North Star Cement and the effect that was going to have on the economy in Corner Brook. Would the Premier care to tell the House if he has had any correspondence, any conversations on the telephone or any communication at all with Atlantic Cement or Atlantic Gypsum because I understand they are going to close too and the effects that all these closures are going to have on the economy of West Coast of this Province. How long will it last? Does the Premier have any idea? Just, what is the situation out there?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I will have to take notice again, Mr. Speaker, but certainly I will get that information today and certainly make it available.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier also find out about Price Newfoundland, what the situation is going to be in Grand Falls and also give the House that information? Sir, another question for the honourable the Premier. Back in 1972, I think it was, when the government dropped the mothers' allowance the Premier indicated that there would be a programme to take its place. Can the Premier now tell the House when the new programme that was to replace the mothers' allowance announced in 1972, when that new programme will be put into effect?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: At the appropriate time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier - a supplementary, Sir, would the Premier indicate to the House when he would consider it appropriate to make this announcement of this new programme? Will it be in the next couple of weeks, the next month?

PREMIER MOORES: As soon as possible, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the Premier be a little more specific and tell us what period of time he is talking about?

PREMIER MOORES: Unfortunately not, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Before an election.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the President of Treasury Board fresh back from Southern sunshine would tell the House what is happening, Sir, concerning the liquor store strike. Is the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations involved? Is he trying to get the parties back to bargaining table or is there still a standoff and nothing being done to try to resume negotiations?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. DOODY: Well, these questions are difficult to answer when the person who asks the question gives his opinion of what the answer already is. The honourable Member for Bell Island says that nothing has been done to try to get these parties together.

MR. NEARY: No, I said is there nothing being done. Is there anything being done?

MR. DOODY: Certainly that is not so, Your Honour. This government and certainly Treasury Board are very concerned about the situation at the Newfoundland Liquor Commission. We have been in consultation with people at Manpower. The honourable the minister is quite capable of speaking for himself as to what steps have been taken and are being taken. We have been negotiating with the NAPE who are representing the liquor commission employees and we are prepared to keep negotiating with them whenever they feel that there is some advantage in resuming these negotiations. We are most anxious to get the thing resolved obviously and nobody wants to see a strike, certainly not a prolonged strike. We are most anxious to get the thing moving.

The honourable Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, of course, is quite capable of saying what his department's participation

has been and will be.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Industrial Development, the President of Treasury Board. Would the minister care to tell the House if any of the clubs or taverns in Newfoundland at the present time have gone dry? Does the minister know of any cases? Are there any pubs now without, not beer I suppose, without wine?

MR. DOODY: There is nothing so sad as a pub without beer. Now, Sir, it is to the best of my knowledge there are no liquor establishments short of beverages completely. I do feel though by this time that there are, very likely, some of them who are short of the hard liquor, the more stimulating alcoholic beverages. But I really cannot say. I have not done a survey of all of them as yet but I can assure you that some of them are.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Justice. Would the Minister of Justice inform the House what action has been taken by his department to prevent bootlegging in Newfoundland during the strike of the employees of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Any extra precautions taken taken by the minister's department?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! That question can go on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation, Sir, could tell the House whether or not the site for the facilities for the Summer Games has yet been picked and if so would the minister tell the House where it is?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

MR. T. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, that is not a question for me or for government to answer. That comes out of the complete jurisdiction of the Canada Games Society.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the minister is contributing over \$5 million towards this project, would the minister

not be advised when the site is selected?

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Has he got no input to it?

MR. NEARY: Would the minister not be advised, not know where the site is, where it is going to be? The government does have a vested interest in this matter.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Signal Hill, maybe up on Signal Hill.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how often I have to say it but the complete responsibility for the Canada Games, be they Summer or Winter is under the jurisdiction of the municipality. As such the Mayor and Council of this city have appointed a committee known as the Canada Games Association of Newfoundland and those questions would be better directed at that Committee and not at government.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for the minister. In view of the fact that the government are putting \$5 million into this project will the minister insist that the government's tendering procedure is used in the spending of this money for the construction of the facilities? Will the minister insist on that? Is the minister asking that the government tendering procedure be followed.

MR. DOYLE: I am not going to answer that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Before I recognize the honourable Member for Bell Island another question, I have just been informed that we have in the galleries Mayor Lambert of Twillingate and the town manager, Mr. Hoe. On behalf of all honourable members I welcome you to the galleries and trust that your visit here is most interesting.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I better switch to another minister. I am not going to get much information from that one. Sir, would the Minister of Tourism care to tell the House whether or not a news blackout has been placed on the Norma and Gladys affair? If so, why is there a news blackout?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Tourism.

HON. T. HICKEY (MINISTER OF TOURISM): I have no idea, Mr.

Speaker, I have no knowledge of anyone declaring a news blackout. I have suggested that those parties interested, especially the members of the Opposition who have a particular interest in the project allow us to get on with it and develop it to the point where we can make a final decision.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister aware that the owner of the shipyards in Clarenville where the Norma and Gladys is being refurbished stated that there was a news blackout? Is the minister aware of that?

MR. HICKEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I read it. I am aware of it. I was approached by a reporter from The Telegram who informed me, and I told that reporter, and I will tell the House right now that the shipyards is a private property as far as I am concerned. If the gentleman wishes to bar anyone from going on his premises that is his prerogative and his privilege.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. In view of the fact that the Norma and Gladys is public property, would the minister arrange a tour of the newsmen to go and take photographs or to inspect -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - the Norma and Gladys if they wish?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! That question is out of order.

MR. HICKEY: I would be glad to answer it, Your Honour.

MR. NEARY: Yes, go ahead and answer it.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay if the honourable minister wishes to answer it.

MR. HICKEY: Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker. I have no intentions of allowing photographs so that the project can be further damaged, absolutely no intentions.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the minister care to tell us how he expects the project to be further damaged by photographs of the Norma and Gladys? In what way?

MR. HICKEY: I simply ask, Mr. Speaker, that a reasonable amount of time be allowed so that the project can be completed and then a final decision will be made. I have stated publicly and I restate it again now that the final decision with regard to this project will be made in good time based on proper information.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was not quite clear there whether the minister will or will not arrange a tour of the newsmen to take pictures or to inspect the Norma and Gladys if they want to? Did the minister say, no, he would not do that? And if so why not?

MR. HICKEY: I would be quite happy to, Mr. Speaker, when the proper opportunity arrives. I mean there is no point in having the work stopped for such a tour at this particular moment. When that vessel is ready for its sea trials the press will be welcome aboard, the Member for Bell Island especially. I might even arrange a special job for him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Will the minister go out if it is a good -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Minister of Tourism, Would the minister tell the House where the ten information plazas that are to be constructed in Newfoundland, where are they going to be built?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: I do not have the details, Mr. Speaker. Does the honourable member mean the locations where they are going to be established?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. HICKEY: I do not have the details. I will be glad to get them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the -  
no I think I will go after the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs on this one, Sir. What about the Lower Battery? Would the minister tell us now what is happening concerning the rehabilitation of the Lower Battery that has been on the go now for so long?

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



HON. A. B. PECKFORD (MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING):

Mr. Speaker, --

MR. NEARY: I caught him off guard.

MR. PECKFORD: - I cannot answer that question right now. I am not familiar with what the honourable member is asking. If he is asking about the St. John's East Neighbourhood Improvement Programme, the Rehabilitation Programme I can answer that. If he is talking specifically about the Lower Battery and the rehabilitation thereof of that section of town I would have to take it under advisement and get some information for him. I cannot give him information on St. John's East -

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker. What I am asking the minister if anything has been done to rehabilitate the Battery under the urban renewal scheme?

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as an urban renewal scheme.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that Shea Heights was an urban renewal scheme, and Mundy Pond?

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was an urban renewal scheme.

MR. NEARY: Is there any such thing now as an urban renewal scheme?

MR. PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, there is not.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, does the minister have any intention of entering into an agreement with the City Council, the Government of Canada under some kind of an urban renewal scheme to rehabilitate the Battery?

MR. PECKFORD: The federal government's stated policy on that is that there is to be no more urban renewal schemes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question - no, perhaps a question for the Minister of Tourism, Sir. The Battery comes under the minister's department. Does the minister have any intention of approaching Ottawa to have the Lower Battery rehabilitated under the National Historic Sites Programme?

MR. HICKEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have since 1966 put forth the suggest that the Battery and indeed the whole area stretching down to Quidi Vidi be included in the Signal Hill National Historic

Park. But for a great number of years, Mr. Speaker, my suggestions fell on deaf ears. We are moving forward with a programme and a plan to the federal government in conjunction with the City Council. I understand they have lately decided that they are prepared to get involved, and hopefully something will come out of this. That is all of the details that I can give at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Hermitage.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation. The minister undertook to get some information on the design work being done, supposed to be done, for the Conne River Causeway. I asked him earlier whether the design was under contract. He undertook to find out. Has he any information since then?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: I will ask the officials to check or give the information to the member today if he wants to privately or at the answer question tomorrow. I have not had a chance to see the officials this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with Orders of the Day, on Friday I think it was the Hon. Member for Hermitage rose on a point of privilege, and I took the matter under advisement. I have since - I, of course, recessed the House for a few minutes and listened to the tapes. I have since listened to them again and obtained transcripts of what was said by the Hon. the Premier and the Hon. Member for Hermitage. And find that the Hon. Member for Hermitage did not establish a prima facie case. It was a difference of opinion as to what was said by two honourable persons.

Orders of the Day.

MR. SIMMONS: Disgraceful!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Order, please!  
The Chair just made a ruling and the Hon. Member for Hermitage was heard to say disgraceful. Now the Chair can only interpret that in one way, that the member was challenging the ruling made by the Chair. I am sure that if the honourable member does not agree with the ruling then he certainly has the right to appeal the ruling.

And I would ask him to withdraw those remarks.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I was making an aside. I respect your ruling. I do not agree with it. I think it was disgraceful what the Premier did. I am not saying your ruling was disgraceful. I do not agree with it. But I think what the Premier did was disgraceful and I stand by that opinion. If the Chair got any suggestion that I was saying that the ruling was disgraceful I withdraw that because that was not the intent. What the Premier did was disgraceful, and I stand by that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair will accept the explanation made by the Hon. Member for Hermitage.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HICKMAN: Motion (4).

On motion that the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The City of St. John's Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion (5).

On motion that the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, a bill, "An Act To Impose Taxes On Income From Mining Operations Within The Province And On Income Obtained Or Derived From Persons Holding Rights To Mine, " read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Address in Reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Address in Reply I think, if I remember correctly the Hon. Member for Hermitage, I believe, adjourned the Address in Reply last day, He has some twenty-five minutes left to speak. The Hon. Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I understand about twenty-five minutes remain.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, about twenty-five minutes.

MR. SIMMONS: I understand we are speaking to the amendment made by the Member for Labrador North. It has been so long, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to keep track. But the House will recall the amendment made by my colleague from Labrador North in which he drew on some wording from, I believe, the Anglican Book of Common Prayer or the -

I am not an Anglican - A Common Book of Prayer or -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: - everybody knows what I mean anyway.

MR. F. ROWE: I am a good old Methodist myself.

MR. SIMMONS: And the wording in essence for the benefit of my dear friend the Minister of Industrial Development who was not here but who would appreciate the wording I am sure, is that the House regrets the failure of the government to do the things that it - there it is exactly for him - the House regrets the failure of the government to do those things which it ought to have done and further regrets that they have done those things which they ought not to have done.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

I hope, Mr. Speaker, we can interpret that as support for the amendment.

MR. DOODY: We will save that for our separated brother.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, I will not - no it is difficult, it is difficult to converse with the member and remain parliamentary under the circumstances. Mr. Speaker, at the time I adjourned the debate I was talking in particular about Rural Development. I had a question which might have answered the matter I had in my mind but as is pretty usual now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Rural Development very conveniently leaves the House during the question period, as he did again this morning. So we are having difficulty getting answers from that particular member. However I shall cover the points I wanted to cover in the question period, and some of them right now.

I was on the subject of funeral homes and mortuaries, call them what you will, and after, outside the House, the minister in a private conversation with me indicated that perhaps I had misconstrued, now I hope I have quoted him correctly because it was a private conversation, not a confidential one, but it was outside the House and I mentioned mortuaries and I was told that I was harping on something that was no longer the case, that this was something that happened in the first part of the Rural Development Programme.

Well I thought I would check my facts beforehand because I recognize that any programme, particularly one such as this which was in some respects experimental, had no clear precedents to follow, I recognize that some things could get done that might not be within the spirit of the original intent of the programme.

Mr. Speaker, I referred to mortuaries or funeral homes and I mentioned that the government under the Rural Development Authority Programme had lashed out \$40,000 to five separate firms, five separate firms, and I was told outside the House that, as I say, I was harping on something that the government had long since stopped doing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only go on the information which is supplied to me by the minister's department. And that information, I will show in a minute, contradicts what the minister has told me privately. You see, Mr. Speaker, we have had a fair amount of difficulty getting information

from the Department of Rural Development. We can get the brochures, for instance the brochure called, "Rural Development News" dated January 1975 we got one day last week, one day last week, only about three months late, Mr. Speaker. We have no trouble getting the brochures, they are a little behind time but we get them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Leader of the Opposition, roped the Minister of Rural Development on December 9, 1974 and asked him for a list of loans made by the Rural Development Authority. Now, Mr. Speaker, other speakers, probably from the other side, will get up and manage to misconstrue this as they did before as to our motives for wanting the list of loans. Well let us state our motives and let them misinterpret them all they want but the point is that this is public information anyway.

We were accused earlier in another debate of using the names involved. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a lie. We have never yet mentioned one name, Mr. Speaker, not one name of any -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The honourable Member for Hermitage is certainly not permitted, or any honourable member for that matter, to use the word lie in referring to -

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, I withdraw that, Mr. Speaker, I think the intent, I want to say it clear, it is not true, it is not true to say that. Because we have not mentioned any names of persons who have the loans, what we want to do as I believe is part of our responsibility is to examine the list of loans, and it is not possible, Mr. Speaker, to do it from a summary, particularly when the minister tells me that the summary is not correct. It is not possible to do it unless we have before us the actual list of loans. Well my former colleague here in the House, Mr. Bill Rowe, the Member for White Bay South as he then was, obtained a list in the Spring of 1973 from the minister and so in December my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, wrote a letter requesting an updated list and the minister writes my colleague three and a half months later -

AN HON. MEMBER: Three months.

MR. SIMMONS: - three months later on March 20 and says, the current list which is attached supplies the information which you requested, And of course what my colleague requested was a list of individual firms which had been granted loans. What the minister attached was not that at all but a table, a summary of loans by category, food processing - ten; handicrafts - twenty-three and so on and so forth, just a categorization. So he did not supply the information. We have been trying to get it for a year and we cannot get it, Mr. Speaker. They will not give us what is public information. We cannot get it. Oh the minister has told us in the House that he will give it to us, but he has managed to dodge the issue or otherwise avoid giving it to us. So in a way we still do not have that list that we first requested last Fall and that was formally requested in a letter, December 9, nearly six months ago now, Mr. Speaker. It is six months ago, almost to the day and the minister has still withheld the information, the same kind of information that he gave to us a year before.

I can only assume, Mr. Speaker, that he did not particularly like the sequence of events which followed on our getting the information the first time. He did not particularly like the way we exposed some of the things his authority, his Rural Development Authority was doing. However, Mr. Speaker, as you say it is a ill wind and when I look at the table that he did send my colleague the Leader of the Opposition, the table reveals some information that is pertinent to the point I was making a moment ago about funeral homes.

This is a summarization of loans and grants completed for the period up to October 31, 1974 and under that it shows mortuary: four firms, total loans - \$34,000, four firms.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the document called Rural Development Loans, dated January 1975 under mortuaries shows five firms - \$40,000. So unless the minister is giving us false information, you can only assume that if there were four in October and five in January, that the fifth one, the fifth firm was awarded a loan of approximately \$6,000 since October 1974.

Mr. Speaker, that is in spite of the fact that I have been assured privately that this kind of thing is not going on anymore. They are not doing

that kind of thing anymore. Well I have the evidence there from the minister's own information which he supplied us, that it has happened in the last six months, that that kind of loan is still being made. Now, Mr. Speaker, look I cannot get uptight or I cannot lose sleep about whether they give \$5,000 or \$6,000 or loan \$5,000 or \$6,000 to a fellow in the funeral home business, but I can get uptight, Mr. Speaker, if in the process people who have good sound proposals for developing rural Newfoundland are getting turned down, and being told that their proposal does not qualify because it is not within the areas that have been spelled out in literature, not within the areas of resource based industries.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that buying equipment to transport pulpwood to the Linerboard Mill or to Grand Falls, I suggest that the transportation of that resource can be argued as a resource based industry an awful lot easier than arguing that a funeral home is a resource based industry. And then we could go on to the manufacturing and processing industries and I can give the minister a number of examples of where people who have applied with proposals clearly in that category, manufacturing and processing industries, have been turned down while we have this nonsense going on here. Funeral homes, I cannot find the other one I have in mind but it is certainly here, and beauty parlors, I cannot see them now, they are probably hidden away in a particular category but loans have been given for beauty parlors. I have nothing against beauty parlors or funeral homes, I may get to use both services before it is all over, but I do not think -

MR. NEARY: Which one first? That is the important thing.

MR. SIMMONS: Perhaps both at the same time, but, Mr. Speaker,



But, Mr. Speaker, while I have nothing against these enterprises I cannot see that they should take priority over some others that I know. I can give the minister a list as long as that of applications that have been rejected. Now if they have been rejected it is because the people concerned are not sound risks. That is another matter. Tell them that. But to tell them that they have been rejected because they do not fall into one of the categories, the category of resource based industries, the category of manufacturing and processing industries, the category of service industries related to the first two I have mentioned or the category of tourist based enterprises, to tell people they are turned down because they do not fall into one of these categories and then to continue giving loans to funeral homes and beauty parlors is a slap in the face to these people. And it is their money really, their tax dollars that is involved in that Rural Development Authority. And the minister owes it to these people and other people throughout this Province whose tax money is being used, he owes it to them to come clean with them to give them a better explanation to see that the programme is serving the needs of rural Newfoundland to the extent that it was supposed to.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said sometime ago in talking about this matter, some months ago, first when I spoke, I believe, the first or second time I spoke in this House, and I repeat: the Rural Development Authority is unquestionably a flop. It is a flop because it is not doing the many things that it could have done. When I first heard about the programme I had high hopes for it because it was, at least, in theory going to address itself to the problems of rural Newfoundland. Now, Mr. Speaker, time does not permit me to get into the -

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no quorum.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is so world shakingly important that I should, at least, have a quorum in the House. Could we have a quorum call please?

MR. NEARY: We do not have enough to fill up a punt here now, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): There is no quorum.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the time is up. I would move, Sir, that the House adjourn.

MR. MARSHALL: You do not do that.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): The honourable gentleman I do not believe is in order in saying that the time is up.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour has to count the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): The time is five minutes.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, it is three minutes, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): The three minutes is not up.

Would the clerk please count the House?

We do have a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): The Hon. Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to come to another matter before I leave the Rural Development Authority. It is a question I wanted to ask the minister during the question period but he was not in his seat. I have before me a letter, a copy of a letter which the minister received from a gentleman in the Eastport area, a gentleman who, I understand from talking to people who know the business that I am going to refer to, the business of greenhouse production, a gentleman who had a very viable proposal. Mr. Speaker, you would not believe the runaround this man has gotten. I have some of the correspondence here. You would not believe the runaround this man has gotten. If I had time I would go into the matter. I do not, but I just want to say for the record that I have here part of a file on a man who had, what I am told, and I am no expert in this area but I did check with some people who know, I am told it is a very viable proposal. And while he cannot get to first base, Mr. Speaker, on that kind of thing, we have all this rushing out to approve some more funeral homes. In case the minister did not hear what I say on the subject of funeral homes, there has been an approval, according to the information I have, within the past five to six months. And I have demonstrated to the House, Mr. Speaker -

MR. REID: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: - Mr. Speaker, the minister was not here for the question period. I do not why he tends to leave every day. But he would have had an opportunity then to answer the question. He was not here so let him stay quiet until - or he can speak, of course, after I am through.

MR. NEARY: And get there and present your petition, boy.

MR. SIMMONS: One other matter, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): Order, please!

I would like to remind honourable gentlemen to my left and to my right that when another honourable gentleman is speaking, he has the right to be heard in silence. This certainly applies to both sides of the House. I would like to see that you follow this rule.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to come to one other matter in speaking to the amendment about what the government has not done that it should have done and so on. I have heard a fair amount in the past few months about how this government has been the saviour of Newfoundland in terms of minimum wages. And they have bragged, Mr. Speaker, about how they have raised the minimum wage up to \$2.20 an hour. Mr. Speaker, I believe everybody recognizes that to fully appreciate whether \$2.20 is very much an achievement you got to look at it in relation to what has been happening elsewhere in the country. Now if you go back to day one in the new regime, if you go back to late 1971, you will find that Newfoundland ranked with two other provinces as having the lowest minimum wage in Canada. Three provinces at that time had a wage of \$1.25 an hour. I am not going to get into right now the matter of the difference between male and female. That is another issue. For the record the female at that time was \$1.00 an hour. I want to address myself to the basic rate of \$1.25 an hour in Newfoundland, New Brunswick and P.E.I. Now, Mr. Speaker, while the rate has gone from \$1.25 to \$2.25 in that particular time

from 1971 to the present time, we still find that Newfoundland in 1975 is ranking second lowest among the provinces. In 1971 it ranked with two others as having the lowest minimum wage. Today it still has the second lowest minimum wage in Canada. The only one being lower is P.E.I. with \$2.05 compared to our \$2.20. We are lower than every other province in Canada. To say it another way, Mr. Speaker, in 1971 Newfoundland was forty cents below the highest province. The highest provinces in 1971, Ontario and Manitoba, had a minimum wage of \$1.65. The highest province now is Alberta and also the Northwest Territories with \$2.50. In Newfoundland in 1971 we were forty cents below the highest minimum wage. Today in 1975 we are thirty cents below. Despite all the boasting, all the bragging, Mr. Speaker, about what this government has done, we are still only ten cents better off in terms of minimum wages than we were when this government took over, ten cents relative to the other provinces, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COLLINS: It has doubled.

MR. SIMMONS: The increase, Mr. Speaker - yes, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture has obviously missed the whole argument. Of course, you have doubled it, Mr. Speaker. But if the other parts of the country are moving ahead at a faster clip then relatively speaking you are no better off. Yes, you did double it almost from \$1.25 to \$2.20. But while the government was doing that every other province in Canada was doing at least that and as the record shows better in most cases. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the increase in the minimum wage is not nearly as dramatic as the Tory suggests. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, at best it can be argued, at best it can be argued that we are keeping pace.

You have to stress the point to even indicate that we are keeping pace with the other parts of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment moved by my colleague from Labrador North is one I believe that deserves the support of every member of this particular House, because no one is so well aware of the magnitude of the government's failures as people who sit in this House everyday and see how they managed to bungle just about every matter that they have to come to grips with.

I talked on Friday about the sawmilling I did not get unfortunately much of an answer from the Minister of Forestry on that particular matter. I have again this morning been talking to the Bay D'Espoir Development Association, and they are still waiting patiently, Mr. Speaker, for that contact. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make a political football out of that particular issue, but I would urge the minister to do something to help sort out that matter, not that he suggest or tries to suggest, it is not a matter of being against the other enterprise that is going ahead there. That is not the question, Mr. Speaker. If government brings in a large enterprise and in the process frustrates every small enterprise there is little gain. And I say the challenge to the minister is not just to encourage the development of large enterprises. The challenge to him and his government is to see to it that the two can exist side by side successfully. And I have said to him privately and in the House that there is a lot of frustration - I am using that general term, I could get more specific - but there is a lot of frustration among the small sawmill operators in that particular area. And the frustration has not been sorted out. I have taken some initiatives. I have brought it to the minister's attention. I have been assured by him that something is being done. And as of 10:30 this morning the Development Association once again is waiting for the first initiative from the government on this particular matter.

Now as I say I do not want to make a political football of it, but I would like to see the matter sorted out because a number of jobs are affected there, men who cut logs for these sawmill operations.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, my time must have run out. I had -

MR. THOMS: You have about six minutes.

MR. SIMMONS: - oh very good. I thought I was getting a signal from Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I hope while we are on this amendment that I will get some response from the Minister of Rural Development on the matters I have raised. I hope I will get some from the Minister of Forestry. I did get some the other day but I do not think it was particularly pertinent to the subject I have raised. I have a very real concern about the matter I have raised and I would hope that he will see fit to get the thing moving on behalf of the people in the Bay D'Espoir Area.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable gentleman. Is there a page around this morning, Sir? Perhaps I could trouble one of the gentlemen at the table, Sir, to find me a page or perhaps get me a glass of water, whichever is the easier.

Well, Mr. Speaker, since nobody on the government side seems inclined to speak, I thought the honourable gentleman from St. John's East was going to say a few words, he stood in his place but apparently he thought better of it and went off, I guess, to consult his conscience on the Ombudsman Resolution which we will doubtless get an opportunity to discuss a little later.

There are, Mr. Speaker, a few things I would like to say with respect to this amendment, and let me begin by saying - it will surprise nobody including Your Honour or any member of the House - that I intend to vote in favour of the amendment. The amendment is that the traditional words, or the words before the House, the motion before the House is that the following resolution or Address in Reply be presented to his Honour the Lieutenant - Governor - the amendment before the House, Sir, is to strike those words and replace them with the following: That this House regrets the failure of the government to do those things which they ought to have done and further regrets that they have done those things which they ought not to have done.

MR. EVANS: You fellows.

MR. ROBERTS: It does not include, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Dunphy): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: It does not include, Sir, for the benefit of honourable gentlemen opposite who may not be familiar with the Book of Common Prayer which is - I am not sure whether it is one of the collects of the General Confession, a request for absolution - but the Book of Common Prayer as I recall the words, uses words much like these as part of that Confession then adds to it, 'and there is no health in us.' We could have used those other words but the gentleman from Labrador -

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me right at the start say that either the gentleman from Burgeo is going to observe the rules of the House as best he knows them or he and I will have a running, not a feud, a running crossfire. Now, Sir, I would ask Your Honour to state clearly the rule which Your Honour has stated and which the other men in the Chair have stated, that a member speaking has the right to speak without interruption from any other gentleman in the House. I say that if the gentleman from Burgeo chooses to disregard that rule I would invite Your Honour to use the normal and appropriate procedure and that is if he persists in it, to name him.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman when he speaks has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER (Dunphy): Order, please! Order, please!

The point which the honourable member for White Bay North has made is well taken by the Chair. I would like to inform all honourable members that the Chair is capable of keeping order and certainly will impose the rules as they are, suffice it to say.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank Your Honour and I have not the least doubt Your Honour will enforce the rules. I did not mean to imply Your Honour would not I just wanted to be sure the gentleman from Burgeo realizes that.

MR. EVANS: Do not make any reference to me.

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, whether I make reference to the gentleman from Burgeo or not.

MR. SPEAKER (Dunphy): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - is a matter for the rules of the debate and the gentleman from Burgeo would be well advised to learn that the rules of debate say that even if he is referred to - I met a number of his constituents on the weekend, they were up in Stephenville at



a rally, a re-union for the Royal Navy, and they made reference to the honourable gentleman. I am not allowed to say exactly what they referred to him as, Sir, because that would be beyond any shadow of a doubt, unparliamentary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the motion is, or the amendment, the motion now before the House is that the government have not done those thing which they ought to have done and further regrets that they have done those things which they ought not to have done. I propose to speak first to the second part of that motion, to talk about just a few of the things which the government ought to have done - sorry! those thing which they ought not to have done which in fact they have done.

Now let me start with the curious case of the Norma and Gladys, and let me say that I regret that the Minister of Tourism has found things more important than the House of Assembly. But let me say that what I am about to say is factually correct. I have no hesitation in advancing the facts which I have, and the facts which I have in my possession and which I will reveal to the Committee, or to the House, I am sorry, Sir, reveal quite clearly that the Minister of Tourism misled the House. He has consistently misled the House and just as consistently misled the public of Newfoundland with the truth with respect to the Norma and Gladys.

Your Honour has noted, I have no doubt, that I did not say deliberately misled. I am not allowed to say that and so I do not say it. But I do say that the House and the people have been misled with respect to the Norma and Gladys. I only have ninety minutes and that will but enable me to scratch the long catalogue of sins of omission and commission of which this administration are guilty. But at the head of that list, Sir, has to be the Norma and Gladys.

MR. EVANS: Are you jealous?

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, the kindest thing I can hope for the gentleman from Burgeo is that he is the sole crew member on the Norma and Gladys when she sinks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me just look at one or two or three

of the aspects of the curious case of the Norma and Gladys.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the question of federal and provincial contributions. The honourable the Minister of Tourism on a number of occasions has said that almost all of the cost is to be paid by the Government of Canada. That, Sir, is incorrect. I do not call it a lie. I am not allowed to call it a lie but I would say, Sir, that it is misleading in the extreme. It is flatly incorrect and I would urge that if the Minister of Tourism is anywhere around, that he at least listen to what I am saying and let him contradict it at his peril. Because the facts, Sir, are directly contrary to that which the Minister of Tourism - here he comes. Now let him come into the House and hear because he has misled this House, Mr. Speaker, consistently and constantly.

Now, Sir, there are two separate headings under which the cost of the Norma and Gladys can be assessed. The first is the cost of purchasing the vessel from her then owner, Captain Kean and restoring her and refurbishing her and fitting her out as a museum, the original purpose for which she was purchased. Sir, the total cost as of a current date for that is approximately \$231,000. That is what it cost to buy her, to rebuild her and to fit her out as a museum. That figure may be a few months old, I say as of a current date. But it is certainly at least a quarter of a million dollars that has gone into the Norma and Gladys.

MR. NEARY: The poor old mothers not able to feed their undernourished -

MR. ROBERTS: The mothers, the school boards about to close the schools down, schools without adequate toilet facilities or adequate lighting facilities, school boards that have told the government they are going bankrupt. Liquor store employees on strike, teachers threatening to work to rule -

MR. NEARY: Children undernourished.

MR. ROBERTS: - you know, the catalogue is endless but this government have chosen to put a quarter of a million dollars into

purchasing the Norma and Gladys and refurbishing it.

MR. EVANS: How much did it cost to pay Albert Martin?

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, nobody, including the Minister of Tourism has yet had the courage to tell the people of Newfoundland that fact and there is more to come. But that is the cost of purchasing it, Sir. \$18,000 was spent to purchase it. \$18,000 of which every cent came from Ottawa through the National Museums of Canada which is Crown Corporation under the direction of Mr. Bernard Ostrey, reporting to the Secretary of State, the honourable Hugh Faulkner. \$18,000 to purchase her. The Minister of Rehabilitation was the Minister of Tourism at the time and there is an extract here from the Hansard -

MR. NEARY: She is not even a real banker, by the way.

MR. ROBERTS: No, she is not a real banker. The extract from the Hansard for March 27, as supplied courtesy Cabot Group 4, and we will have a lot to say about that curious collection of entrepreneurs, said it was \$18,000 and the honourable Member for Ferryland was gracious enough to say that the money for that came from Ottawa. Well that was correct. It is too bad the Minister of Recreation is not still the Minister of Tourism. We might then have had something approaching the truth instead of the situation we now have.

So, Sir, the total cost to date, or as of a current date - this may be several months old, the date as of which this money is applicable - the total cost was \$231,178. Of that, Sir, the federal government have contributed \$131,178. The provincial government have made available approximately \$100,000.

MR. NEARY: Just about the price of Newfoundland's -

MR. ROBERTS: Approximately \$100,000 from the Government of Newfoundland has gone into her just to rebuild her and to refurbish her. Not the cost of purchase, that was entirely provided by Ottawa. So in other words, Sir, if we subtract the cost of purchase \$18,000 we find that the provincial government has provided to date

approximately \$100,000 and if there is more spent on her they will have to spend it. The federal government have provided approximately \$113,000, near enough to fifty-fifty. I have not whipped out my handy-dandy little pocket calculator but it is near enough to about fifty-two per cent federal, forty-eight per cent provincial. Near enough to fifty-fifty, Sir.

And the Minister of Tourism has said time and time again, time and time again that Ottawa are paying more. Let me just read a lovely little cutting - I was called intellectually bankrupt by the minister - that is like the inmate of a brothel calling somebody unchaste, Sir. The minister said in the Telegram on April 26, "Mr. Hickey said that while Mr. Roberts said the vessel had not been designed for deep sea, the Norma and Gladys had fished on the Grand Banks for four years " -Maybe she did, maybe she did not- "Adding that the vessel had been restored from the waterline up at a cost of \$225,000 of which the federal government"paid more than three to one." Now anybody reading that, Mr. Speaker, would believe that it means what it says, that out of the total cost of \$225,000 Ottawa had paid approximately three-fourths. But, Sir, the facts do not support the minister's statement. The minister's statement was misleading, inaccurate and a number of other things which I am not allowed to say because they are not parliamentary. But the fact remains that the only part that was even close to being accurate was he said \$225,000, the actual figure was \$231,178, as has been given to me. So in other words, Mr. Speaker, on that count the minister has struck out. Three strikes, no balls, a lot of errors and he is out of the game.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the next item in the curious saga of the expenditures on the Norma and Gladys, this by a government that used to talk of priorities and planning and used to talk of getting good value for money. And it has told hospitals in Central Newfoundland and in Labrador and on the Northern Peninsula and elsewhere throughout the Province that they cannot have the money they need to operate even at current levels, and can afford to fling

out \$100,000 against \$112,000 coming from Ottawa and then try to pretend it is three to one Ottawa money.

Let us look at the operational costs. There, Sir, the figure is a little better. It is still not three to one. It is costing the Province about \$20,000 a year for operational costs to the Norma and Gladys.

MR. DOODY: It does not go down - (Inaudible.)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: It is costing about \$20,000 a year for operational costs to the Norma and Gladys to the Province. Last year Ottawa paid \$34,560 towards the cost of operating the Norma and Gladys, \$34,560. This year the Ottawa estimate is \$44,000 from them and approximately \$20,000 from the Province. In other words, two to one from Ottawa but still costing us \$20,000 a year.

MR. NEARY: Where was the salary to last year?

MR. ROBERTS: That is seventy-five - oh well, you know, the cost of fitting her out and the captain is on pay and he has been making nice statements to the newspapers and everything. He is on salary, he is doing very well. Captain Smith and a number of other people. But, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Look at this.

MR. ROBERTS: My colleague has just passed me a cutting from the Telegram of Monday, March 10. "Poverty Rated Newfoundland The Highest By Far In Canada." And we can look at unemployment, never been higher, prices never been higher and what are the government doing about it? What are the government doing? They are spending \$100,000 on fitting out a schooner and then trying to pretend the money is coming from Ottawa. It is incredible, Sir. They must be - 'Nero Fiddled while Rome Burned.' The honourable gentlemen opposite are fitting out while Newfoundland sinks. But, Sir, there is worse than that on the Norma and Gladys. What I have said so far is just the cost of fitting her out and fixing her up.

The government announced the other day that they are going to send her around the world. We had a great, glorious press conference with a great, glorious kit. It is a marvellous kit, Sir. It has some

lovely speeches in it, it has an invitation to a Japanese style buffet, it has an excerpt from the verbatim reports of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland, it has the Norma and Gladys in relation to the Law of the Sea, it has a brief history of the Norma and Gladys, it has a lovely picture of the Canadian Ambassador to Expo and above all, it has the most gorgeous picture I have ever seen of the Minister of Tourism.

MR. F. ROWE: How did they do it?

MR. NEARY: No sailor suit?

MR. ROBERTS: No. He is not wearing his sailor suit. Bobby Shafto went to sea/ Silver buckles on his knee/ The honourable gentleman does not have silver buckles anywhere. But a gorgeous picture of him, Sir - just, firm, resolute, a man born to command.

AN HON. MEMBER: Salt on his cheek.

MR. ROBERTS: Born to command, Sir, Tanned by the wind of a thousand voyages across the oceans of the world. Not just two years before the mast, Sir, this man has obviously spent twenty years before the mast. Just to look at him! Why generations of Newfoundland sailors who have gone before and are now at Fiddler's Green, Sir, would be honoured to have such a man. Nelson could stand aside and instead of saying, 'Kiss me hardy' which were Nelson's dying words, he would have said, 'Kiss me Hickey' if he had realized the honourable gentleman would show up like this in a picture.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is he a cabin boy or what?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh no! I have no doubt he is going on her.  
He may go as

the minister, Sir, but he will come back in the bilges. But now, Mr. Speaker, this voyage - the minister has been noticeably reluctant to give any information about its cost. I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. Because he is ashamed at how much he has committed the Government of Newfoundland to. The voyage, Sir, is estimated to cost, the Norma And Gladys around the world, it is estimated to cost \$294,000, nearly \$300,000. That is going to be the cost of the Norma And Gladys going around the world. Now, obviously Ottawa is going to pay all of that. Is it?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: According to the minister.

MR. ROBERTS: According to the minister - that is the impression he has given - that Ottawa is going to pay it all. Well, Sir, the truth is that Ottawa is going to pay \$80,000. That is what the Department of External Affairs tell me. I picked up the little telephone and I rang them. They tell me that their commitment is to pay \$80,000. That the balance, whatever it may be - it is now estimated at \$214,000 - but whatever it may be, Sir, the Province has to pay. So, the saga of the Norma And Gladys is that it is costing us \$20,000 a year for her in addition to \$40,000 or \$45,000 from Ottawa. It has cost us \$100,000 to rebuild and refurbish her, and it is going to cost us, the people of Newfoundland, \$220,000 to send her around the world. That is if she makes it.

MR. NEARY: That is \$340,000.

MR. ROBERTS: That is \$340,000 slashed out by the Minister of Tourism. Now, Sir, what I have said is factually correct. If there are receptions, if the minister and his picture has the local ladies and gentlemen down in Okinawa or in all the places she is going to be - she is going to be in a number of interesting places in theory. Wait until I find that list. There is a great list here - the Straits of Canso, Boston, New York, the Panama Canal, San Francisco, Honolulu, Yokohama, Okinawa, Singapore, Aden, the Suez Canal, Greece, Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Great Britian and then back to St. John's. The cheers, they will be lining the Narrows, Mr. Speaker! It will be like-better than ever it was when the sealers came in fifty and 100 years ago. The people will be lining right on both sides of

the Narrows, Sir, all up and down the harbour. Why the government could sell tickets to get to see the Norma and Gladys come back in with the minister at the wheel. I can just see her now, Mutiny On The Bounty, part two.

MR. NEARY: In his grass skirt.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, if there are receptions during that extensive tour, Ottawa may or may not pay part of the cost of them. That has not been worked out. But, they may or may not. It may be that the minister's grog parties - grog is the naval thing, is it not - the minister's grog parties will be entirely on the Province or it may be that he will be able to inveigle the generous and trusting Government of Canada to pay part of the shot.

MR. NEARY: I do not think. Not after today they will not.

MR. ROBERTS: But, Sir, to date, and the receptions are not included in the cost of \$294,000. I do not understand where that figure is coming from. My colleague here has sailed many a vessel back and forth to Chidley and down to the Caribbean Island, around the Straits of Fogo Island and other places of danger and bravery. I mean, the ship is only worth - she cost \$18,000 to buy. That is all that Charlie Kean figured she was worth. That is all he paid for her and he had twenty years use out of her. But, how would they spend \$300,000 to send her around the world?

MR. EVANS: Have you not ever heard of inflation?

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman asks me if I have heard of inflation, Sir. I do not know if the Premier heard those figures. I do not know if he has ever been told about them. But, out of the \$80,000 or Ottawa kicking in \$80,000, roughly \$215,000 from the Province. Now, what are people around Newfoundland going to say. What are they going to think?

The school boards have sent word they want to see the Premier. They are on the verge of bankruptcy. But, we have got \$215,000 to lash out to send the Norma And Gladys around the world. The hospitals are having difficulty in paying their present level of services. But, we have got \$215,000 to send the Norma And Gladys around the world. You



know, it beggars description. The Minister of Tourism has long been noted for his inability to come to grips with his ministerial responsibilities. But, Sir, this is a new low.

Then to add insult to injury, the minister in his statement to the Evening Telegram said, and I quote the newspaper, Sir, in fact he, the minister, said, the decision to engage Mr. Brown's company was a co-ordinated effort between a staff member of the External Affairs Department and a member of Mr. Hickey's staff. The entire cost, which he said he does not know, is to be borne by the federal government. Sir, I cannot call that a lie. If I could, I would. It is completely and totally incorrect. The decision to hire Mr. Joseph Brown or his firm, Cabot Group 4 Limited was entirely a provincial decision. Whatever payment may have been made or may have been agreed to be made to Mr. Brown and his company is entirely the responsibility of the government of the Province, every nickle. Whatever they have gotten out of the government, will be entirely out of our treasury.

The department at Ottawa paid part of the Japanese buffet. They did go that far, Sir. If we had some sukiyaki they paid for the suki part and the government paid for the yaka part. But, Sir, they paid nothing at all towards Mr. Joseph Brown and the cost of the press conference, whatever that may be. It is obviously substantial, Sir. We have a lovely brochure, a lovely brochure here. As I said, we have lovely things in it including above all - that should have been eight by ten, Sir. I do not understand. Indeed, what about we have a large one blown up for campaign rallies?

MR. NEARY: The size of this one up here.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh no. It should be far larger than any of the men who have ever been Speaker. Maybe we should have rented a billboard for the Minister of Tourism, and it should have been in glowing, living colour, not in - I mean, I resent, as a citizen of the Province -

MR. NEARY: He has it up in Honolulu, Singapore -

MR. ROBERTS: There was a meeting in Little Hooping Harbour last week. A strange thing because there are no people living there. But, in Little Hooping Harbour, Sir, there was a meeting and they passed a resolution

of regret that the Minister of Tourism had not seen fit to have his picture put out in colour, living colour, glorious technicolor. Better still, Your Honour may remember the old fashioned 3-D where you would wear special glasses, Sir? That is what the minister should have done because one needs special glasses to understand this government and the Norma And Gladys. Of all the ridiculous things that any government has ever done! The Almighty knows that governments have done some strange things in this country, Sir.

MR. EVANS: You should know.

MR. ROBERTS: But this, Mr. Speaker, this is about the strangest. I appeal to the honourable gentlemen opposite to come to their senses before it is too late and to call her off, admit she is not seaworthy. Whether she is or not, admit it. Say she is, and nobody will quarrel with it. Then let the honourable Minister of Tourism get back to his business of trying to promote tourism and not trying to promote himself.

\$80,000 from Ottawa, \$215,000 from Newfoundland, \$100,000 from Newfoundland and another \$130,000 from Ottawa, and the minister trying to pretend, oh, it is okay, Ottawa is paying the shot. Sir, it is a shoddy performance by the minister.

Then we come to Cabot Group 4 Limited, a marvellous little company, a company, Sir, that got the contract to do this marvellous brochure, a marvellous, marvellous thing, Sir. They did not get it on public tenders. There was no invitation for a proposal for this. We invite proposals to landscape the rectory down here, the St. Thomas's rectory, but nobody invited proposals to put together this particular - that is not parliamentary - this particular example of the public relations man's art.

So, I got a little curious, Sir, about this Cabot Group 4. They were the ones asked people to the press conference, a letter April 10. J.O. Brown, general manager, Public relations and consultants, artistic designs, importers and exporters - I wonder what they are importing. I know what they are exporting. Money. I wonder what they are importing. It is interesting that they have an office in the Center Building. I must have a word now. My father owns the Center Building. I must have a word to make sure this crowd

pay their rent in advance.

Mr. Speaker, Cabot Group 4 Limited were the people who invited the press to this conference. The Information Services are not adequate. We are lashing out \$50,000 or \$100,000 a year for Mr. Butler in the Information Services down here on the main floor of the building, but they are not adequate to do this job.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: About \$250,000.

MR. ROBERTS: About \$250,000, is it, including the teleprinters and all that thing. Well, they were not adequate to do it. The government out of their own money and on their own decision had to go and hire Cabot Group 4 Limited. So, naturally, Sir, I got interested. There must be something to Cabot Group 4 Limited. They must have pretty powerful appeal for nobody had ever heard of them. They were brand new. One of the reasons they were brand new was that their incorporation was only filed on January 21, 1975. It is down in the registry, Sir. Your Honour could look it up or anybody could look it up. It is company number 7952. The registered office is

is P.O. Box 7337, the Centre Building Church Hill, the same as on their letterhead. They list their objects of business as being general advertising and publicity business. They have become importers and exporters since then according to their letterhead. There are no directors listed. Because as Your Honour knows the law does not require that information to be filed for a year or so. So there are no directors listed. The solicitors are the well known firm of Marshall, White, Ottenheimer and Green - solicitors for the firm, as of record. I mean, I have no doubt they are doing it legally and in the course of their business in incorporating companies.

The shareholders, each of whom has one share, Sir: Mr. George Murphy who lists his address as 37 Richmond Street, St. John's, Artist; Mr. Fraser Lush, Victoria Cove, Gander Bay, he used to be executive assistant to the Minister of Forestry, he now is, was formerly employed by the Tory Government, who will probably be running as a Tory candidate; and then Mr. Howard Crane, 24 Memorial Drive, Gander - Mr. Howard Crane -

AN HON. MEMBER: President of the P.C. Association.

MR. ROBERTS: Right he is President of P.C. Association out there, from time to time. He is the Imperial Oil agency at the airport. Imperial Oil have a hand in many, many pots. They have the honourable gentleman for Labrador North, and they have Mr. Howard Crane.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is a fine man.

MR. ROBERTS: He is a fine man.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is an outstanding man.

MR. ROBERTS: He is an outstanding man, and a well known Tory, and now he is branching out, and lo and behold, he and Mr. Fraser Lush have got together with Mr. George Murphy and they decided to incorporate a company and that company decided to hire Mr. J. O. Brown, Mr. Joseph Brown who lo and behold suddenly gets a commission and the commission is from the Department of Tourism of which the honourable Member for St. John's East Extern is minister.

Now I do not know what you read into it, Your Honour, but a lot of people read a lot into the facts that this Mr. Joseph Brown either now or formerly lives with the Minister of Tourism. They share an apartment in Elizabeth Towers. He is a Nova Scotian, formerly employed by Mr. George MacLean of fame or infamy. It is amazing how all

the web, the tentacles keep coming back, Sir, and they interlock. I am told that Mr. Joseph Browne and his company have been much favoured by this administration.

The Coordinator of the Silver Anniversary Celebrations, Mr. Robert Nutbeam, I am told gave them a \$9,000 contract to advise him, Mr. Nutbeam who to write his report. I am told there is a \$16,000 contract for hotels, a study on hotels in Newfoundland given to this same firm. I am told they are working on road maps.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I understand they have got some contracts to print, and the Public Accounts Committee will be well advised to look carefully into the Tourism Department contracts this year. They were called twice, Sir. They were called twice. A very unusual set of proceedings - very unusual to say the least. And we have heard no explanation. There can be no explanation except the truth.

MR. HICKEY: You would not let me.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman, Sir, has not spoken in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: He spoke outside the House. And the statements which he gave to the newspaper, Sir, were misleading -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - inaccurate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Hon. Minister of Tourism on a point of order.

MR. HICKEY: The honourable gentleman has made a lot of mistakes in the last half hour but let the House record that I attempted to give details on just what he calls this sordid affair, and I was not permitted.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. The honourable gentleman was not allowed to speak because he had already spoken.

MR. HICKEY: You did not want the truth.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour I am giving the House the truth and I shall repeat it unless - does Your Honour need to rule on that? I do not think there was much of a point of order, Sir, but -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Hon. Minister of Tourism did rise on a point of order, the Chair feels that this is more of a matter of clarification rather than on a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir. The honourable gentleman let him - I say to him now let him reveal the truth. How much is Ottawa contributing to the Norma and Gladys? And how much is the Province contributing? Who owns - who are the true owners of Cabot Group 4 Limited? How come they have been so favoured all of a sudden, out of all the public relations firms in Newfoundland? A new firm is set up, and the beneficence of the Ministry of Tourism shines upon them. The sun, the sun, the bright shinning sun, Sir, beams forth from the Minister of Tourism onto to Cabot Group 4 Limited. His former roommate. He may still be his roommate. And a firm set up with well-known Tory supporters! Now I do not mind well known Tories supporting anything, and I do not mind them incorporating firms, but I do find it curious, Sir, that this firm has got so much work without the formality of public tender or even letting - there are many firms in St. John's that do public relations work, some of them are connected with one party or another, some are connected with no party.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Cabot Group 4 Limited, Sir, Mr. Crane, whatever his expertise is and he has a great deal of it in his own field, has never in his life done anything on publicity before. Mr. Fraser Lush edited the Gander Beacon, I think, at one stage. That is as close as he ever came to being in the P.R. business. And what has he got to do with this firm, he is out in Gander Bay teaching. Well I will tell you what he has to do - peddling influence, Sir, the worst kind of influence, peddling.

And then Mr. Joe Brown who is not even listed as a shareholder but is general manager of the firm according to the firm's own letterhead, a former roommate or a present roommate of the minister, a buddy, a friend, an intimate acquaintance suddenly shows up with the contracts. And on top of that, Sir, the minister misleads the House time and time again, consistently and constantly with respect to where the facts come, with respect -

MR. HICKEY: Are you questioning my honour?

MR. ROBERTS: I am questioning the honourable gentleman - I am not allowed to question his honour. I am questioning the honourable gentleman's statements. And I am saying they are incorrect. And if I were allowed to call them a lie, I would call them a lie.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: If I was allowed to call them a lie, Sir, I would call them a lie, but I am not allowed to call them a lie and therefore I do not, and that is the only reason I do not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman goes outside of the House and he makes statements. I have shown that those statements are incorrect, and I will make them outside or inside. He has misled the people of Newfoundland on the Norma and Gladys - misled the cost of her, misled who is paying and how much and the total cost. I say, Sir, when the people of Newfoundland realize this around the world voyage is going to cost the better part of \$300,000 of which \$220,000 in round numbers is coming from Ottawa, they will rise up and the best thing they can do for Tourism is to send the minister one way, not to Okinawa, we have friendly relations with Japan, how about South Vietnam where we do not have any relations at all. Let the minister go.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, - Now, Mr. Speaker, so much for the Norma and Gladys .

AN HON. MEMBER: .... bash your brains in.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh who is going to bash my brains in? If the minister

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: bashed my brains in,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, he would have far more brains on his hands than he has got in his head.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, -

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: ..... brains.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Hon. Leader of the Opposition may have been getting carried away in the heat of debate. The Chair certainly considers his last few comments with regards to the personality of the Hon. Minister of Tourism to be unparliamentary. I would ask him to withdraw them.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank you, Your Honour. I will withdraw them but I will ask Your Honour to ask him to withdraw his comments because I responded in kind to him. Would Your Honour ask him to withdraw his comments, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, there we go now (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair certainly did not, quite honestly say did not hear of what the comments made by the Hon. Minister of Tourism were.

MR. ROBERTS: I am told in fact, Sir, and I thank Your Honour, that the Hon. Minister of Tourism did not say what I thought he had said, so I will apologize to him as well.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir,

AN HON. MEMBER: ..... challenge you outside of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: He is going to challenge me outside of the House. There is a long queue of honourable gentlemen opposite, Sir, who want to challenge me outside of the House. Let them do it.

Now, Sir, let me turn to the honourable gentleman's seat mate who was here earlier but must have feared that he would be involved, the Minister of Rural Development. He is gone. He is probably looking for Rural Development somewhere.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, there is something very strange about the Rural Development Department, passing strange. There is what amounts to be a conspiracy to keep silent about the money they are spending, the purposes



for which they are spending it, the people to whom they are lending it, and the results which they have obtained. And I think this is a fitting subject for public exposure because it is obvious to me, Sir, that the Minister of Rural Development is hiding something. I do not know what he is hiding. But last year the gentleman for White Bay South, Mr. Rowe, Bill Rowe, wrote a letter to the minister and said could we please have a list of the people to whom loans have been made, and the minister in due course sent back the list. Now I know what happened. He lived to regret it. I have no doubt that the Premier and the Minister of Industrial Development took the Minister of Rural Development to the woodshed and had a little heart to heart talk with him and said in effect, "Jim" of all the blankety fools you take the cake, do not ever do that again, because -

MR. MORGAN: It embarrassed the people who received the loans.

May 5, 1975

Tape No. 2035

NM - I

MR. ROBERTS:

- it embarrassed the government. I have not heard from one applicant. I say to the gentleman from Bonavista South, let him produce one letter, from one applicant, dated a year ago and postmarked a year ago -

MR. NEARY: Bern Fitzpatrick.

MR. ROBERTS: It may have embarrassed Mr. Fitzpatrick, but other than Mr. Bern Fitzpatrick, and the Tory and the Tory Cabinet, I say to the gentleman from Bonavista South, let him produce one letter objecting, saying he was embarrassed, not one.

Now, Sir, this year - I have talked to them.

AN HON. MEMBER: I have talked to them.

MR. ROBERTS: I have talked to them. I say now publicly, let them send me collect telegrams if they feel that way. Any man in Newfoundland who feels that way let him do it. But this is public money and there is no better place for it to be discussed than in the people's House.

This year, Sir, this year the minister refused to table any information. And it leads one to believe that the only reason can be he is hiding something. But of course he is hiding it. We had just a little glimpse of what he is hiding when he was forced in a letter to me dated March 20 to provide a list by category. And we get such gems as the one to which my friend from Hermitage referred the other day, mortuary business. As of October 31, the information was sent to me on March 20, there were four mortuaries that had been approved, that had loans or grants, we are not told which, at a total of \$34,040. Now as of the other day, Sir, when we had a lovely little piece of something sent out by the honourable minister, it does not give a date on it, it just says loans approved to date, so let us assume it was a month or two past. We had five mortuaries having been approved, 4.5 jobs for \$40,000. So in other words, sometime between October 31 and the date of this departmental publication we had half a job created, at a cost of about \$6,000 in one mortuary.

Now, Sir, there is nothing wrong with mortuaries. Honourable gentlemen opposite obviously have an interest in them.

MR. NEARY: A very dead issue.

MR. ROBERTS: It is a dead issue. But let me point out, Sir, that by making a loan to a mortuary— let us call him an undertaker, I mean let us call a spade a spade and a casket a casket. The basic regulations, and this is a publication produced by the department, Sir, the basic regulations for the Rural Development Authority loans specify, I will read it, "All applicants who are already engaged in or planning to establish or expand on the following types of industries may be eligible for assistance: (a) Resource based industry." Now, I wonder, Sir, if a mortuary is a resource based industry? I wonder if the undertaking industry is a resource based industry? If so it qualifies for a loan.

Maybe it is a manufacturing or a processing industry. That is another head.

MR. EVANG: Caskets do not grow.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman says caskets do not grow, no that is true. The wood from which they are made grows, the caskets do not. Now, Sir, a manufacturing or processing industry. It could be that. It could be said to be a processing industry, Sir. But there is a category which takes in that. (c) Service industries have all or in part support either (a) or (b) above. Maybe that is the justification. Or maybe you will try the final category for which loans may be made - tourist based enterprises. Now, let it not be said, Sir, anywhere in this country, from here to Vancouver Island, that we do not make our tourists welcome, Sir. With all the tourist based industries we have, we have the Norma and Gladys and then we have morgues, undertakers, supported by the government. We have newspapers, and the government cut off the loans, the advertisements in The Daily News, because it disagreed with the government editorially.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: One honourable gentleman opposite just said hear! Hear! Well that is fine. The government now apparently want to establish their own newspapers. Two, two jobs, or I am sorry, 3.50 jobs. Now they were \$11,492 on October 31, but as of to date they are, according to their own paper, \$12,500.

May 5, 1975

Tape No. 2035

NM - 3

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: One o'clock is it Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: It now being one o'clock I now leave the Chair until  
three o'clock this afternoon.

The House resumed at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, when we rose for lunch I had said a few words about the proceedings of the Rural Development Department, and in particular the refusal of the minister, the honourable gentleman from Labrador South - I am sorry, I am sorry from Trinity South- to make public any real information. And that is very true. We have had all sorts of glossy handouts from the minister. It is true that we have not been as yet favoured with a picture of him, but we shall have to take that as, not as read, as least take it as seen. But we have not been favoured with any information giving details of the Rural Development Authority.

Now in view of the fact that the Auditor General has been severely critical of the Rural Development Authority and has in his most recent report, a report which the government have refused to allow to be debated, and a report which has not been sent to the Public Accounts Committee because the government have not moved to set up the Public Accounts Committee - in view of the fact that the Auditor General was very, very critical of the administration of the Rural Development Authority, he said in one or two cases they had broken the law, they had ignored the Statutes, they had ignored the regulations adopted by cabinet under authority of the Statutes, one would think, Mr. Speaker, in view of that the minister would be the very first to come into this House and to lay upon the table of the House a great deal of information. But he has not. And he has resisted repeated and renewed requests to make public some information about the Authority. I have written him two or three times. My friend and colleague from Hermitage has written the minister two or three times, all to the same end: Would the minister make available a list of those to whom loans and grants have been granted and have been lent? Well he will not, Mr. Speaker, he has not, and he will not. Why? Well we do not know. We know that he did so a year ago, so it is hardly a case of setting a precedent. The precedent has been set to the contrary. The precedent is that it is quite in order to make public these loans.

And then if some honourable member wishes to criticize it that then, Sir, is upon that honourable gentleman's head. And I might add, and I repeat that while honourable gentlemen opposite say that there has been embarrassment caused by virtue of the fact that some names were mentioned in the House, I say that I have heard of no such embarrassment. Since I am one of the ones who was accused of having done it, it is reasonable to believe that the gentlemen concerned would have raised some question with me. And I am quite prepared to say that there has been no such embarrassment caused, because the only names that were mentioned in the debate in this House on the Rural Development Authority - the only names that were mentioned, Sir, were -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: (Yes.) - were those of Tory candidates, former Tory candidates who had got loans. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that anybody who runs for the Tory Party in this Province is above embarrassment and cannot be embarrassed and need not be embarrassed. He may be somewhat discomfited by virtue of the fact that it is revealed that the Tory Government lent money -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: -lent money on very generous terms, low interest or no interest, long loans so soft as to be soggy, not just soft loans, but soggy loans to former Tory candidates. And now this year when we enquire whether the minister will make available a list showing the activity in the twelve months since his last list was brought up to date he, Sir, has refused to do this and the obvious conclusion, and I challenge any honourable gentlemen opposite on this point, is that the minister is hiding something and what he is hiding obviously is at very least improper, and may very well go beyond that.

Here we have an Authority that was set two or three years ago, great fanfare, staffed by a defeated Tory candidate Mr. Meade of Hermitage fame, a gentleman of some stature, some ability, unfortunately none of it in the political field, and some other well-known Tory supporters, set up to dole out millions of public dollars. And the first year we get a report as to what

they have done with it, the second year, Sir, we get nothing except the Auditor General's report. And they cannot deny the Auditor General access to information or I venture to say they would, and then the Auditor General makes some criticism and that is the last that the minister says. You think, Sir, that in common shame the minister would at least stand up and defend himself. The government refused to allow the estimates to be called. The whole estimates debate comes and goes with the minister cowering in his corner when he is here, scared that somehow his departmental estimates will be called, he will have to stand in defence of the policies and the programmes he administers and the actions of he and his officials. Sir, it is a pretty third class performance. We would expect better from the minister. And then when we get a glossy handout by the minister, a good picture on the front, it is Abel Taylor's chess set which was carved by Abel Taylor a gentleman who lives at Raleigh and works at St. Anthony and won the prize in the handicrafts exhibition last year - we get a great thundering message from the minister, we get another less thundering message from the deputy minister, and we get some propaganda. We get all sorts of pictures, all sorts of useful things like a two page thing on the metric system, great lists of very useful information that can be put on about a third of the page needed, but no data, Sir, on the millions of dollars that have been spent.

I mentioned the mortician's one - that is just an example of how this Rural Development Authority is being abused. It is being abused, Sir. It has been anything but a success. We used to hear a great deal from the administration about it. Every now and then the Premier would erupt with a carefully prepared statement about so many hundred jobs having been created at so many thousand dollars cost. We hear that no more, Sir. Why? Because the Rural Development Authority is anything but a success. It has turned out to be more of a failure than even the most cynical and pessimistic of Newfoundlanders feared. It has not worked. It has deteriorated and degenerated into a patronage

dispensing body for the Tory Party. And I say - the RDA and I am not talking about the Ombudsman yet - but the Rural Development Authority - and I say to the Premier that he should table that list. If there is nothing to fear then there is nothing to hide. But the mere fact that the gentleman from Trinity South has refused to make available a list of those to whom loans have gone is in itself indicative of fact that the gentleman for Trinity South is hiding something. I do not know what he is hiding. Why? He made it public a year ago, he will not make it public now. Why will he not make it public?

MR. MOORES: The Development Corporation -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the Development Corporation makes details available. There is no secret at all about the Development Corporation. All their mortgages are registered, one can go down into the Registry of Deeds and look them up. They are all there. They have an annual report. They make quite a production of it. The RDA have nothing to show except the Auditor General criticizing them and saying that they have broken the law. The Auditor General's report has a number of references less than complimentary to the minister and his administration of that department.

Now, Sir, the Field Aviation caper has been very thoroughly discussed. I still have not seen the documents tabled by the Member for Labrador West. Have they been laid upon the table of the House?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I would like to read them at some point, and I should not say a great deal more until I have had a chance to read them because, you know, what I say should be founded on the documents. But I will say, Sir, I will say that the minister's statement this morning did not assuage the public doubt on this point. The fact remains, Sir, that the government's commitment in respect to these conversions was made several months past in the Fall. On the 14th day - or I am sorry, on the 13th. day of February the Hon. Member from Gander wrote a letter -

MR. COLLINS: Hurray!

MR. ROBERTS: Yes he sticks his hand up, that is the only time



we have heard from him. It was the most sensible speech he has made. The honourable gentleman from Gander, a great fighter for his constituents, at least some of them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Howard Crane.

MR. ROBERTS: Howard Crane and the likes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman from Gander on the 13th. day of February wrote to the Minister at Ottawa, Mr. Jamieson, to ask permission to reallocate \$800,000 from one part of the forest agreement under DREE to another part. That was several months after the government had committed themselves to a contract in respect of these water bombers. The Hon. Mr. Jamieson signed the letter on April 30 agreeing to that suggestion - April 30, Sir. That was the same day that the Minister of Justice stood in his place and with great aplomb said, oh Ottawa are paying for it. It has all been signed, sealed and delivered. Well I challenge the minister then -

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable

gentleman if he is going to speak, let him speak from his seat.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order, please!

HON. A. HICKMAN: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice on a point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I never said any such thing. The honourable gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition should check his facts. The honourable the Leader of the Opposition asked me if as House Leader I would indicate whether certain agreements will be made public and I said I would discuss the matter with the honourable the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture upon his return. If he and/or the other party to the agreement have no objection I am sure they will be delighted to do it. But to suggest that I said it has been paid for or there is any talk of payment the honourable gentleman is wrong.

MR. COLLINS: He will be laughed at in Gander. Let him carry on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Happy Harold - Oh! I am sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: May I speak to the point of order, Sir, before your -

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: I submit, Sir, there is no -

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I submit there is no point of order. What the honourable gentleman said is in Hansard. The Hansards have not yet been published but as I recall and my notes made at the time indicate that the minister said there was an agreement and that Ottawa had agreed to pay the cost. I, feeling there was no agreement, for this purpose stood and asked the minister if he would table it. The minister walked blithely into the situation by saying he would table it and it was somewhat strange because the letter from Ottawa authorizing it

was only signed later that afternoon. I submit there is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair rules that it is a difference of opinion as to alleged statements made between two honourable members.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, as I was saying, the agreement by Ottawa to pay part of the cost came several months after the contract was awarded. In fact, Sir, the Cabinet order dated June 26 -

MR. COLLINS: I did not think you read that.

MR. ROBERTS: Happy Harold must be on his pills again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Is the honourable gentleman on his pills, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. COLLINS: You are a low-down -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. COLLINS: - that even went through under a skunk and you know it and the people of Newfoundland know it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Are you on your happy pills again "Harold"?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. COLLINS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I remind honourable members that when a member is speaking he does have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, obviously Happy Harold is on his pills again today, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: As I was saying on June 26 the Cabinet authorized the government to enter into two contracts at a cost of \$300,000. Now that is a curious state of affairs. In June they authorized that. On the sixth of November, the Cabinet authorized the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the same gentleman who has been so vocal in the debate and has so little to say, to enter into the contract with

Field Aviation. By that time, of course, the air craft were on their way to Gander - to Calgary. They had been stopped on route. The minister has not dealt at all with that point of it. The further fact, of course, is that it was only in February, the middle of February which was all of November, all of December, all of January and half of February, three and a half months later the Minister of Forestry got around to signing a request to Ottawa to the honourable Mr. Jamieson to ask him whether the government could have some money to spend for this purpose out of the forestry agreement. The honourable Mr. Jamieson agreed as I have said on a letter dated the thirtieth day of April which was the afternoon the question arose in the House. Furthermore, that money, let it be recorded, is coming from other monies available to Newfoundland under the Forest Programme. We are going to have \$800,000 less on access roads this year because of the minister's decision. Up until then, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. COLLINS: We can have things twisted in this House and a lot of people might not understand it or might believe the twisting which the honourable Leader of the Opposition is a past master at. There is no doubt about it. He thinks he is on to a great political ploy.

MR. NEARY: Where is the point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. COLLINS: The point of order, Mr. Speaker, and the honourable Member for Bell Island might just as well shut up right now because we have seen him. We have heard him. The point which I am raising Mr. Speaker, is that -

MR. NEARY: You will hear more from him after this.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. COLLINS: - the DREE Management Committee, the DREE Management Committee have proved the expenditure of those funds last Fall. I have not got the exact dates here. My colleague, the Minister of Transportation gave them this morning. What happened yesterday or

a week ago with Mr. Jamieson writing us agreeing to it has got nothing to do with the awarding of the contract at all. I am sure that the press have all the information on this and I am sure the press of Newfoundland will want to make sure that the facts are put in proper perspective as they are. The Leader of the Opposition is on to something, you know, he is barking up the wrong tree.

MR. MORGAN: The brainless wonder over there.

MR. ROBERTS: There is no more point of order there! The honourable gentleman is obviously tender and it is obvious to me, Sir, he realizes that he has made a terrible mistake, that he tried to cover up something. He was part of dastardly cover-up and he has been caught at it. Now, Sir, I do resent honourable gentlemen opposite who should know better standing on points of order and trying to enter the debate. I would ask Your Honour to allow me extra time to make up for the three or four minutes that the honourable gentleman opposite dillied and dallied.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Minister of Forestry and Agriculture in the Chair's ruling did not have a valid point of order. It was a point of clarification that he made as such. The Chair certainly does not intend to take time out for points of order raised from any debate.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honour. Now, as I was saying, the whole event is somewhat curious. On 26, June, and I am reading from an Order in Council now - there is obviously more to the Order in Council but this is a version of an Order in Council, an edited version - on 26 of June - we have part of an Order in Council - ordered that the following action related to the forest fire air fleet of the Department of Forestry and Agriculture be and it is hereby approved provided the necessary funds to meet the cost involved are available in the department vote for 1974-75, one, the reconditioning of two Canso aircraft at an estimated cost of \$150,000 for aircraft. We do not know what comes after one. It could be anything in the

world but the minister has chosen to edit. Well, I am sorry, I do not take the minister's word for that. Let it stand the Order in Council has been edited. Whoever photostated it was directed to photostate only the top portion of the page and that is what he did.

On October 16 the Deputy Minister, the Deputy Minister, Mr. Patrick wrote to the Secretary of the Forest Agreement Management Committee. "It has now been" - the second paragraph - "it has now been decided by the Province that the most practical approach to providing a fire suppression service is the refurbishing of the Canso Water Bombing Fleet. This is estimated to cost \$200,000 per machine and it is planned to do two machines per year starting this winter."

On October 21, from the minutes of the seventh meeting of the fourth management Committee, again, Sir, an edited version, "The Committee agreed to the establishment of a new project under programme item (6) rebuilding of four Canso water bombers at an estimated total cost of \$800,000." And then, "it is estimated that expenditures on this project will total \$400,000 during the present fiscal year. If necessary, funds for the project will be transferred from the Access Roads Programme, item (4) and an exchange of letters between the minister will be arranged by Mr. Sheppard if required."

It was on February 13, long after the contract was awarded, three or four months after the minute of the, whatever they call it - the Forest Management Committee which is a Committee as I understand it made up of officials. It was on February 13 that the minister found time to write to Ottawa and it was on April 30 that the minister wrote back from Ottawa, Mr. Jamieson, to say that it was agreed that some money could come from one part of the agreement, the forest access, and be put into another. Until that was done, Sir, the only money that was allowed in the agreement out of the \$1.6 million originally made available for the protection of forest resources, part of the agreement, \$5,000 was allotted for the evaluation of the present condition of the aircraft. Now, with the amendment, \$805,000 has been allotted.

Sir, the fact remains that the government called tenders before the money was approved at any level other than the Management Committee, which is not binding on any minister. It is a Committee of officials acting within the terms of the agreement. The government awarded the contract to other than the lowest tenderer and it does not say in these minutes that the Committee recommended it. It just says the Committee approved the awarding of the tender to Field Aviation Limited, Calgary. This firm has been the lowest evaluated tender. That is all we are told. That is all we are told.

In October 28 we are told, the Committee has reconsidered its approval but that is a long way from recommending. Sir, this Committee was presented with fait accompli. We still have not got to the bottom of it. We still do not have the truth. That Eastern Aviation firm, Sir, is capable of maintaining Trans Atlantic aircraft. It is the firm in Gander that is doing a lot of the work now. The minister, in his wisdom, decided not to give them the contract. So, I say to the Minister of Transportation who is so sensitive on this issue, let him open his files. These documents are not complete. They have major omissions. I say to the minister, let him open his files. Who recommended that contract? Who said it was the lowest tender? Who evaluated it? All that the Committee did, Mr. Speaker, was approve it, ratify a fait accompli. That is all they did and even the papers tabled by the minister this morning indicate that. It is wrong. It is as wrong as can be to say that that Committee of officials recommended that the contract go to Field Aviation. They ratified it, Sir. Well, who approved it? Was one of the ministers involved in that? Why? It is a very strange state of affairs and the minister's attempted

explanation only makes it worse. So, I say to the minister, I say to the minister, produce the documents, not a carefully edited version thereof which is all that this is, carefully edited, an incomplete file, an incomplete documentation. Produce the documents. Produce the documents, Mr. Speaker, and then let the matter be judged. Let the documents speak for themselves. The honourable gentleman, Sir, has not produced any documentation that refutes the point. The documentation he has produced and the other ones about which we know only make it seem all the more curious and strange the way in which the government have handled this agreement. It is a very, very, very unusual state of affairs, Sir.

I am not saying anything is wrong. I have said it is scandalous. That does not make it a scandal. The honourable gentleman from Gander seems awfully sensitive on the issue, Sir. I would ask if he has nothing to hide, if he has nothing to fear, then he, I would have thought, would be the first to produce the truth, and not produce personal attacks on the gentleman from Bell Island that the Premier has to apologize for his colleague. The Premier had to get up and apologize for the Minister of Transportation.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I did not say anything.

MR. ROBERTS: So, the honourable gentleman did not say it. Then the Premier apologized for nothing. The Premier apologized, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Transportation.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier apologized, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier - I am not worried about the minister. The Premier apologized for the minister, not the minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I did not think I had to.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, then, that, Sir, is the minister's fault. That is the minister's fault. But, the Premier was the one who apologized, not the minister. Whether the minister thought he had something to apologize for or not, the Premier stood in his place this morning and apologized.



MR. ROUSSEAU: I apologize -

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman can apologize to the Premier if he wants to. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me just touch upon one or two other matters. The Labrador Linerboard situation; How is it, Mr. Speaker, that nearly three years after the people of this Province purchased the linerboard mill, an agreement approved in this House, after we have spent about \$250 million on the linerboard mill, the government have yet to produce for the House any detailed information? Where are the profit and loss statements? Where are the details of what that mill is doing? Where are the details of how our money is being spent?

Today, Sir, as Your Honour knows, the mill is closed. It has been announced it is closed for at least two weeks, maybe longer. But, let us hope not. Let us hope that it will open in two weeks. The reason we are given is that the American linerboard markets are soft, that the market for linerboard is not as good as it was or as it will be. Sir, we were told earlier in this House that Europe was to be the destination for the product of much of the mill or much of the mill's product. These two statements do not square one with the other.

Again, Sir, the same thing as the contract in Gander. What are the administration hiding and why are they hiding? Where are the profit and loss statements? There is nothing to be hidden. It is our money, Mr. Speaker. If that corporation, the Labrador Linerboard Corporation, a board of which is made up of political hacks, the Labrador Linerboard Corporation, Mr. Speaker, if it runs bankrupt, we the people have to pick it up. We have no choice. Such is the guarantee. It is now the Crown, a Crown Corporation. The budget, Sir, has another \$25 million in it for Labrador Linerboard, most of it coming from DREF, most of it coming from Ottawa. But, again, Sir, it is reasonable to assume that if the DREF money was not going into Labrador Linerboard, it could go somewhere else on forestry resources, maybe to do something about the chaotic condition of the lumber industry in Newfoundland at present.

Why will not the government give the people the facts, Sir? Two or three years ago they were willing enough to trot in here. We have

not heard anything since, have not heard - I do not know, is the Minister of Manpower on the board of the Labrador Linerboard at present.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Is the thing making money? Losing money? Where is the annual report? I do not know, the shareholders, I assume are three or four of the ministers by virtue of their ministerial offices. But, where are the reports? The shareholders may or may not have them. I do not know. But, I know the people of Newfoundland do not. Where are the statements? Is that company making money, losing money? Is it being well run or not? We do not know anything about it. Nobody knows anything about it.

You know, I do not know if there is anything wrong or not, Sir. All I know is that we are on the back of \$250 million in round numbers now. If the thing is losing \$5 million or \$10 million or \$20 million a year, we are paying it. It is our working capital that is being eaten up. Eventually the government of the Province, the people of the Province will have to be faced with putting more money in or seeing it go under, if that is the situation. What is the situation? There are all sorts of curious things about the linerboard mill.

The insurance contract with the linerboard mill is worth a Royal Commission in itself, Sir. In due course, there is liable to be one. The way in which the mill's legal affairs are being handled - we can hardly get Fabian O'Dea to go in on that because his firm is benefiting. There are all sorts of very curious aspects - the way in which they have been purchasing machinery, any number of things that are at very best curious. There has been no explanation. That, Sir, speaks for itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am told I have about twenty minutes left. I would rather have the twenty minutes left, Sir, than what little the honourable gentleman has left in his political career, the gentleman from Gander if he ever gets up the nerve to face his electors again, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. Well, the Public Accounts report is debatable. So, we will have a - if ever the Minister of Justice brings it in, we will

have a debate on the Public Accounts - you know, to appoint the committees.

Sir, I have in front of me one of the great fictional documents of our time, a document that is worth the Pulitzer Prize in fiction, Prix Concorde, the première French prize in fiction, any number of awards for creative writing inspired by everything except reality. What I have, Sir, is a list of the Tory Government promises, things they will do. We just touch on some of them, Sir. I mean, take five or ten minutes and read some of them. Some of them may be familiar to Your Honour. Some of them may not.

In January, 1973, in the Throne Speech, the government in a speech said that the Department of Education will sponsor an offshore manpower needs conference in Spring, 1973 and will continue to organize such conferences on a regular basis. Nothing has been done. In a campaign speech in October, 1971, the Premier said that the Tory Government would institute a Provincewide educational television system. Nothing has been done.

In another campaign speech in October, 1971 the Premier said the government will pay special incentive to teachers and other professional people to serve in smaller communities. Again, Sir, nothing has been done. The most that can be said on that is the hard-lying allowance has been extended to all of Labrador, but not to all of Northern Newfoundland. But, nothing has been done, Sir, to pay special incentive to teachers and other professional people to serve in smaller communities.

In January, 1973, the Premier said that the government has a four year financial plan, that it was now before cabinet. Less than two weeks later, Sir, the Throne Speech said that the government is now completing a five year plan for long term orderly spending. Directly inconsistent statements. Again, Sir, we have not seen the five year plan or any evidence of it. It is like the Minister of Transportation's five year road plan, it does not exist. It is a figment of political imaginations.

In an October, 1971 campaign statement the Premier said the Tories plan to look into the possibility of devising a method to give higher

basic exemptions to low income groups or to give them a rebate on some SSA taxes paid. Now, let us look at that, Sir. That was a campaign commitment. It rates right up with the house for a house that the gentleman from St. John's North quite rightly is incensed about. It has been kept just as efficaciously, not at all. What was done on the SSA? It came off childrens' clothing just before the March election. Just after the March election the Mothers' Allowance was whipped out of the pockets of mothers. Who did that benefit? Well, everybody in Newfoundland alike who had a child of the age to qualify got twenty dollars. I venture to submit, Sir, that to Your Honour twenty dollars does not mean nearly as much as to many of Your Honour's constituents or to many honourable gentlemen in this House who are of reasonably good means, it does not mean nearly as much as to many of the people of this Province who do not have that degree of affluence. Do they equal out?

Oh yes, Sir. If somebody spends \$300 a year on childrens' clothing, on a child's clothing, then you are better off. The twenty dollars represents the tax on about \$300 clothing. But, Sir, I can find few parents in this Province who spend \$300 a year on clothing for each child. They would like to, but they are not able to. So, that is benefiting low income groups. The one thing the Tories did helps only the wealthier people, if it helps anybody at all. They have done nothing at all to keep that promise that the Premier made, the commitment he made to give higher basic exemptions to low income groups or to give them a rebate on SSA taxes paid. Nothing has been done except to increase the burden. They are given back the SSA which has been increased in the meantime. They are given back the seven per cent on childrens' clothing and they lose twenty dollars. So, there is not a mother in Newfoundland Sir, below an income of \$6,000 or \$7,000 a year, not a mother in Newfoundland who is not worse off instead of being better off. The people believed the Tories just once.

In the March Throne Speech in 1972, the goals of the government were given, as not having the highest unemployment rate in Canada, reaching full employment and having reasonable price stability. Now,

MR. ROBERTS: that in itself is enough. This government should go straight to Government House and resign in shame. Unemployment has never been higher. Prices have never been higher. Employment, full employment, is even further away than ever. The government opposite, Mr. Speaker, have yet to create any meaningful number of jobs anywhere, anywhere. The Come By Chance Refinery we heard so much about, was such a bad thing, and then the Premier discovers he too can get a refinery and he waltzes into the House, great announcement, bursting with pride nearly three years ago, Sir. Nothing has happened on that.

Nothing has happened at the new mill at Come By Chance. At one stage the Premier went so far as to record with Mr. George McLean for distribution at the appropriate time, the election that did not come off, an announcement that the fourth mill was to proceed at Come By Chance. That, Sir, has been put on the back burner.

The cement plant come to nothing. It may be not the government's fault but certainly not their doing and certain gentlemen, Sir, who were foolish enough to travel throughout the Port au Port Peninsula telling the people of the great time which would come, the great day which would dawn when the cement plant came into operation, are going to find, Sir, certain gentlemen are going to find when they go back to face the verdict, an angry people, Sir, an angry people who can be fooled once but not twice, who will believe a politician when he is a new figure to them, believe him on his face value, then when they have been tricked and let down, Sir, will find out and will not forgive. Fool me once, the old saying goes, shame on you, fool me twice, Sir, shame on me.

Fisheries - a long sad tale. The March 1972 Throne Speech promised the introduction of a new programme to provide better assistance to inshore fishermen in obtaining boats, gear and equipment - nothing done. The March 1972 Throne Speech promised government encouragement of participation by all fishermen in developing government programmes through discussion groups. The government, it says, will also establish regional advisory councils

to develop plans and policies with the government - not one council established, not one discussion group held.

The March 1972 Throne Speech said the government will introduce legislation concerning a new financing approach to provide the supply of fish necessary to have fish plants efficiently utilized. Sir, there has not been a comma put on the statute books of this Province about that. The only thing the government did in fish plants financing was to make Spencer Lake a little wealthier by giving him an extra \$1 million on the purchase of the Burgeo Plant.

The Trawler Corporation, now here is a tale of deception and woe. In March 1972 the Throne Speech said that the government would introduce legislation to establish a corporation to own or to lease rights on a new fleet of trawlers. Well that legislation, Sir, has not seen the light of day, if it ever existed.

In April 1973 the Premier dropped by Harbour Grace and he said that the programme is an established fact, the trawler programme. He says the initial plan is for construction of twenty, count them, Sir, twenty trawlers, either for use of the government fleet to pull catches or for leasing to companies. These people were told two years ago, Sir, that it was when an established fact, not that we are working on it, not that we hope to do it or expect to do it or would like to do it, but that it was an established fact.

In the January 1973 Throne Speech, two months before the Premier's infamous speech at Harbour Grace, the government said it intends to introduce legislation to establish a \$40 million fund for trawler construction. Again, Sir, not a scratch on the statute books, let alone a new act. In January 1975 the Premier comes back to ground. Now, he says it is most unlikely we will do it now.

Well ironically, Mr. Speaker, now is the time the government should be thinking of doing it because when we get control of the 200 mile limit, not if but when, Canada will need a greatly increased fishing capacity. So it makes good sense, Sir, for the government now to go into it. But two or three years ago it was at best an attempt to deceive the electorate. So much for the trawler corporation.

Now, Sir, the Gear Insurance Programme. The March 1972 Throne Speech said that legislation would be introduced to establish an inexpensive shared cost insurance programme covering loss of fishing gear. Nothing has been done. I had a phone call this morning from a gentleman in Trinity South who said that he could not get his member, he also said some uncomplimentary things about his member, he said he lost, the gentleman said he lost \$2,000 or \$3,000 in fishing gear in a storm two or three nights ago. Where could he turn for help? And I suggested he get hold to the Minister of Fisheries and he indicated he would like to get hold of him, Sir, by the scruff of the neck. I said that was not going to do it.

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not say that.

MR. ROBERTS: No, his words were a little stronger than that. I have repeated the essence of what the gentleman said, Sir, but certainly not the exact words because Your Honour would have to rule them out of order. They would -

MR. MOORES: You are saying the Gear Replacement Programme this year was not enough.

MR. ROBERTS: I certainly am. I am also talking about the March 1972 Throne Speech which said that legislation would be introduced to establish an inexpensive shared cost insurance programme covering the loss of fishing gear.

The people of Newfoundland had the right to believe the Governor. He was only speaking the words put in his mouth by the Premier. They had a right to believe. But nothing has been done. No legislation has been introduced, there has not been a comma, or a jittle or a tot, or a tot or a jittle, or an iota or a scratch or a scrimis put on the statute books. Nothing has been done to have an insurance programme covering the loss of fishing gear.

The March 1972 Throne Speech, funny Sir, how that document keeps coming up. It commits the government to embarking immediately upon a programme to encourage the establishment of additional facilities for the

further processing of fish in the Province.

Sir, nothing has been done. Nothing. If we were importing fish before processed outside Newfoundland but caught in Newfoundland, we are still doing it. The government have done nothing at all, a cruel deception.

In 1971 the Premier went to Twillingate for a campaign rally in honour of Mr. Jack Loveridge at that stage flying the Tory colours. And at the campaign rally in Twillingate the honourable gentleman said that the Tories would study fish auction centres being established in major fishing communities and would set up one auction centre as a pilot project on the East Coast. Sir, nothing has been done. Nothing has been done. I have the cuttings, if the Premier would like, I also have copies of his statements, marvellous reading, worth Pulitzer prize in fiction.

MR. MOORES: The honourable Member for Twillingate will not be running for you next time.

MR. ROBERTS: There are going to be a lot of people running for us down in Twillingate, anyone of whom will win. Anyone of whom will win.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: They are awfully worried, are they not? They are awfully worried.

MR. MOORES: We are worried.

MR. ROBERTS: Who is running for George McLean? Now, Sir, let us look at Forestry and Agriculture. Again the same story of broken promises. Farm equipment banks 1971, and we have seen it in two throne speeches since, March 1972 and January 1973. The government promised to establish agricultural equipment banks in several areas of the Province and nothing has been done, Sir.

In the March 1972 Throne Speech the government said they would introduce legislation to bring vacant arable land into active and productive use. Nothing has been done.

In the January 1974 Throne Speech the government said it would introduce legislation on land control. It will articulate a land use



policy. Again, Sir, nothing has been done. In October 1971 the Premier made a speech in which he said that the Tory Government would set up an agricultural board of farmers to set long term objectives and plans with the government. Again nothing has been done. In that same election campaign, October 1971, a statement by the Tories that they planned strategically located experimental farms. Again, Sir, nothing has been done, n-o-t-h-i-n-g, nothing.

Industrial Development. Here is a sad tale of incompetence and the desire to do nothing. A 1974 October press conference, the Premier said that work towards the start up of a huge cement plant, here we come again Your Honour, on the Port Au Port Peninsula is progressing favourably, and they began to queue up, Sir, in Aguathuna and in Port au Port East and in Berry Head and in Ship Cove and in Lourdes and every community around the people began to queue up, Sir, waiting to go to work. Nothing has happened.

In January 1975 the Premier had two foreign firms examining the possibility of constructing huge offshore concrete platforms. They are still examining it. They are liable to go on for a long time yet and now the North Star Cement Plant is closed, I am told, for a couple of weeks. In October 1974 in their press conference the Premier said that many industries have expressed great interest in using some of the Gull Island power in Newfoundland. Negotiations are going on. The Premier feels most of them will become a reality. And a year and a half later, Sir, nothing has happened.

In November 1973 during the Hermitage by-election campaign the Premier said there was a very definite possibility that an aluminum industry or something similar will be attracted to Newfoundland by the trigger power, whatever that may be, from the Lower Churchill and of course he said it would be in Bay D'Espoir. The people in Bay D'Espoir did not believe it, Sir, they gave the Premier a jolt, but not the kind he wanted.

The Junior Member for Harbour Main in September 1973 said that a proposed \$10 million to \$14 million venture creating 350 to 400 jobs would see a birch veneer and particle board plant established in the Province. In that same month, September 1973, the Premier said that there is a very real reason to believe that there will be substantial developments in the hardwood industry in the near future. Two years have come and gone, Sir, and nothing has happened.

Manpower and Industrial Relations Department, the one in which the government have been most cruel in their deception. In a January 1974 speech the Premier said that the study and the implementation of the recommendations of the report of the Royal Commission into Illegal Work Stoppages would improve wildcat strike situations. The Throne Speech of 1974 said that legislation would be introduced regarding this. Nothing has been done, Sir. Nothing has been done except the odd attack by political friends of the Premier on the labour movement in this Province.

In 1972 in March the government said, the Throne Speech said that the government would repeal the Trade Unions Act and introduce legislation relating to the registration of Trade Unions. There is a bill on the Order Paper now which may or may not achieve that purpose, three years later.

The January 1973 Throne Speech, the government plans to implement several aspects of the Cohen report. One year later the Throne Speech said that the government are still studying the Cohen report. "After due consideration legislation will be brought before you." The Throne Speech also stated that the government should have legislation before the House in 1974 consolidating labour standards legislation. Again, Sir, nothing has been done. We are now told that the bill may come before the House. It is on the Order Paper. It is getting closer and closer and so is Armageddon.

In an October 1971 campaign statement, reiterated in the March 1972 Throne Speech, the Premier said, the Tories would set up an Industrial Relations Council to advise the government on Manpower policy.

Nothing has been done. The Minister of Education and the Premier announced a great international conference on illegal work stoppages. Nothing has been done.

Mineral processing: In the election of 1971 the Premier said, the Tories would encourage mining companies to refine and to re-process ore within the Province to create new jobs for people. Nothing has been done.

MR. MOORES: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier wants to say something? Oh, I will send the Premier a copy if he wants.

MR. MOORES: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: This is the mineral processing, the campaign speech in 1971. The Premier said the Tories would encourage marketing companies to refine and to re-process ore within the Province to create new jobs for people. Nothing has been done, not a thing.

The offshore exploration regulations: We were told in 1971 in the March speech that regulations were going to be issued to govern the activities of groups involved in offshore exploration. They have not appeared.

New concepts of local government: The January 1973 Throne Speech said that the Tories had laid the groundwork and the framework for "a whole new concept in local government." It has not been heard of since, Sir. But where the report is now, we are now told it is buried somewhere down in the Department of Municipal Affairs. If it ever survives, Sir, there is no sign of it, we would like to see it. There is no reason why it should not be made public. This government used to talk about making documents public. The Throne Speech again of 1973 stated that the government requested reports to be submitted by the Fall 1973 from all of the following: The St. John's Urban Region study, we have it; The Study of the Town of Stephenville-Harmon Complex, I do not believe it has been made public but the amalgamation has gone ahead; the Grand Falls-Windsor

study, no sign of that, Sir; the Royal Commission on Municipal Governments, it may have reported, Sir, but the report has not been made available to the public of the Province.

Now some of the matters falling within the Provincial Affairs and Environment Department. In 1971 in a campaign statement the Premier said that the Tories would investigate setting up a no-fault insurance scheme thereby reducing auto insurance premiums. The Premier said the Tories would also investigate the high cost of auto insurance. This morning we hear on our radios that the insurance industry is putting up the rate for car insurance another fifteen per cent this year. There is still no sign of any no-fault insurance or even compulsory insurance. The Minister of Justice, contradicted by his own officials, says that the matter is still under study. His officials say that something is about to happen. I suspect the latter is correct, Sir, because I suspect we are getting closer to an election.

We are told in the January 1973 Throne Speech the government were going to designate a Senior Citizens Day for the Province. Again Sir, nothing has happened.

MR. NEARY: By the look of that crowd over there there will be no Senior Citizens Day.

MR. ROBERTS: Let us look at Rural Development now. There is no legislation in this making it a holiday in this Province, a statutory holiday. We have everything else as a statutory holiday.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The Honourable gentleman from Bonavista South has said something?

MR. MORGAN: We all all sorts of days last year.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course, we had all sorts of days. We had Remember Hermitage Day. We had -

MR. MORGAN: Senior Citizens Day.

MR. ROBERTS: We had Senior Citizens Day? We did not have a statute or a proclamation making it a statutory holiday. The Premier is making notes, good. Maybe he will even speak. That might be better.

MR. MOORES: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: In October 1971 in a campaign speech the Premier said that the Tories would establish a Young Newfoundland Service Corps to give service to Newfoundland community life, similar to Pioneer College.

MR. MOORES: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. Yes. If they are turning into the Tory plot they seem to be, yes, but the fact remains, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that nothing has been done to implement that promise, nothing.

Tourism, ah ha, Tourism, ah ha, the minister is here, let him listen. The April 1972 Throne Speech, that is not the March one, that is the April one, said that the government would embark upon a master tourism and outdoor recreation plan for the Province, determining demand estimates between 1980 and 2000. That was 1972 and this is 1975. We have had four throne speeches come and go. We have had about seven ministers come and go. We still do not have any master plan. Maybe that is what Mr. Joe Browne is doing now for all the money he is getting. Maybe that is what he is doing.

MR. HICKEY: Maybe Don Jamieson -

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman is blaming Mr. Jamieson now. Well let him blame **whomever he wants**. The truth is the honourable gentleman is the minister and if he cannot do the job let him get out and let the Premier get somebody else in there. We will get the plan I guess about 1981.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Ah that is it, there was an election. Now we are getting close to the honourable gentleman's motivations.

MR. HICKEY: - we were elected to govern.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman was elected to govern. That is the problem. If only he would govern, Sir, instead of trying to help his friends. The March 1972 Throne Speech promised a government programme of assistance -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

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

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, Sir, I was not aware -

MR. HICKEY: I would like the honourable gentleman to retract that statement. I have taken about as much as I am going to take from him. I do not help my friends. If he wants to call for an enquiry in anything that I have done, in any department since I have been here and any department I have served in, let him. But he does not have guts enough. Why does he not make a charge and be done with it?

MR. ROBERTS: May I speak to the point of order, Sir? Thank you. I accept the honourable gentleman's word that he has taken as much as he can and I have no quarrel with that, Sir. I do not propose to withdraw or retract any statement unless Your Honour tells me to do it. I submit there is nothing out of order in what I have said. I say the honourable gentleman helps his friends. They may be few in number but he does help them.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! While this is a question of some difficulty to resolve, it had to be elaborated on by the honourable the member, the Leader of the Opposition, before a ruling of substance can be made. At this point I would suggest that it may be a questionable phrase but it is probably parliamentary. If honourable members wish to debate it further, I am prepared to hear it, at this point I am not prepared to rule it out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am told I have only a few minutes left. I could go on with this sorry tale of incompetence. I could talk about the Premier's promises to - what about the one in the October 1971 campaign speech to end political patronage. That was a dandy. Ambrose Peddle represents an end to political patronage. What about the one to have a smaller Cabinet? What about the one to have regional development plans? You know on and on and on -

MR. MOORES: What about those?

MR. ROBERTS: What about them? More broken promises, In an October 1971 campaign speech the Premier said the would reduce the size of the Cabinet.

MR. MOORES: Now has it not been done?

MR. ROBERTS: Not by the Premier's choice. It may have been reduced by ministers leaving, getting out, but not reduced by choice, no. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I could go on but unfortunately I have used pretty well the time allotted to me. Let me say simply that if ever a motion was well founded, this amendment is. This government, Sir, have not done those things which they ought to have done. They have not brought in any positive programmes to improve life in this Province. What have they done in Labrador? All the talk there was! Nothing has been done. Nothing. They will not even go to conferences. They will not even listen to the people. What has been done to create employment? Nothing. Oh sure a few executive assistants, the Premier's brother-in-law and Ambrose Peddle have got nice jobs. But what else?

Where are the programmes to create work? The Premier thinks I am being personal. I am not. I do not mean to be, nor am I.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: My brother-in-law does not work for the government.

MR. ROBERTS: Pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

I have yet to hear from the clerk, but I believe it does indicate that the honourable member has spoken for fifteen minutes since three o'clock -

MR. ROBERTS: May I just draw to a close, Sir? Well, Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the Premier I have no intention nor desire of being personal. If I have been in his eyes personal, I regret that. I have nothing against - but the point I am making, Mr. Speaker -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He is not throwing around dirt?

MR. ROBERTS: The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that this government have yet to create any significant new number of jobs for anybody in this Province. They have yet to bring in any programmes that will benefit the people of this Province. If ever a government deserved to be censured with the words that they regret the failure<sup>1</sup> to do those things which they ought to have done, and they have done those things that they ought not to have done, and there is no health in us," Sir, this government did. I intend to vote for the amendment, and I ask honourable gentlemen to do the same.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Tourism, I think, has already spoken, and he is rising on a point of order or something. The honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: A point of privilege of the House, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, you have spoken on the amendment. Speak on the main motion.

MR. ROBERTS: Put the motion then.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yes -

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, I am sorry, those - no, the honourable minister has not spoken to the amendment. He has just spoken to the main motion.



AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He has not spoken to the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I listened this morning to the Leader of the Opposition. Since I have sat on this side of the House I have tried to appreciate the role of the Opposition having spent five years on that side. One can take with a grain of salt a great deal that comes from the other side. But, I have heard, Sir, a fair number of speeches in my time from Leaders of the Opposition, from members of the Opposition. I have made a number myself while I was over there, inexperienced, having not had the opportunity to be in politics before I was in the Opposition. I know from time to time it must have been difficult to see someone find their legs so to speak as a new member of the House and particularly a member of the Opposition who is required to get on his feet so many times during a sitting.

But, I think, Mr. Speaker, the classic speech of all, the two classic speeches of all have been the budget debate and the speech that the honourable gentleman has just concluded. I think it will go down in history, Mr. Speaker, as probably the worst speech that has ever been made by a Leader of the Opposition. His performance in both areas has indeed disgraced those who have preceded him.

As I stated, not having had the opportunity to do so in the House, as I have stated outside the House, with a budget in excess of \$1 billion and in concluding the debate the Leader of the Opposition could find nothing more to talk about than a proposed world voyage of the Norma and Gladys. So, he went on. Not a mention, Mr. Speaker, of all the departments that he had let fly through without debate because of his poor management of debate on the estimates, some six or seven departments. Not a word, not a syllable. But, no, the Norma and Gladys, something he had uncovered. As I said earlier, he laboured to bring forth a mountain and he brought forth a mouse and a pretty wee one at that. How bankrupt, Mr. Speaker, can anybody get, that with all that is going on in this Province, with the progress that is taking place - indeed as the honourable Member for Bell Island so often, almost daily, rises and talks about unemployment, which is a real motherhood, if there is anything to gain votes, that is

the thing to talk about, unemployment, the cost of living, consumer protection. He picks them.

But, what did we hear from the Leader of the Opposition? The Norma and Gladys and a company by the name of Cabot Group 4 and a sly inference or innuendo that all was not well. An unsavory mess he called it, an unsavory mess, Mr. Speaker, to use his own phrases, that I had allowed to grow up under my feet. Well, let me inform the honourable gentleman it will never knock me down. There is no mess. There is nothing unsavory about it, no more than there is anything unsavory about anything that I have done since I have been in public life. I can bear inspection, Mr. Speaker, from the Leader of the Opposition or anyone else. I hope he can bear inspection to the same degree that I can.

I have sat here ad nauseam listening to the vile inferences and innuendos cast across this honourable House for the most part, Sir, by one person, the Leader of the Opposition. Funny thing about the nature of the beast, a very funny thing, how a number of honourable gentlemen can sit on that side of the House -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKEY: Beast.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You have said it all.

MR. HICKEY: - a number of honourable gentlemen can sit on that side of the House and no matter what the pressure and tension is, Mr. Speaker, no matter what the heat of debate, no matter what the subject or the issue, you will hear debate, you will see people get hot under the collar, you will see it all happen, but very, very seldom with the exception of a couple of incidents and a couple of honourable gentlemen will you see the kind of vile charge by inference and innuendo come from across from that side. That is what I mean, Mr. Speaker, by the nature of the beast. If it is not in you, it will not come out. If an honourable gentleman believes that someone is innocent until proven guilty, there will not be anything come out by inference and innuendo.

But, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, today as he did last week, but more specifically today, came into this House with one

thing in mind, with one motive, one and one only, Sir, to attempt to discredit me and my department and all of those who work for me and with me and discredit this project. He says, he was not prepared to say that I deliberately misled the House. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will say that he deliberately misled the House.

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

There was some ruling made some days ago over the word mislead. At that point in time the word mislead was constituted as certainly unparliamentary. To accuse another member of deliberately misleading the House is certainly unparliamentary. I will have to ask the honourable Minister of Tourism to withdraw that phrase.

MR. HICKEY: I have no hesitation in retracting anything, Mr. Speaker, which is unparliamentary.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. HICKEY: The honourable gentleman then must have failed to provide some additional information that he had in his possession.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no.

MR. HICKEY: Or if he did not, I find it extremely strange to say the least. For how he could take figures, Mr. Speaker, and show to this honourable House that this Province was paying for such a large percentage of the cost of the Norma and Gladys be it the purchase, the restoring of it or indeed the proposed voyage around the world, I will never know. Mr. Speaker, I gave certain figures to the press at a press conference some time ago. I made the statement outside this House as I made within this chamber that the federal government in the restoration and purchase in total paid for more than three times, three to one in dollars, the purchase and restoration. In fact it paid the total amount for the purchase of \$18,000. As of this date, Your Honour, that figure is unchanged. More than three to one is paid for by the federal government contrary

to what the Leader of the Opposition says today.

MR. NEARY: Could the minister -

MR. HICKEY: The minister is giving you the facts now so listen. The honourable gentleman - the figures were given before. They are as old as time. \$165,738 was the total spent up to that particular time and out of that, \$43,968, I am sorry, \$56,968. That was up to that time. Mr. Speaker, it is still on the basis of three to one. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned the figure of \$80,000 for the world voyage as given by the External Affairs Department and he said that that was the federal contribution. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, if he got that information must have gotten something additional about all of the other areas where the Federal Government is footing the bill. Did people in External Affairs only give him that? I find that very strange. Did they not say anything about the other things that are involved, Sir?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No.

MR. HICKEY: No, they did not. Well, the Leader of the Opposition Party did not ask either. He was too delighted with the information he got, was he?

MR. ROBERTS: The facts.

MR. HICKEY: Did not the Department of External Affairs say anything at all, Mr. Speaker, about agency fees, wharfage fees, canal fees, harbour fees, pilot fees for which the Federal Government is paying the total.

MR. ROBERTS: \$80,000 for all that?

MR. HICKEY: Another thirty, another thirty thousand -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: The honourable gentleman spoke in silence this morning while I was meeting with the Director of Historical Resources who I might add is right here in the Chamber today listening to this in the event the honourable gentleman may assume or may suggest again that I am not giving the facts. Those are the facts that are given me by my staff, a very competent staff I might add. Did the honourable

gentleman not have that information?

MR. ROBERTS: No.

MR. HICKEY: If he did not have it, why did he not ask for it? Why did he not give all the facts?

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: There is some \$30,000, Mr. Speaker, in just one area alone that the Federal Government is picking up the tab for, a \$30,000 contingency fund.

MR. ROBERTS: For which department?

MR. HICKEY: A \$30,000 contingency fund for which the External Affairs Department, Mr. Speaker, will pay fifty/fifty for whatever expenses which are unforeseen at this point in time, which might go over that.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Table the first ones.

MR. HICKEY: I am not tabling anything. If the honourable gentleman wishes to believe it, he may. If he does not wish to believe he does not have to.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: The honourable gentleman should realize that all of the people, in fact very few of the people in this Province have a mind like he has.

MR. ROBERTS: \$80,000 from Ottawa; \$214,000 from the Province.

MR. HICKEY: An absolute untruth.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman may not believe the statement. That is a matter for him. He may not feel they are correct. That is a matter for him. But he has no right, as I understand the rules of this House to say that a statement is untrue. I say, Mr. Speaker, that out of the estimated cost of \$294,000 the Government of Canada say they will provide \$80,000 and perhaps a portion of receptions and so forth because that matter has not been settled. So, if the minister is going to go around debating, let him debate but let him

not break the rules by saying statements are untrue.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The rule as regards to that particular remark, one is not allowed to accuse another honourable member of lying or use the word lie. However, using the word untrue, I think has generally been accepted.

MR. HICKEY: All right, Mr. Speaker, incorrect. How is that? Will that suit the honourable gentleman? The honourable gentleman can stand in his place though and he can infer that I make untruthful statements but that is all right. That is him. He should wet his throat and he might find this hard to swallow. But no matter how hard he finds it to swallow, Mr. Speaker, the facts remain and that is that what he stated here this morning is totally incorrect.

MR. ROBERTS: Table the evidence.

MR. HICKEY: I do not have to table anything. If you want to question my honour go ahead and do so.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: We are asking you to produce the evidence.

MR. HICKEY: Yes. So what! For what? So that I can convince the honourable gentleman. I do not hope to live long enough to convince him of anything.

MR. NEARY: Some of your colleagues -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Do not have to worry about my colleagues. Mr. Speaker, what possesses or what motivates the honourable gentleman for zeroing in on this project, I will never know. The record of the former administration in allowing the heritage of this Province to go unrecognized, unreserved, Mr. Speaker, will go down in history and they will be judged in due course because the list is a mile long of all of the things that they let fall by the wayside. But when this administration sees an opportunity to preserve part of that heritage they cannot wait, a couple of them, to get

on their feet and knock it. Then they are not happy, Sir, they are not happy until they involve personalities and by inference and innuendo make all kinds of wild charges. But, Mr. Speaker, let them. The record will show in due course. I am prepared to wait until this project is finished and then let the honourable gentleman judge whether it was a good one or a bad one. I cannot repeat, Mr. Speaker, often enough that no chances are taken with this project. We do not intend to take any chances. But we are not prepared to scrap it, Sir, because the Leader of the Opposition does not like it or the Member for Bell Island does not like it or two or three others. If somebody comes along, Your Honour, with evidence, good solid evidence as to why that vessel should not sail then she will not sail. But until such time as that evidence is available then there is no change in my decision.

The honourable gentleman can say all he wishes my pride is hurt. My pride is not hurt one iota. I will the first and I will be delighted to use my authority to cancel the voyage if in fact I have the slightest indication or any doubt in my mind as to the safety of the vessel or indeed the crew.

The Leader of the Opposition touched very vaguely, Mr. Speaker, on the involvement and participation of the External Affairs Department by means of receptions. But he did not go into any detail. He did not tell the House, for example, that they would pick up the full tab of whatever receptions, arrangements and everything else that is done. He did not inform the House seeing he was so anxious to investigate this project to bring forth this great thing that he had uncovered.

MR. NEARY: He said that had not been worked out yet.

MR. PICKEY: Oh! It had not been worked out, eh! Well, it is too bad. His source of information is not very good as been demonstrated here today because it is worked out. They could see fit, Mr. Speaker, to hire a project officer, a full time job, to do nothing else but to deal with this project and to make all those arrangements. Nothing at all about that. Then, Mr. Speaker, he gets on to what has become the old whipping boy of later, Cabot Group 4. Again,

May 5, 1975.

Tape 2042

RR - 5

because - I am not sure here what motivates the honourable gentleman no more than I am sure of what motivated the Member for Bell Island in thinking that they were on to something. For, Mr. Speaker, they are on to nothing. I have no control over companies that are set up. I have no authority and no right to question who is involved in any company unless I am suspicious. Why should I be suspicious of everyone who comes in to do business with my department, most of whom I never see.



MR. HICKEY: There was a reference made that a Mr. Browne was a friend of mine, shared my apartment for a couple of weeks. Does the honourable gentleman want me to unfold all of this to the House? If it is, it is true. He is a friend of mine. Lo and behold I took him in two weeks while he was waiting for an apartment. What does that say, Mr. Speaker? Does that say anything wrong? Is there anything wrong with that? Am I answerable now to the Leader of the Opposition, whether I be friendly with someone or not? Am I to check with him to determine whether I should maintain friendship with someone because they do business with the government or has he got a bad mind? Or is his mind working overtime? I suggest, Sir, the latter is true.

He was not satisfied to leave it at that. Apart from the disgraceful performance of what he suggested with regards to one press conference that that company was involved in, he walked on very thin ice and he said there was a road map that was being done by Cabot Group 4, and there were brochures being done by Cabot Group 4. And the obvious inference no public tendering, well well. Is that so now, Mr. Speaker? Let me state for the record of the House that that is not so, that there were public tenders called, that the printing is done locally with one exception, a road map and I stand here, Mr. Speaker, and will defend my decision to award the contract for the road map - \$17,000 worth of reasons.

MR. NEARY: Who got the contract for it?

MR. HICKEY: None of your business! Dig like you have been digging for everything else,

MR. NEARY: This is the taxpayers business. Who got the contract?

AN HON. MEMBER: Tommy Toe.

MR. HICKEY: The Leader of the Opposition said so this morning.

AN HON. MEMBER: Was he right?

MR. HICKEY: Cabot Group 4.

MR. NEARY: Was the Leader of the Opposition correct? Cabot Group 4 has the contract.

MR. HICKEY: Not without public tendering, and not without being the lowest tender, not without a differential of \$17,000. Does the honourable gentleman

who is so conscious of the taxpayers suggest I award a tender to somebody who is \$17,000 higher. Is that what he is talking about?

MR. NEARY: Put it on the table.

MR. HICKEY: I will put nothing on the table except the honourable gentleman if he keeps shooting his mouth off maybe. Put it on the table, that is all I can hear Your Honour is put it on the table. Those gentlemen over here are suffering from some kind of ailment, they are preoccupied with put it on the table. There is no such thing anymore of taking somebody's word. There is no such thing anymore, even when a charge by inference is made, that someone is innocent until proven guilty. No, you are guilty and you are going to be guilty, Your Honour, until you produce it and put it on the table and then we will believe you.

Well let me tell the honourable gentleman from Bell Island something -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. HICKEY: Let him, as the old people used to say, wished his tongue and listen until I tell him something. I could not give two hoots, Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Bell Island, or anyone else who sits there, believes a word I say. It could not matter less. If it could, or if it would, or if it did, I might as well have left the Chamber long ago.

MR. NEARY: It is public information, it is not only for our benefit.

MR. HICKEY: I have just given it. I have just made it public. And I have just said what the situation is. Now if the honourable gentleman does not like that, then let him get up and make a charge.

MR. NEARY: I want to know who got the contract?

MR. HICKEY: I have already said so.

MR. NEARY: Cabot Group 4.

MR. HICKEY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, he also talked - Mr. Speaker, you know if I were on the Opposition side, and if I did not have the control that I have managed to acquire with my five years having sat over there, and now finding myself

in an altogether different situation sitting on the government side.

MR. NEARY: It is better over here.

MR. HICKEY: I would have gone across that floor this morning -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKEY: I would have gone across that floor this morning and I would have made a complete exhibition of myself, because I would have taken the Leader of the Opposition, as sometimes I would like to, and make small pieces of him. Because I do not mind Your Honour -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. HICKEY: I do not mind Your Honour having someone question me. I do not mind that. I occupy a public office which is subject and which warrants questioning, all of us, the fact that we are in public life.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. HICKEY: But, Mr. Speaker, when someone connives, when someone makes up, when someone dreams up, as if they cannot unfold through investigation, enough issues, when someone dreams up yet another one, a survey or study of hotel, motel accommodation -

AN HON. MEMBER: Not true is it?

MR. HICKEY: No, not true, no such animal as a contract to Cabot Group 4.

MR. NEARY: He is batting 500.

MR. HICKEY: He is batting 500? He is batting zero! And he will be batting minus zero when the election rolls around because if the honourable gentleman thinks that his stature is increasing in the eyes of the people of this Province I have got some news for him. If the Member for Bell Island would not be so personal and would get away from this personal trait and personal attack that he always involves himself in, he would be head and shoulders over the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition would not be worth two pennies.

MR. NEARY: Wait until the survey is done.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. HICKEY: But he too suffers from one of the ailments that the Leader of the Opposition suffers from, a constant, constant personal attack, or a questioning which suggests wrong-doing, preoccupied, Mr. Speaker, with something unsavoury or wrong, something corrupt. They are preoccupied

with it. I do not hear the other honourable gentlemen on the other side engage in this kind of thing, just two gentlemen, and to be fair about the whole thing, I suggest if I were to place the two gentlemen I would have to say that the Leader of the Opposition has the worst mind of the two, himself and the Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: I declare a peace.

MR. HICKEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, every now and then the gentleman from Bell Island says something good about me and I shiver, so now he is on the receiving end of one and he knows what it is like.

Anyway, Sir, my purpose today is not to engage in a political or personal attack on the Leader of the Opposition, simply to clarify the situation. If there is anything I want, Mr. Speaker, if there is anything and the one and only thing I am desirous of, I do not think any honourable gentleman who sits in this House should have to sit here day after day and be subject to the kind of attack that we have witnessed this morning.

This House would do well, as I said earlier so many times, to change the rules of immunity, that an honourable gentleman may think and think well before they speak, before they cast reflection on another honourable member.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I can only say that I can bear inspection anytime the honourable gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition, wishes to start or to increase his investigation practice as he has already started, it would seem. I say to him, he can investigate me, my father, my grandfather, and my great-great-grandfather, and while he is at it, let him investigate himself as well. I will say to him that I have no worry about how I will stand up, none. I can only carry out my duty in an honest fashion, which I have done. I make no apologies, Mr. Speaker, for any decision I have taken, none, not one iota, and if and when the time comes, as I have said before, if there is a final decision to be made with regards to this voyage and if somebody indicates by some reasonable evidence that it is unsafe for that vessel to go, it will not go. I do

May 5, 1975

Tape No. 2043

NM - 5

not know what more anyone could say than that and the only other thing I would say to the Leader of the Opposition, if he finds this project so distasteful, then I say as a prominent editorial writer said a little while ago, it is too bad it is sour grapes after twenty-three years of doing nothing by the former administration.

6064

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the amendment, "Aye". Those against the amendment, "Nay". The amendment is defeated.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Divide.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

DIVISION:

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Those in favour of the amendment please stand. The honourable the Leader of the Opposition; Mr. Gillett; Capt. Winsor; Mr. Neary; Mr. Rowe; Mr. Simmons; and Mr. Martin.

Those against the amendment please stand. The honourable the Premier; the honourable the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations; the honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications; the honourable the Minister of Justice; the honourable the Minister of Industrial Development; the honourable the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture; the honourable the Minister of Tourism; Mr. Carter; Mr. Wilson; Mr. Marshall; Mr. Evans; Mr. Young; and Mr. Howard; Mr. Stagg.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is defeated.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, before we move on to the Address in Reply may I, with the Leader of the House, table the report of the committee appointed pursuant to Standing Order 84 (a) to prepare and report a list of members to compose the standing committees of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable the Minister of Justice have leave to table this report? Does he have leave?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, for our part we are willing to give leave, but I do want it confirmed, you know, openly, that - the report has now been tabled - but before it can be acted upon, that a motion will be made, a debatable motion that can be debated and the House will decide because I, for one, wish to debate the report, Sir. I was a member of the committee but I certainly do not agree with everything in the report.

MR. SPEAKER: That is correct, that the motion when made is certainly a debatable motion.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The minister has leave.

MR. HICKMAN: I table the report of the committee, and there is no question that the committee is debatable. The honourable the Leader of the Opposition asked me to state when tabling it that he did not vote for all of the members on the Public Accounts Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, the honourable member in the Address in Reply.

The honourable Member for Labrador South.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, when I sat down to compose my notes on this year's Address in Reply, it occurred to me that I had already done so last year. So, rather than take up the time of the Assembly by repeating what I said then, may I just say that for the record my reply to this year's Throne Speech is the same as it was last year and the year before. So, we may just enter ditto.

The amendment just debated concerning the government's action programme said that they have done those things which they ought not to have done and have left undone those things which they ought to have done. Well, maybe so. But, we must try to exercise some kind of Christian charity in the House. I would say, Sir, "Forgive them, for they know not what they do." That is the impression that I would get. Blind, Sir, blind to the real causes of what we are trying to fight here, blind to the real causes of what it is that we are trying to get down to the bottom of. Trying, I have no doubt that they are trying. Sometimes they are very trying.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear! Hear! Hear!

MR. MARTIN: But, I would not be so uncharitable as to say that they have not done anything, or they have left undone all those things. Many of them, yes, but they are trying. So, we will give them credit for that.

I have not come here today to berate the government. What is the use? Who cares, after all, how much we berate the government? It is lost on the public. It is lost on the media. But, after all what is an Opposition for if not to berate the government? In this House, Sir, one gets the feeling that we are all tarred with the same brush no matter what we say. As far as the public is concerned we are all the same grasping and self-seeking political parasites with one purpose in life, to make a continuous appeal to the lowest common denominator of the gullible public so that we may get voted back into office again and again and again. It matters not what we say, whether it be garbage, half-truths, sly insinuations, statements of glowing fact or shameful exposes, whatever the member intends, whatever his motives, it is all interpreted the same way. To the media it is fodder. To the public it is the gospel according to his own individual interpretation. Fact,

fancy, fabrication, everything emanating from the same honey bucket has got to smell the same. So, what is the point in getting up and saying it all over again and again and again.

I could go on at great length about what has not been done for my district. I have said it all before. The record stands. It is still not done. I could go on and say what should be done, but then I have told all of the ministers in the privacy of their own offices what I think should be done. The record stands. By and large it has not been done. Now, I know that there are some sincere efforts under way. I am not saying that nothing has been attempted. All I am saying, Sir, is that the record speaks for itself. Three years later we are still practically in the same boat. Lord, help us! "They know not what they do." But they are trying.

Today, Sir, I have but one purpose, to stand in my place in the legislature, and unhappily it will be my last opportunity to stand in my place in the legislature. For after this part of a session I will be resigning my seat and I will not have the opportunity to speak to honourable members again. I am unhappy about, this not because I have to leave the House but because I have to leave the House under these circumstances. I would have preferred to stay until the end of my term. In fact, I had stated that I would. I said very early after my election that I would not stand for public office again because personally, as an individual, I am not suited for politics. I am not comfortable here and I am anxious to return to my career and get on with it before it is too late.

To paraphrase a quotation - I think the Premier is fond of this one - let each of us do what he can do best and let us get on to it and do it to the best of our ability. That, I hope, Sir, is what I am going to be able to do, because I believe that I can do better for myself, better for my community in my chosen profession as a journalist, than I can standing here day after day in the legislature and play-acting the part of a politician. I agreed to run for office in the first place because if I had not done so, four long years of hard work which a number of us had put into building a party organization was about to be wiped out.



Our former leader, the illustrious Mr. Burgess who most will remember, was about to throw the District of Labrador South to the Tories. God help us! I will tell you the story -

SOME HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARTIN: If it is not too embarrassing I will tell the story.

We could not find a candidate for Labrador South for the New Labrador Party, so Mr. Burgess informed me at the eleventh hour that he had the solution in hand. He was going to agree with the organizers of the Tory Party not to run in Labrador South and in return the Tories were not going to run in Labrador North. I think he was doing it probably for my own benefit, but it worked. I ran.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, there was a pattern in Mr. Burgess' behaviour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. MARTIN: However, I did agree to run and in campaigning I did, by inference, commit myself to staying for the whole term. I fully intended to do so, Sir, and only circumstances which were totally unforeseen then, have forced me to renege on that commitment. Ordinarily, if anybody were to ask me to divulge my own personal financial condition I would very swiftly tell them where to go. But I am at this moment a public figure. I do occupy a position of public trust and it is because of my financial conditions that I am now forced to betray that trust. I would like to have it on record, Sir, the reasons why I have to go before my term of office is complete. As a member of the Provincial Legislature I owe it not only to my constituents, I think, but probably to the whole public.

I owe it to them to let them know by what means a Member of the House of Assembly runs himself into personal bankruptcy. Here, then is the reason why I must resign my seat. Stated quite simply, my income from my sessional pay cannot cover my debts. The immediate reaction to this might be that I must be some kind of a fool to have allowed myself to get into that kind of a bind. In fact it has already been stated so on public radio by some of the experts on the St. John's open line shows and perhaps they are justified in thinking so.

Let me put the record straight, my sessional pay is \$8,000, paid twice annually for a total of \$8,000. It is not \$12,000. Some honourable members might like to phrase it that way because it sounds better. I get paid \$8,000 in sessional pay, \$4,000 in tax-free expense account. Now as far as I am concerned, Sir, a tax-free expense account is precisely that, an expense account, and if I am getting \$12,000 then so be it. But I am not.

I do not think that I am the only member in this Assembly who is in financial trouble. Any member who has to live on that pay and represent a rural riding, a rural district, cannot possibly do it on that pay.

The ordinary running bills in trying to travel and represent my district in the course of a twelve month period in the first year came to approximately \$5,200. I have the alternative of taking \$1,200 out of my sessional pay or running up debts. I chose to do the latter. Well then, why did I not see it coming before I got in? In the first place I was making quite a comfortable living as a freelancer, not making any fortune, but I was making it. If I had not had to increase my debt load I would have been able to keep afloat with my sessional pay and hopefully with the odd bit of outside income to supplement it.

Several things conspired, Sir, to make that impossible. First of all it was impossible to foresee that I would have to go one whole year without any income whatsoever. Who could have foreseen those incredible political events of 1971-72 when we had two general elections and I had personally in Labrador South to run a by-election! I had to run three election campaigns within a period of eleven months. Not only was I not earning any income during this period, but to keep my family fed, clothed and sheltered, I had to go and refinance my debts, higher mortgage, another bank loan. Eventually it got down to borrowing from every personal friend I could put a touch on. There was no way at the start that I could have foreseen that. Had I been able to foresee that, there was no way that I would have got into politics, no way that

I could have got into politics.

Had I not had to borrow, had I not had a year with no income, if I had not had to finance three election campaigns largely by my own devices, if I had been able to depend upon extra allowances from the House as some honourable members can by being appointed as assistants or some other remunerable function, if I had been able to depend upon some financial assistance from my party, things would have worked out differently. A lot of ifs, Sir, a lot of ifs, but if circumstances had been different I would have had a better chance.

Even when it came to earning a supplementary income, I found that producers and publishers, the very people whom a journalist must depend upon for his bread and butter, were extremely shy of dealing with anybody who is a practicing politician, and rightly so. Politics and journalism, responsible, ethical journalism, is incompatible except in the very rare cases. Therefore, I had to contend with an income that had dropped by approximately one half and a debt load which had quadrupled. That is mathematical.

I must say that I have made a sincere effort to stay until the calling of the election. But when this last sessional pay failed to cover even my bank draft, the decision was no longer mine. It was left with my bank manager. I was faced with two alternatives, personal bankruptcy or a better paying job. To declare bankruptcy would have proven nothing since I would have had to resign my seat in any case. Now if I were a doctor or a lawyer or an insurance salesman or practically any other professional person or in practically any other occupation, I think I would have been able to earn enough to help me along. But it is not right, Sir, it is not right, regardless of the man or regardless of the party, that a member elected to a provincial legislature should have to depend for his survival upon bits and pieces and scraps that he can earn from outside. If we are going to attract good people to this Assembly then we must be prepared to compete in the job markets, in industry and business. Otherwise we are going to have all of the trouble that is associated with running the system the way it is running now. There is no need for me to elaborate.

Honourable members know what I am talking about.

So it gets to the point where I have to go. But I would like to point out in passing one inconsistency. This problem is not a new one, and it was one of the many anomalies connected with Labrador that was pointed out by the Royal Commission on Labrador. One of their recommendation was this, that in order to cover the extra expenses incurred in trying to properly represent their districts, that Labrador M.H.A.'s be given extra allowances. I pointed this out to the Premier and his Cabinet and asked that this particular recommendation be implemented for all M.H.A.'s. I was not asking for special favours. The answer I received was in the negative.

I would like to reflect for just a moment on what has happened in Labrador over the last three years. Many will say that my leaving the Legislature is of not great consequence since I have not achieved anything for my district anyway. There may be a lot of truth in that.

I cannot point at anything in Labrador South and say, I got you that, or this was done while I was a member, we did this for you. Very little in Labrador South has changed materially in the last three years. But there are certain accomplishments which I do claim and I may be the only person in the whole world who can point with any degree of certainty and pride in achievement in this respect, because it is the kind of thing with which one must have been very, very closely concerned and connected in every way possible, to be able to look back three years later upon what has transpired in a district like Labrador South, and I think all over Labrador generally, and to detect any kind of change one must have the facility to be able to look back and compare it to what it was. It is not easy to do that unless you were very closely connected with the situation beforehand. It is very easy to forget.

If no one else I can satisfy myself that something has been done.

When I came into the Assembly, when I was elected I was offered two choices, I could either play the same political game as the traditional one, and try to do those things for my district to satisfy the greatest number of people to ensure me the greatest number of votes the next time so that I would be elected again; or I could tackle what I conceived of being the base, root problems, not the on-the-surface, not the short ranged problems, but the root causes of those problems. I could not do both because there was not the time. It was not humanly possible. So I made a decision at that very early point not to run again, and in freeing myself from the necessity of having to go and earn votes the next time left me open to pursue those long range problems, ones of attitude, ones of time and distance. And it is in that area that I claim achievement.

There are a number of notable things that stand out, such as the Royal Commission on Labrador. Now we do not take full credit for having had that Commission established, but we do take credit for having put on the necessary pressure to make it necessary for the government to have a Royal Commission. And then to have put on the necessary pressure to have that Royal Commission study tabled in the House. We do claim certain credits for that. So you might say, okay, we have got a Royal Commission study. A big deal. Nothing has been done on it anyway. That is largely true. But the one real value in that Labrador Royal Commission Report is that it takes forever out of the hands, out of the realm of politics, all of those problems that we have been crying about for so many years, and getting shoved off saying that you are making politics or you are trying to gain points or something else.

I had been called by honourable ministers, maybe not a liar but something coming very close to it, because it was so easy to deny to the public that these conditions actually existed in Labrador. Well, now it is official, Sir, now it is in the report of one of Her Majesty's Commissioners and never again will we have to worry about trying to convince government that this is the case. This is the case and it is official, and we take some credit for having done that.

The first problem we had to contend with was one of communications, not telecommunications, every day ordinary communications between groups

and communities. I thought that one of the ways to achieve better communications was to try to promote organization on the coast in any way possible. As a consequence, and I am not taking full credit - when I say 'we', I mean the party and those who have worked with us. We have promoted and assisted to organize various agencies and organizations, committees, everything ranging from the Women's Institute to St. John Ambulance to local health boards, sports and recreation groups, resource advisory groups, community councils. Each in its own right perhaps not very significant, but collectively, totally, they add up to a continuous flow of information communication happening back and forth, something that was never there before. It took not just a little bit of arguing and not just a little bit of promotion to get that kind of thing working properly, and it is working properly now and for that we take credit.

We take credit, too, for having a better kind of understanding now existing between government and the Labrador communities, between the Newfoundland general public on the Island and those people who live in Labrador, between the two business communities operating in the two sections of the Province. It is impossible to describe the kind of conditions that existed, and because they no longer exist, it is impossible to have anything to point at in comparison, but things have changed. They have become better. There is better communication. There is better understanding. There is a more open forum. At least we are getting government members, government ministers to come down and visit us. At least they do not treat us with the same kind of contempt that we had to deal with under the Liberal Administration. Now maybe that is not much of an achievement, but it is an achievement, and we claim credit for it. We claim credit for tearing down that psychological block that said that it was impossible to do anything with government funds in Labrador. The infamous Red Bay Road is a case in point. I kept coming into the minister and his deputy for years trying to get a few hundred thousand dollars to repair a road, and they kept saying that it was impossible, because no matter how much money you put into it, it is never going to amount to anything. Well, we managed to shame them out of a couple of hundred thousand dollars. And the work they have done on that road

makes all the difference in the world. So we have proven that money is not wasted there.

MR. NEARY: Do they have guardrails around it yet?

MR. MARTIN: They still have not got around to putting guardrails around the cliffs because the road is still too narrow.

There is one thing more than anything else and if I have done nothing else by getting involved in politics and coming into the House of Assembly, if nothing else has been achieved, then I think this is all worth it, that we have brought the people of Labrador into the mainstream of politics. There will be no more political parachutists going into Labrador, I guarantee you! We have brought them politics like was never seen before and never again, regardless of party, regardless of member, will anybody in Labrador ever have the wool pulled over his eyes by some smart-talking politician from St. John's and that is fine. And I do not care how they vote as long as they know why they are voting.

I promised I would not say anything about the party today because I do not like bringing partisan politics into the House, but I should say one thing. There was an announcement a couple of days ago about an abortive executive meeting in Labrador West at which two people arrived, and a lot of people embarrassedly came up to me and tried to sympathize but I look upon this as again a kind of a record of progress. We are not a political party in the sense of traditional political parties. We were born out of a sense of frustration. We were born out of a pressure group, in fact. And shortly after my election I was asked by one of the news reporters, what is going to happen to the party and what do you expect to get out of government? And I stated at that time that if the government really wanted to kill the New Labrador Party there was one sure-fire way of doing it, and that was to give us all of the things that we were complaining about, and at that point we would have no more need to exist. And this is precisely what has happened in Labrador West.

I talked with some of our executive people, in fact the gentleman who was the right-hand man of Tom Burgess when he was leader, and he told me that they are reasonably satisfied. They are satisfied to the point where they do not think it is necessary to continue protest politics, and I wish to God I could declare to the world today that the

New Labrador Party was dead in all three districts because it would mean that finally we have arrived at par with the Island part of the Province. There are a number of ways the party could die, but in the West I am not at all sad that it happened that way.

I was sent here, Sir, to make a point. The point has been made. There is nothing else I can do. I have brought to the attention of government those problems that have to be dealt with. I know that they understand those problems. I am satisfied that the message has got through. Whether or not they can be forced to do something about it is entirely outside of my control. I can plead and beg and threat and all the rest of it, but if they choose not to act they will not. But I know they have the message. I have spent three years trying to get the message across.

I would like to be able to say, Sir, in closing, that I am proud of being a member of this Thirty-Sixth General Assembly, but I find nothing in particular to be proud of. This Assembly, the Thirty-Sixth, will not go down in history as being one of the more productive or more significant ones. It could have been perhaps with a little more good will and common sense. I would



like to be able to say that I have enjoyed my work here, but in all honesty I cannot. I have had many jobs to perform over the last twenty years. Few of them, very few of them have been so personally demeaning as this one has been, and I leave without any sense of loss whatsoever. I can honestly say that as a result of this work, being involved in politics and in the House, I have met a lot of very wonderful people whom I will be able to account as friends for the rest of my life and maybe that is the greatest accomplishment of all. It is reassuring to confirm now and then that the world is not totally and completely populated by bastards. It is reassuring to confirm that every once in a while there is going to come a morning when you will want to wake up singing. It is not all bad.

I wish to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and members of your staff for the courtesy and co-operation that you have afforded to me and through me to the people of Labrador South. I would also like to publicly express my gratitude to those honourable members to whom I have gone periodically for advice and assistance, and I would be remiss indeed, Sir, if I did not express my thanks to those members of the Civil Service who have been of so much help to me. Public opinion notwithstanding our Civil Service, with some notable exceptions, can be stacked against any in the country. On behalf of the people of Labrador, thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Is the House ready for the main motion?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we are the final motion on the Address in Reply. I do not propose to make a lengthy speech but I do want to mention a few things in connection with my constituency, the about to be abolished constituency of White Bay North. But before I say that I may observe I am surprised that no honourable gentlemen opposite has seen fit to enter into the debate. I can assume only one of two things, either that they are very anxious to get into the Ombudsman debate which

should be an interesting one. I hope honourable gentlemen opposite will state their positions, either that or they have nothing at all of any interest to state. It may be the latter.

Let me also say that I - well I was not in the Chamber of course, I listened with great interest through the magical P.A. system to what the honourable gentleman for Labrador South had to say and I think everybody in the House did. I regret his leaving the House, his decision to leave active elected public life. I can understand his decision, and I respect what he has done and the reasons for which he has done it. Nonetheless I do not accept his reasoning, and I think somehow it is a sad matter when a man who had sought election of the House and worked very hard, Sir, to become a member of the House eventually, very quickly, not just over a long time, but eventually decides that he cannot go on, the way to achieve things does not lie here in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I did want to mention a few things in White Bay North. I do not believe the purpose of the Throne Speech Debate is to deal exhaustively with one's district. Some members over the years have made it a practice on the Throne Speech Debate to list their district inevitably talking about the great historic district of blank -

MR. NEARY: The Santa Claus list.

MR. ROBERTS: - going on. As my friend from Bell Island says, the Santa Claus list. I do not intend to do that. I get ample opportunity to speak and to make my views known. But I did want to mention two or three types of projects in White Bay North which are of great concern to the people there, which are of great importance, and which affect the government of the Province.

It is relevant to the Throne Speech Debate under the rules of this House, but it is not terribly relevant to the Throne Speech, because, of course, Sir, the most notable thing about the Throne Speech itself is the complete absence of anything that will do very much for anybody anywhere in this

Province, and that includes White Bay North.

Now, Sir, I would like to touch upon the area of public services. These are the major concern at least insofar as the government are involved. Let me deal first since the Minister of Municipal Affairs is present in the House at this point with the Municipal Affairs needs. To give the minister his due I think he is fully familiar with the needs of many of the communities in White Bay North. He had the pleasure and the privilege of serving as a welfare officer in that area and came to know something of the geography of the area and of the community structure of the area, and of the needs of the people of the area. And I may add without any reservation and he has shown himself very sympathetic and very understanding when from time to time I have had the privilege of accepting - I am sorry, the accompanying of delegations that waited upon him. And also I find in talking with the councils in White Bay North - and almost every community in White Bay North now has a municipal structure of some sort - and finding that the minister is responsive. Now, Sir, to date his good intentions have not been accompanied by good deeds, but we are living in hope that when the governments finally make up their mind on how they are going to slice up the municipal capital works pie for this year there will be a fair share for White Bay North. I doubt if there is enough money available to do everything that needs to be done everywhere in the Province. Indeed I am quite sure that there is not enough money available. But out of the amount that is cut out, which I understand is of the order of \$20 million, I would hope that there will be a reasonable share available for the people of White Bay North.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the needs are there. They have a reasonable share of the needs. And I am particularly concerned with water and sewer systems or with water systems. In no particular order let me just outline briefly the needs of some of the individual communities in White Bay North. First of all the one that is probably most public, that is most in the news are the needs of the community of Main Brook. Main Brook, Sir, is a community of about 600 or 700

people, located on the Western end, the Western side of Hare Bay or Belvy Bay the older people call it, an interesting corruption of the French for hare which is lièvre, Belvy Bay. Obviously a name that has come down through history from the original French, not the French settlers, there was never any French settlement on the French Shore, but the French contact, the French presence of the French ships that came out in the Summer and late Spring when the ice went, and spent the Summer there, and in the Fall went back across to France.

MR. PECKFORD: There were some French dead settled there.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. PECKFORD: Some of their dead settled there.

MR. ROBERTS: Some of the -

MR. PECKFORD: Dead.

MR. ROBERTS: Danes?

MR. PECKFORD: Dead. Corpses -

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, yes I am sorry. The honourable gentleman has reminded me that in St. Anthony and in Goose Cove - not in St. Anthony, I am sorry, in Goose Cove and in Croque there are still some French graves. Up until recently every year or so a French frigate would visit and put a party ashore and would fix up the graves and make everything proper. That has not happened now for three or four years. Either the French have withdrawn from that portion of the North Atlantic or they no longer consider it important, but, you know -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inflation.

MR. ROBERTS: Well it may be inflation - it is still a -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: - it is still a bit of a sad thing to see the passing of what has been an old standing tradition. There are not many graves, four or five or six. And one of the graves, the most interesting one in Croque -

MR. PECKFORD: A young voyager.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes - is a young, just a young lad he is, but a midshipman on an English war ship. And I have been unable to find out from the records how came it that a young English sailor, a young midshipman, a young gentleman who was in training to become an officer at about the time of the Napoleonic Wars, 150 years ago now - how he met his death on the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well he may have drowned in the river, but what was he doing in the river? You know, what was he doing ashore? I just - there are no records that I can find. And it must be a tragic minute.

MR. PECKFORD: The story down there was that he drowned in the river when out salmon fishing.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the local story, but salmon fishing 150 years ago was a little much to take. I think the story has become overlaid with the fact that in the closing years of the last century and in the early years of this century when the Royal Navy would regularly make visits up and down, indeed not just up and down the French Shore but all around the coast of this Province they would inevitably put officers ashore, parties of officers would go ashore for the day and would have great sport on the rivers. There are any number of books referring to this, there are any number of records. The records, indeed one of the great sources of historical information in this Province are the reports which the captains of those Royal Naval vessels made. Very few of them have been published. I guess the first of them to be published was Chapel, Lieutenant Chapel who wrote a book in 1818

called the Voyage of the H.M.S. Rosamund which is a marvellous account of life as it existed in Newfoundland 150 years ago as seen through the eyes of a young Englishman, a lieutenant on one of Her Majesty's ships.

But, in any event, to come back to Main Brook in Bellevue Bay.

MR. PECKFORD: I was going to say that my theory about the drowning was moonshine.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the honourable gentleman may be right. The honourable gentleman has some strange theories and that goes along - the more intriguing one, even than the case of the young boy in Croque is that off Quirpon between Quirpon Mainland and Quirpon Island quite easily seen from the shore or from a small boat, there are six or seven cannon, naval cannon in the water. There was one more than there now are. The people there dragged it up which was a mistake because of course these cannon are preserved perfectly under water. They could be there indefinitely. When it was dragged up, there was a chemical reaction which set in between the air and the salt and the cannon oxidizes or rusts and it very quickly went away to sponge, very spongy metal. You could almost pick it up in your hand and crumble it. So, I advised them - this was seven or eight years ago when I first saw it - to leave the cannon there and eventually somebody will discover what they are doing there, how they came to be there and if they are to be raised, there is a method for preserving iron so that it will not rust out very quickly. It a matter of days it will rust out after 200 or 300 years under the water.

It would be interesting to find out why they are there. Obviously some naval vessel either went ashore and was destroyed or jettisoned them, threw them over the side. It would not have been a merchant vessel. A merchant vessel would not have carried - these are twenty-four pounders. They are big, big cannons, very big cannons. Indeed many small naval vessels would not have carried cannons this large. You would be getting up certainly to a frigate, Sir, maybe even to a line of battleship before you would come to vessels that carry twenty-four pounders. It was the second largest caliber weapon used by the Royal Navy at the time.

I do not know how long they are there or what they are doing there. But, there is a story behind it. It is an interesting story. The House

Leader is interested in the story. I could tell him many stories.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBEPTS: Well, you know, the Sapphire was scuttled off Bay Bulls Harbour. It has been in the news recently. The government have acted quite properly to declare it an historic site and to prevent anybody from scavenging it or taking it away. There are many such wrecks around Newfoundland, none as old as the Sapphire. I guess none as clearly documented as the Sapphire. The Sapphire of course, as with any ship in the Royal Navy when she was sunk or destroyed, her Captain stood a court-martial. It is a requirement that is still in effect. If a naval captain loses his vessel be it through enemy action or be it through action of wind and storm and sea, he stands a court-martial. It is not true in the merchant navy. Not that merchant navy captains cannot be court-martialed but there is not necessarily even an enquiry in the case of a merchant navy vessel, but in a naval vessel a captain stands his trial, a court-martial.

It can be a formality if he loses it in action and indeed he may even get a declaration, but still there is a court-martial. The British have been very good about preserving these records. The Sapphire's captain stood his court-martial when he got back to England, and I am told the records are all there in the public record office and can be seen, and it is quite a story. I would like to know how the cannons came to Quirpon. I find it very interesting. Quirpon Harbour is probably the most historic in Newfoundland if we accept the fact that the Basques and the Bretons were in Newfoundland. This is not quite the Farley Mowatt theory in West Viking. It is an embroidery upon it and an improvement upon it. Not Farley Mowatt. It is Harold Horwood as relayed by Farley Mowatt. If we accept the theory that the Basques and Bretons were there, you know, before Cabot came across, before the Englishmen came, and there is no doubt that when Cabot discovered Newfoundland - I am not going to enter into the place of just where Cabot first touched land out of deference to the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South and his successor who has raised that to an art - the predecessor, I am sorry, also his successor.

The fact remains that when Cabot came he must have been greeted by several score or hundreds of Basque and Breton ships because they had been fishing this part of the North Atlantic for some considerable time. Well, it was Quirpon Harbour, Quirpon and Cape Bald was their landfall. Whatever the line - it is latitude that runs across the ocean, is it not? - whatever their line of latitude across the ocean, they followed that line of latitude and they came and hit - I hope not physically - but they came ashore at Quirpon. They went up and down then the coast from there. There was some evidence that there was some whaling evidence there. Indeed my own feeling is that Farley Mowatt has confused that with the Norse site. As honourable gentlemen are well aware having read I am sure his book, Mr. Mowatt feels that there were never any Norse people at the Northern tip of Newfoundland at L'Anse-au-Meadows and that area but rather that there were Basque people in the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Well, I think the Basque people were there, but I think Mr. Mowatt was quite wrong. Indeed there can be argument that he is not wrong because the North people were there around the turn of the tenth century, the 900 - 1000 A.D. period.

But, in any event, to come back to Main Brook. The community there - the honourable gentleman from Municipal Affairs keeps trying to bring me away from Main Brook, but I am going to say what I want to say about it, Sir. The people there have come through some hard times. Main Brook is a community that was founded by Bowaters. It grew out - in effect it is a company town although Bowaters does not own the land. They own all the cutting rights around a large area near Main Brook, but people came to Main Brook originally only because of Bowaters. They came there to cut wood, to work for Bowaters. The company has had ups and downs and ins and outs, but they are now going ahead with a major chipping operation and they propose to move chips from Main Brook to Corner Brook by sea. Of course Labrador Linerboard, as the junior Member for Harbour Main is aware, are established and cut a certain amount of wood in the area through a contractor, Mr. Leander Pilgrim whose firm, Pilgrim Brothers, has substantial contracts. Mr. Pilgrim is also the mayor of Main Brook at the present time.



Anyway, Main Brook, Sir, has been trying desperately to get a new water system.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What kind or size of chips are they talking about?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, they have not moved a chip yet to my knowledge.

It has to be a relatively small ship because Hare Bay is not a very deep bay. I suppose 3,000 or 4,000 toners. Part of the difficulty is going to be getting a wharf because they cannot water load ships and they are going to have a blowing mechanism. The honourable gentleman from Bonavista South would be well able to find employment there is ever he should find himself in need of such. They are going to have a blowing mechanism or even a blowing hard mechanism if the honourable gentleman goes there.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do not be nasty.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not being nasty. I am being jovial with the - I am having sport. I am being sportive with the honourable gentleman from - he may not recognize this as sportive -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. The honourable gentleman wants to run down there?

MR. MORGAN: The next election in White Bay -

MR. ROBERTS: White Bay North will not elect a member in the next election, because it has been abolished. I am sorry.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: The Liberal candidate will be Joe Smallwood.

MR. ROBERTS: Who is going to be the Liberal candidate? I have no idea.

MR. MORGAN: I am.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, the honourable gentleman is going to be the Liberal candidate. Well and good, Sir. In that case for the first time in history White Bay North would vote Tory.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what the honourable gentleman for Bonavista South is probably saying is that the Tories will not let him run anywhere. Well, that is his problem not mine.

Now, Sir, Main Brook - the people there have had a water system for quite a while, longer than I have been there, nine, ten, eleven years. The water system has two serious defects in it. First of all, the supply

is inadequate. The supply comes from George's Pond. It is quite near the community, but there is not a sufficient volume of water and the quality is insufficient. So, the system is inadequate from that point of view.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the distribution system consisted of two inch plastic hose with little smaller hoses running off as laterals to connect the individual homes. Mr. Speaker, the system may have been adequate at the time, but it certainly is not adequate now. The hoses have split and broken under the Winter pressure. The water in them freezes. They were not put deep enough. They expand. The water expands when it is frozen into ice and it splits up the systems. So, the people there have been trying to get a new water system. I would hope the minister will look with favour on their application this year. I think there have been an adequate number of surveys done. Indeed if we probably had all the money that has been put into surveys and put it instead into the ground as a water system, we would be well on the way towards a water system.

We know where the water must come from. It is quite a distance. It is going to be relatively expensive. The people there, Sir, as they have said in the petition presented to the House, are willing to spend or to pay as much as twenty dollars per family per month. They have taken that position in a public meeting. They have reaffirmed it in writing and in delegations to the minister. I would imagine that is the highest water - that is just water, Sir. We are not talking of sewer.

MR. PECKFORD: Is it a town council there?

MR. ROBERTS: It is a town council in Main Brook. The highest water rate that any community has agreed to assume. I do not think it should be that high. I think the minister's figure is twelve dollars a month, as I understand it. I think the government should agree to make up the balance necessary.

Two things will be needed.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Water and sewerage.

MR. ROBERTS: The twenty dollars a month. They are willing to pay \$20

just for water, just for a drop of water. The twelve is for water and sewer. But the people of Main Brook are that desperate to have water that they will even go to twenty dollars a month for water. I do not think they should have to and as my friend from Twillingate says that is three times, three times the amount that any other community is asked to pay under the policy as the minister has announced it. Well, Sir, that is an indication the people of Main Brook are willing to do their share. They do not have a lot of money. It is a prosperous little community but it is not overly prosperous and they are not affluent. If they are willing to pay that large a porportion of their income I think it is an indicator of their very real desire, their very real anxiety and that in turn, Sir, grows from the need. The need is there and I do not know what it would cost, probably several hundred thousand dollars. But if that community of 700 people is to continue to exist as it can and as it should and if it is going to continue to thrive as it will, if the proper services are in, then, Sir, little enough to provide it. All we would have to do is not send the Norma and Gladys and we could probably find enough money right there to take care of Main Brook. I am given a choice, Sir, between the Minister of Tourism's pride as considerably as that might be and the value of the Norma and Gladys on one hand or providing water to a community on the other hand, I think I will opt for water.

In Main Brook, Sir, the people there are exceedingly anxious to -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: - assistance from DREE.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, no, DREE will not nor should they. I think the minister would be the first to agree. DREE are not going to get involved in all the little communities around. I will tell the honourable gentleman what DREE are going to do. It is quite public. DREE are going to assist with the major water systems, the St. John's water system, the Clarendville water system, the Grand Falls water system, the Gander water system; the major ones, the ones

which cost many millions of dollars.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Bonavista is major -

MR. ROBERTS: Bonavista is major but the government here have not listed it as major in that sense.

MR. MORGAN: \$5 million.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I am not - I mean it is a lot of money. The St. George's is over \$3 millions and still climbing. You know, many million, Catalina, there are - Bay Roberts is going to look like the national debt by the time Bay Roberts is finished. The Norris Arm system is \$2 millions and still going up. You know, there are many million dollar systems around, multi-million dollar systems. But DREE are going to get involved in the major towns, the largest towns. Maybe Bonavista should be one of them in which case the honourable gentleman should take it up with his colleagues.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the honourable gentleman should talk to his colleagues. I am not talking about the people in Ottawa. But in any event, my understanding is that DREE - and it will help Bonavista, at least indirectly, because if DREE put money into areas that otherwise the government would have to do. Grand Falls, for example, we have not heard a peep about it from the gentleman from Grand Falls but there must be a major job done on the water distribution system in the town of Grand Falls. The original system was installed by - by Price now - by the A.N.D. Company back in 1908. The pipes are rusting out. They are inadequate. In any event, they cannot carry the volume of water that is necessary to provide adequate water supplies to a town such as Grand Falls. It is a growing town, a prosperous town and needs water.

St. John's, you know, that great expensive system that is going up in Bay Bulls, Big Pond, it must go. It should have gone two years ago.

MR. DOODY: Conception South.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Conception Bay South, as the gentleman from Harbour Main reminds us and that is going to be a staggering, staggering cost, I would think \$20 million to \$30 million or \$40 million. It is of that

order. Again, it must be done. There are, well, there are about 15,000 or 20,000 people living along the South side of Conception Bay now permanent, very prosperous, lovely homes, a lovely area of the Province but there must be a water and sewer system. But anyway DREE are going to help with the major communities and that will free many millions of dollars which the Province can then use for the smaller communities. Whether Bonavista is a smaller community in that sense or a larger community is not a matter I wish to debate now. I am concerned about Main Brook and DREE is not going to help Main Brook nor would I expect them to. I think we should be very grateful that DREE is coming in and helping with the larger centres because otherwise, Sir, the Government of this Province would have to fund those larger centres and that would mean the smaller centres have that much less for their needs.

So, Main Brook, Conche, and Conche, Sir, a community of about 600 people, centre of the parish, nursing station, a large high school, a brand new high school, water is becoming an increasing problem. The government I hope will at least make some tests there this year. They have not done that as yet. They have been asked to. The council there are quite anxious, again, a petition presented in the House. There is a very real need for a water supply in Conche. What is happening, Sir, is all these communities are growing. Some are growing more rapidly than others. But not only are they growing in numbers, Mr. Speaker, they are growing in their concept of what they expect from life and so they should. A situation which was adequate and perhaps even considered to be very good, ten years, twenty, thirty years ago, now is regarded as inadequate. People expect now, and again obviously they should have, all of the modern facilities. And when we come to talk about water and sewerage systems, an indoor sewerage system requires a great deal more water than the old fashioned outhouse which requires essentially no water unless it was over the edge of the wharf and the honourable gentleman cocked his posterior over

the edge of the wharf and the tide served as a sewerage disposal system. Well, that cannot work in many places. It is no longer considered desirable even where it might work.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Eaton's catalogue.

MR. ROBERTS: Eaton's catalogue and Tory manifestoes equally, equally and the only trouble with it, Sir, the ink used to smear on the Tory manifestoes. That is what I am told. You think they could do that for the people. They could not even manage that one, Sir.

Anyway, Conche - now, let me come a little further to the South, Englee and Roddickton, again just let me repeat the appeals for more assistance there. Both communities have systems that are well underway, all of them well underway indeed before the Tories came into office. To give the present gentlemen their due, they have put money into both communities. More is needed to enable the systems to be finished.

MR. PECKFORD: Which ones?

MR. ROBERTS: Englee and Roddickton.

MR. PECKFORD: I got a letter on Englee today, I think.

MR. ROBERTS: I have not got it. The minister may have signed it but Englee and Roddickton need more money, relatively small amounts compared to the total expenditures. The same is true of Goose Cove further to the North, just South of St. Anthony.

MR. MORGAN: Are you running up there in the next election?

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. MORGAN: - in that area in the next election or are you going to the Straits?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I imagine I will probably run in the Straits but there will be people in Englee and they still will have needs and the same with Bide Arm and Roddickton and -

MR. MORGAN: Who is going to have you in the next election?

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. MORGAN: Who is going to have you?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, there are a number of districts want me to run including the Straits of Bell Isle. You know, Bonavista South, there is an overwhelming cry for anybody to run there but that is -

MR. MORGAN: I hope to have you down there.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I may come. I may come. It will be very intriguing, Sir, but the only problem is it would mean the honourable gentleman's political career which has been inglorious would also be short.

Now, Sir, let me come back to a touch upon Goose Cove. We are also very concerned in Raleigh. The people of Raleigh would like to see a water system. Again, Sir, they do not need a sewerage system. They have made arrangements which are adequate to enable the sewerage to be treated and disposed of. They do need a water system. It is a matter of a couple hundred thousand dollars and I would hope the minister could find it in his heart and in his beneficence at least to make a start on that this year.

St. Lunaire-Griquet, about \$180,000, \$200,000 in round numbers has been put into the ground there. The water supply has been provided but we have yet to hook up very many homes. The more expensive part of the system is done. Now we need the distribution systems through the communities.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Griquet and St. Lunaire toether -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, it is one municipal area, St. Lunaire-Griquet. I think, Mr. Speaker, we are going to need a second half of a system for the Griquet end, particularly for Lower Griquet and Camel's Island. But certainly there is a need for at least \$100,000 this year to enable the present water line which comes from Joe's Pond running up through St. Lunaire itself. It is now up to about Sleepy Cove to carry it down through the rest of Griquet and up - yes, the rest of St. Lunaire and up into upper part of Griquet by the Pentecostal Church there and Upper Griquet. That area will have to be served from the Joe's Cove reservoir. When we come down further into Lower Griquet, particularly out by Ford Elms's Store and then running down into Camel's Island over the Tickle I think we have got to look at an extra system. Indeed, a mere \$10,000 would provide those people with adequate water. There has been 100 letters back and forth between the minister and myself. The letters are all very fine but there has

been no money yet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that deals with the water and sewer problems. I could go on at some length but I do not need to. I merely want to record in this House what I have said many times outside and to the minister in conversations and in letters and in delegations, you know, we have a great need. Much has been done. When I went to White Bay North in 1966 no community had an adequate sewerage system, no community had an adequate water system. The only community that had a start on either was St. Anthony and there we had the Grenfell Mission System which was very old and the old system put in on the East side of St. Anthony however in the mid fifties which just did not work. It was inadequate to begin with and it did not work to finish with. We have put into White Bay North in the last few years, I have never added it up, \$6 million, \$7 million, \$8 million in water and sewerage systems in all.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Did you mention Roddickton?

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry - Yes, I did mention Roddickton.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: - water committees down -

MR. ROBERTS: Oh! I could mention many others. I mean there is a water community in Ship Cove. There is a water community in Fishot, a water community in Croque, one in Straitsview, one in L'Anse-au-Meadow. South - there is no Southeast Crouse - South West Crouse is sometimes referred to as Back Harbour Conche. It would come in on the Conche system. North East Crouse so far has managed to solve the water problem but they would like a road, thank you very much. They do not have a road. There are



MR. ROBERTS: only seven families left there now.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Father Murphy?

MR. ROBERTS: No. Father Murphy, Sir, is now in Ottawa taking further studies. Father Cashin, no relation to Richard, I understand, but Father Cashin is the Parish Priest in the Sacred Heart Parish.

MR. NEARY: What about Bishop Reid?

MR. ROBERTS: No, Archbishop Reid is in Bide Arm carrying out his oversight duties. Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on at some length on the water and sewer problems. It might appeal to honourable gentlemen opposite but all I want to do is to note them and record them. There is a very real need. I realize there are real needs elsewhere around the Province and I would not want to see the people of my district get more than their share, but I do want to see them get their share. And I would expect, Sir, this year that we will see one or two systems started or major continuation authorized in White Bay North. If we do not I shall be very disappointed. And I am not expecting everything. The communities I have mentioned I suppose we could use \$1.5 million or \$2 million to finish water systems or the water and sewer systems as applicable in those communities. I do not expect to see that all at once, Sir, but I do expect to see several hundred thousand dollars put into White Bay North this year and I will be very disappointed if the minister, and so will the delegations and the people with whom he has dealt, they do expect, Sir, we will get some satisfaction this year and we hope we will get it fairly soon, because the construction season is coming and I can say to the minister that I do not envy him his job of dividing up the money he has got because I know he has not got all that he needs, but I would say to him, Mr. Speaker, that it will get no easier as time goes on. What he must do is bite the lead bullet, to make the phrase, and then decide and he should be grateful, Sir, that he only has to answer to one district when the election comes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well other districts will take it out of the honourable gentleman's colleagues' hides and I know that greater love hath no man

than this, Mr. Speaker, as the saying goes. But I say to the honourable gentleman, he only has to answer for one district and when it comes to sins either of omission or commission, he is not high on the list of sinners. He has a place on the list of sinners, but nowhere near, Sir, those of some of his other colleagues.

The honourable gentleman from Green Bay, Sir, let me give him a word of advice, I do not know if he wants a word of advice or not, but let me give it to him, There is a phenomenon in this Province in Municipal Affairs, now I have seen, how many ministers in Municipal Affairs have I seen come and go, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Dawe, Captain Strickland briefly, Mr. Crosbie ingloriously.-

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Dawe.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh I mentioned "Ek". The honourable gentleman from Gander, the honourable gentleman from Fortune Bay and now the gentleman from Green Bay, it has averaged about a year to a year and two or three months, a great turnover in Municipal Affairs ministers. And what happens, Sir, is happening now to the honourable gentleman from Green Bay. Every minister who comes in, a great flag of hope goes up in every municipality in the Province, be it -

MR. PECKFORD: Beaton had two or three runs at it.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Abbott was in and out a number of times. Be it, you know the City of St. John's or be it the smallest, what is the smallest - community council is the least sophisticated form of municipality which we have, the smallest community council, one is debating whether or not they will have a garbage collection service. But whatever the municipalities, Sir, whatever their aims, whatever their size, whenever a new man is sworn in as Minister of Municipal Affairs, their hopes rise, phoenix-like they pick themselves up and come back into action and before very long the letters start coming into the minister and the delegations start coming in and the speaking invitations start coming in, and he is a great man, he is beloved by all, and he believes it, and well he might. Because they mean it. They are all being very friendly to him and they are all saying, well they all without exception, knock his predecessors, be they Liberal or Tory and they say, but you, Sir,

will be something new.

MR. PECKFORD: You get more with honey than -

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is it. But all these municipalities they come in and the Federation of Mayors is nice to him and everybody, a new Minister of Municipal Affairs. Sir, it is like -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: - it is like a young girl, Mr. Speaker, a nice nubile. seventeen or eighteen year old girl who wanders in say to a woods camp where no girl has been seen for six months. Everybody pays court to the minister, using all the sophisticated wiles and techniques they can envisage. Indeed if we had, Sir, I can see it, a full length picture of the minister in the next issue of the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, Federation of Municipalities Newsletter; position the minister with a strategically placed water and sewer system protecting him from the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune.

So the minister is now in that stage, Sir, the honeymoon, and I would say to him, beware, beware, because at some point the minister is going to have to start issuing approvals or disapprovals and very quickly the honeymoon wears off and if the minister is wondering, Sir, why men have come and gone from Municipal Affairs like the snow comes and goes, then that is why.

So I would say to him, Sir, enjoy the honeymoon. It will be a lot honeyier and a lot moonier if White Bay North gets its fair share and then hope and pray that in due course one of two things will happen, either the Premier moves him to another portfolio, or the administration is put out of office but he carries on as the Member for Green Bay. That would be his best to hope for, and then he could hope that when the tide changes again in another eight or ten years, he could come back into office and be spared the Municipal Affairs portfolio.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, there are one or two roads problems I would like to mention, and the gentleman from Labrador West who seems

so tender of late, and whose equanimity has been ruffled so much recently, there are a number of problems. Chief among them is the fact, Sir, that since this government took office, they have not, I know the minister is listening, he can pretend to be reading The Evening Telegram, but I know he is listening -

MR. ROUSSEAU: I was looking at the weekend Lions Club.

MR. ROBERTS: He was looking at the weekend Lions Club. Well, Sir, the point I would make to the minister first of all is that since this administration came into office, other than their funding under DREE, which is as a rule ten per cent, they have got yet to spend one red nickel anywhere along the Northern Peninsula Highway.

The biggest road need in Newfoundland today, the biggest, most costly, the longest, the most expensive is the Northern Peninsula Road, from Deer Lake North. A fair amount of work has been done on it the last three or four years, more will be done this year. But I say, Mr. Speaker, the government of this Province can take no pride in that, because ninety per cent or more of every single dollar that has been spent on the Northern Peninsula Highway has come from Ottawa, through DREE, and in the case of the National Park, through the National Parks Division.

MR. NEARY: God bless our Liberal Government.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. Yes. If it were not for the Liberal Government in Ottawa we would be in trouble. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the minister it is high time he spent a few dollars of his own on the Northern Peninsula. It is high time they spent a few dollars of their own. And if the honourable gentlemen opposite wish to wonder why they have not got any political support and why they are getting less all the time, the reason is that the people on the Northern Peninsula feel with considerable justification that the government does not care a hoot about them, and it is the gentleman from St. Barbe South who should be most concerned because he is the one whose political career is most immediately affected. But I say to the gentleman from St. Barbe South that unless there is some evidence, unless people come to believe, and they will come to believe only if there is evidence, come to believe that this government cares about them, there will not be a Tory elected north of Deer Lake in the next general election and

nor will there deserve to be.

The gentleman from St. Barbe South, Sir, the honourable gentleman from St. Barbe South, Sir -

MR. EVANS: You will have to get (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I cannot speak about the gentleman from Burgeo, it is just not parliamentary. Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman from St. Barbe South will be well advised to pay some heed to that. He is going to quiver in his boot straps when he discovers who is seeking to run against him. I do not know who will run against him. There are a number of people who are vying for that honour.

MR. EVANS: Did you know Joey was running against him?

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, to come back to roads, I say to the Minister of Highways, the Minister of Transportation and Communications, that it is high time some provincial money was spent on the Northern Peninsula, the people there know full well what has happened. We need more money on the Northern Peninsula Road, particularly on the Northern end, and then there are a number of communities, Sir, that have a need.

MR. EVANS: They need a new member, boy.

MR. ROBERTS: The roads throughout White Bay North have never been in worse shape than they are now, never, and it is either the direct result of the minister's negligence or a direct result of bad feeling on the minister's part, a desire to hurt, because there is less equipment there than ever before. There is less maintenance work than ever before and there is not a contract envisaged for improving any road other than the DREE contracts. And the minister can claim no credit for that. If this government had their way, Mr. Speaker, there would have been no DREE money spent north of Plum Point last year. Mr. Jamieson fortunately listened to reason.

This government, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that, if this government had their way there would have been no money spent north of Plum Point last year and I venture to say this year. The government wanted to spend it all elsewhere. But thanks to some representations by the gentlemen who represent those areas, Mr. Jamieson insisted that a fair share of the DREE money go north of Plum Point and I say to the honourable gentleman

if he wants to smirk let him smirk, but let him produce the correspondence. Again I know whereof I speak. Yes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the minister, let him spend a few of the provincial dollars on the Northern Peninsula. Let him do something for Roddickton. To date he has not even answered their letters.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I beg your pardon.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister can beg my pardon, it will not do him any good. I have a number of letters, two or three from Roddickton, the minister has not answered.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well if it is current -

MR. ROBERTS: Well they are current. Sure. Sure. And the answers that have been given are less, are less than satisfactory.

The most recent letter from Roddickton, a copy of which has come to me, now it may have been answered. But if so it has been answered without a copy to me. The most recent letter from Roddickton indicates that certain a feeling on the part of the Town Council the minister is not paying much heed to them. Well, Sir, the way for the minister to disspell that is to pay some heed to them.

Then there is the question of the road between Roddickton and Englee. It has never been in worse shape. The road from Roddickton over to Conche, the road from Branch up to St. Lunaire and then on out to Ship Cove and Raleigh, and then on up the other way to Quirpon and out to L'Anse-au-Meadows, never been less done. So let us spend some money on the roads in White Bay North. Does somebody want to ask me a question?

MR. PECKFORD: Does the hon. gentleman want every road up there paved right now?

MR. MOORES: We were just wondering what roads were paved, for instance in your district.

MR. ROBERTS: The roads that were paved? Yes, the only pavement laid on the Northern Peninsula was laid while I was member, and there has been none laid since - not an inch laid in White Bay North since.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where was that?

MR. ROBERTS: Around St. Anthony Harbour is six miles, \$1.5 million, and the community of Raleigh. The only ones. Not another inch of pavement on the Northern Peninsula other than a DREE contract in Port Saunders to Hawkes Bay.

MR. MOORES: In twenty-three years?

MR. ROBERTS: In twenty-three - there were no roads in part of it when I went there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: We were too busy putting money in the Northeastern Fish Industry.

MR. MOORES: That was all of the pavement that was done?

MR. ROBERTS: That is all of the pavement that was done. And I say to the Premier what -

MR. MOORES: How much money did they put into the Northeastern Fisheries?

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: I have no idea, not as much as the Premier asked for.

MR. MOORES: Not a nickel.....

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MOORES: Not a nickel.

MR. ROBERTS: Not a nickel?

MR. MOORES: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Well it was not for the want of asking on the Premier's part.

MR. MOORES: You (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker - Mr. Speaker, would the honourable gentleman please withdraw that - the Premier may feel things but he is not allowed to say them in the House. I ask Your Honour, Sir, to invite the Premier to withdraw that phrase please?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I will gladly withdraw that phrase, and can say it outside of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay. We shall deal with it outside of the House then.

Now, Sir, I say to the Premier how much paving has his administration done other than DREE paving? And I answer it - not a nickel, not a nickel, not a mile other than DREE paving. Anyway my friend from St. Barbe North keeps quite a close watch on this, am I correct?

MR. F. ROWE: Yes. A little bit around Rocky Harbour.

MR. ROBERTS: Oopa, hold on now, a little bit around Rocky Harbour? Well I will have to amend my statement. The Government of Canada put the water and sewer into Rocky Harbour under the parks agreement.

MR. PECKFORD: What do you want, all of it down there?

MR. ROBERTS: No I want a fair share of it down there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: DREE - what money has been spent on the Northern



Peninsula is DREE or Parks Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: I am not going to get any DREE money.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman is not getting - he does not deserve any after his performance.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, all I want is a fair share. We are getting a fair share of the DREE money, but the government of the Province have not put a nickel other than - if there is a little bit around Rocky Harbour I stand corrected but other than that - the Premier can talk about what he wants. The point remains that its a fact, and an indisputable fact that nothing has been paved by the Tory Government North of Deer Lake - nothing. What has been done is DREE money, and what is being done this year is DREE money, and the most that the Province has contributed to that is ten per cent at the very most.

Now, Sir, if the Minister of Transportation would like to come down we would be glad to see him sometime. I would like to see him drive down and not run around in the airplane.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I drove down the other -

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman drove to Twillingate, I give him full marks,

MR. ROUSSEAU: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: He drove to Twillingate over the roads that we built and paved.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Because I was invited.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I now say to the honourable gentleman -

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: - I say to the honourable gentleman then please consider this an invitation to come at anytime and I stand ready to go with him at anytime. I will even - I was going to say I will use my own car, I will not be that foolish, I know how bad the roads are, I will provide a car. I will go out and rent a car and we will go to Deer Lake and we will drive the 300 miles to St. Anthony and then we will go back and drive the 100 miles over to

Roddickton and Englee, and then we will come back and get the ferry across the Straits, we will drive the fifty miles through Labrador South, from L'Anse-au-Clair down to Red Bay, and then the minister will see what bad roads are. If he has never seen a bad road before he will know what they are, and if he never thought he saw bad roads, he will see what real bad roads are.

AN HON. MEMBER: They were impassable when the Liberals were in.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, -

MR. NEARY: And if you do not convince him come over and I will show him Middleton Avenue over on Bell Island.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman, Sir, I do not fault his good intentions, the Minister of Transportation, but at some point he is going to have to produce some works to underline his intentions, to date he has not with respect to the Northern Peninsula. The people there know what is happening. They know that what is being done is DREE money. What they do not understand is why no provincial government money has gone in. Maybe it is because the area has dared to vote Liberal.

MR. PECKFORD: Do you want all of the money down there?

MR. ROBERTS: No we do not want all of the money, we want a fair share of the money.

MR. PECKFORD: .... DREE down there?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, we are getting DREE down there sure, no thanks to any honourable gentlemen opposite. They fought and resisted every step of the way.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course they have. It had to be shoved down their throats -

MR. PECKFORD: That is not true!

MR. ROBERTS: - forced down their throats.

MR. EVANS: Do not be so foolish boy!

MR. ROBERTS: Why, Mr. Speaker - Mr. Speaker the honourable gentleman's officials wrote a year ago to DREE and said we cannot do any work North of Plum Point because there is no engineering ready. And that was shown to be a completely false statement. The

minister might go down and look up the files.

AN HON. MEMBER: I do not have to.

AN HON. MEMBER: This year.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, this year.

AN HON. MEMBER: You know what happened last year.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes the honourable gentleman - and he had it forced down his throat last year, one quarter inch of pavement at a time and he had to swallow awfully hard -

MR. HICKMAN: By whom?

MR. ROBERTS: By Mr. Jamieson, supported ably by Mr. Rompkey and two or three provincial gentlemen who went -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: - and, of course, Mr. Jamieson did - he is pretty good at getting pavement. The honourable gentleman from Burin should have a look at his own district.

MR. HICKMAN: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I have not heard anything called the Hickman Highway yet, but the crowd down are all set to call it the Jamieson Highway, the joint town and community councils have said so publicly.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes that is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I have not heard of any Hickman Highway.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: No and we are not going to.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No.

AN HON. MEMBER: The way the DREE money .....

MR. ROBERTS: No the DREE money comes out of the taxpayers of the Government of Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear! Hear! And if the honourable gentleman over there pays taxes, Sir, he pays his share towards it, as well he might. As well he might, and be grateful for the purpose of doing so.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you want DREE funds or Hickman funds?

You want both down there.

MR. ROBERTS: Right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: Right. The same as everybody else in the Province. We would like a little of each. Anything wrong with that?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Three hundred miles of road.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Three hundred -

MR. YOUNG: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: - hold on now the gentleman from - the gentleman who used to be pickled and formaldehyde.

MR. YOUNG: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: What are you saying now 'Haig'?

MR. YOUNG: Nothing.

MR. ROBERTS: That is obvious you are not saying anything, but you are taking a lot of words to do it.

MR. YOUNG: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, wait until the gentleman for St. John's West comes back and finds the gentleman from Harbour Grace has been sitting in his seat. You will hear the yell from here to Toyko wherever the honourable gentleman from St. John's West presently is.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am all in favour of getting -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if these gentlemen did not lead me astray, poor innocent little me, did not lead me astray then I would not be astray, Sir. And it is heart rendering to see them picking on me, and trying to discomfit me and divert me, take me away from the thrust, if that is the word, of what I am saying.

MR. YOUNG: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: Why was there not some paving in 1968 down there?

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know. Why was there not some paving in 1938?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Paving where?

AN HON. MEMBER: Down in his district.

MR. ROBERTS: Well there was paving in 1968 in my district, yes, of course, there was, sure, sure. Roads being built too. Lights being built too.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The St. Anthony project was underway in 1968.

Now, Sir, the honourable gentleman whose only acquaintance with White Bay North is a night spent in a tavern in St. Anthony on the 22nd. of April, and that is his only acquaintance, Sir, with White Bay North - would be well advised -

MR. MORGAN: Your friend owns the tavern you better watch yourself.

MR. ROBERTS: No. The gentleman who owns the tavern lives in Corner Brook.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman's - the person who used to run it was the late Max Smith who is now dead.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course, I called it a tavern.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is as close as he would come. They got there sort of -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, as a select clientele at that establishment, but -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, as I was saying, the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South let him not talk about the district unless he

wants to spend some time there, and we would welcome him to spend some time there. As I say his only acquaintance with it to date has been a tavern in St. Anthony, club, call it what he wants.

MR. MORGAN: I worked there in 1962.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman worked there in 1962 and 1963, well that is the last work he has done since. No wonder the phone services were that bad, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No wonder one of the big things I had to do was get after the CNT to try and straighten them out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. MORGAN: How are your friends in the district?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the people of the district will decide whom they want for whom. And I invite the honourable gentleman not to run against me, if he wants to do that he can, let him come down and campaign against me. I would rather have him campaign against me than for me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: Rossie got him worried.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, to come back to roads. There are a number of - I see the gentleman from Labrador West is indulging one of his vices outside of the Chamber but I am glad to see that he is listening. There are some roads that need to be built. There are two or three communities that still do not have any road link, Croque a few miles away from the end of a woods road. It would not cost very much to hook up Croque. St. Julian's a few miles on from Croque. We are not going to be able to put a road to Fishot Islands, it is an island. We could certainly put one to Croque and St. Julian's. Harbour Deep, named by the forestry task force as one of the areas where there is wood potential - as part of the woods potential.

There should be a road built to Harbour Deep. The people have petitioned. I think it is a reasonable request to make. It is about forty miles. But, I think a large part of that now is drivable on woods roads in behind the Hawkes Bay operation. Surely it would not be an insuperable job to provide a road to Harbour Deep. We have done more difficult roads. If the government of the Province -

MR. ROUSSEAU: It would take one-third of the budget.

MR. ROBERTS: One-third of the provincial budget at least to put a road to Harbour Deep. I would ask the honourable gentleman to send me the report.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Provincial roads budget.

MR. ROBERTS: Provincial roads budget? Well, how large is the provincial roads budget?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: \$22 million.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: This is not very large.

MR. ROBERTS: \$20 million, \$22 million. Out of \$100 million expenditure.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I have had people in from Harbour Deep too but let the honourable gentleman send me the engineering reports so I can at least look at them and then I would be in a position to know - I am sorry?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I would not believe the honourable gentleman. I would believe the reports, sure.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: The people of Harbour Deep would like to see a road built. They at the very least would like to see a road around the harbour. It would only cost a few thousand dollars to finish that work - I am sorry.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They deserve it.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, of course they deserve it. Of course they do, and it would only cost a few thousand dollars, maybe a month of the Norma and Gladys sailing time to put a road around Harbour Deep. You know, what?

\$20,000 to \$35,000 would do it. Now, Mr. Speaker, this honourable crowd over there have only got one Summer left in office. The next government will do it.

Now, Sir, let me come to another area, electricity. We have only one community left any size in White Bay North without electricity services and that is St. Carols. The Minister of Energy and myself had a number of exchanges upon it. It would not cost very much money so I again say to the minister I would like to see lights provided to St. Carols. It is a mile and a half or two miles of pole and whatever they call it. They do not call it line. Conductors they call it. I do not know what that would cost, but again it is not an unreasonable amount to provide electricity to those homes. Those people again have the same right to have power as anywhere else in Newfoundland, Sir. If we can spend money the way we do on the power commission, then we can find whatever money is needed, a few thousand dollars to provide electricity - I am sorry.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: How many people live there?

MR. ROBERTS: How many people are there? It goes up and down, but I think there are thirteen or fifteen family connections and they are not quite enough to meet the arbitrary policy, and I have said that I will become a customer for however many are needed and I will pay the man charge each month and we will go on from there. It is only a few thousand dollars. You know, I do not know what it would cost. \$10,000, \$15,000, \$20,000 - a lot of dollars piled in one place but not a lot of dollars when viewed against the talk of \$1.6 billion for the development of the Lower Churchill River and bringing it to the Island.

MR. HICKMAN: Are they still using lamps?

MR. ROBERTS: Well no, not quite. There are not doing it by kerosene lamps. They have Delcos and their own power, but it is a most annoying little thing because each year I bring it up and each year nothing happens. I am just wondering if the minister is punishing the people of St. Carols again by his refusal to hook them up.

MR. EVANS: They have not seen the light yet.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, maybe they have not seen the light yet, but I would say to the gentleman from Burgeo, Sir, that he misreads our Newfoundland



people if he thinks they can be punished into voting one way or another. Our people, Sir, as Hermitage showed clearly, will vote as they feel best. If ever a government tried to bribe a district, Sir, this government tried to bribe the people of Hermitage district in November, 1973. The people of Hermitage quite properly accepted whatever beneficence the government brought and then quite properly voted them out of office, clearly, decisively and unmistakably. I venture to say, Sir, that when the election is called, the people of Hermitage district who are being split, who are being cut up, put into two other districts will vote essentially the same way and indeed if anything stronger than ever.

MR. EVANS: Two Progressive Conservatives will be in there now instead of one.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the honourable gentleman may think so. I would advise him then to urge his Premier, Sir, to have an election quickly. It will settle the matter for once and for all. I say, Mr. Speaker, there will not be a Tory elected along the South Coast. That includes the gentleman from Burgeo.

MR. EVANS: You must be crazy.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, yes. How much would the honourable gentleman like to bet?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A bottle.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman is so worried he has to go and tell radio announcers that he has seen Liberal surveys that do not even exist. After the performance the Premier put on on Saturday - the reports I get of it from a variety of sources - it only makes it all the more definite.

By the way is it true, Mr. Speaker, that the reason the Premier did not announce the site of the hospital - he said construction would begin on June 15 - the reason he did not announce the site was that the Member for Placentia West or the Member for Burin had been unable to agree on the site. The Premier has had to set up an impartial committee of referees in the cabinet.

MR. SIMMONS: That is true. That is true.

MR. ROBERTS: I believe the junior member for Harbour Main is on it,

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He just got back.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, he just got back. If he had known it was coming up, he would not have come back. He would have stayed wherever he was at. I forget who else is on it, but three or four ministers are on it to try to resolve the issue between the gentleman from Placentia West and the gentleman from Burin. Here we are - the Premier said on Saturday night that according to the press reports, that the construction was to start on June 15.- and here we are on the fifth -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. And what did he say?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The site would be selected.

MR. ROBERTS: The site would be selected by June 15.

MR. HICKMAN: The site has to be selected by June 15 -

MR. ROBERTS: Hear! Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: - so that the architects can complete their drawings -

MR. ROBERTS: Hear! Hear!

After two years of saying the hospital was going there, we are now at the point where they have not as yet selected a site, appointed architects or began to draw the plans.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I am not saying he did not say it. Of course he did not say it. He has got better speech writers than that. They are very skilled.

MR. BARRY: When you were the Minister of Health, you did nothing about it.

MR. ROBERTS: I waited for the honourable gentleman to walk into it. I invite the honourable gentleman to listen in tomorrow, Sir. I have a copy of the speech which I gave in Marystown in 1969. The honourable gentleman may say what he wants. He walked right into it. I invite him to stay carefully tuned. I have a copy of the speech. I also have the press reports and I am very happy to say that what the Premier said I said, I did not say no matter how much the honourable gentleman opposite may wish. I am sorry.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentlemen opposite may clutch at whatever straws they wish.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Face up to it like a man.

MR. HICKMAN: I was at the meeting.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Face up to it like a man.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman may have been at the meeting. I do not know. The honourable gentleman may have been at the meeting. The honourable gentleman opposite is the man of principle who used to say, for example, here will be no political figure ever put into the ombudsman. Well, watch the honourable gentleman when the motion comes before the House. The honourable gentleman opposite used to say, never again will the government tamper with redistribution. Then he voted for the gerrymandering. You know, I do not pay any attention to what the honourable gentleman says. What I said in Marystown I said. I have a text of what I said. If the honourable gentleman would like a copy, I would be delighted to send it to him.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I have the speech.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, he has it. Then it is a better speech than the honourable gentleman has ever given himself.

MR. NEARY: He tried to take credit for the St. Lawrence fund to but the people noticed it.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, he is going to try to take credit for lots of things.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the most revealing thing about the Member for Burin is that he is so worried about his seat politically that having realized he is not going to get a judgeship out of it, that he had to go to a radio station in person on the South Coast and say, I am the only one who is safe, the only Tory who is safe on the South Coast. Why? I have seen the Liberal survey.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been no Liberal survey done. The honourable gentleman made that up out of whole cloth.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: He is that worried.

MR. BARRY: I will put my money on Mariptown.

MR. ROBERTS: He put the gentleman from Placentia West way down on the list but that just shows there is no love lost. I would think that of the two, the honourable gentleman from Placentia West has a better chance, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I really hope so.

MR. ROBERTS: I would hope so too. The gentleman from Burin, Sir, will shortly be returning to the practice of law. That may or may not be a good thing for the practice of law. It will be a good thing for this House. But, now, Sir, as I was saying -

MR. HICKMAN: The honourable gentleman from Burin was going to be defeated in 1971.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I did not say that.

MR. HICKMAN: No. Everybody else said it though on this side of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Everybody on that side of the House said it. Well, I think it is now they want the honourable gentleman to feel it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who were then sitting on this side of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: I have never predicted before this the honourable gentleman's political demise. I am one of those who felt that he would be back.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: There is nobody over here right now.

MR. ROBERTS: No, there is nobody over there now, Sir. The Liberals will be over there then. But - want to have an election? Anybody want to have an election? Do I hear any calls for an election?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who will be fighting? Which Liberals? The Reform Liberals or -

MR. ROBERTS: Both groups. The fight will be which fifty-one men come in. There are going to be 102 men sitting in the House, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that might be. That might be.

MR. ROUSSEAU: You have to get a leader over there first.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman from Labrador West, Sir, is getting a little better, but I might point out to him it is his own colleagues who have talked so much about the safety of the Norma and Gladys and the great value of it. I would say to the gentleman from Labrador West, Sir, that his enthusiasm for trying to play games -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Is Your Honour saying something?

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

Maybe it is because I have not been in the House for a week or so, but I was enjoying the repartee to some extent. However, it could degenerate into chaos or whatever else might happen. So, I suggest to honourable members the rule that a member speaking has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank Your Honour, and it is nice to have a Deputy Speaker who is not going to try to bash my face in (Break in tape) Your Honour will in due course. But the gentleman for St. George's has honoured himself again by being quoted in the public prints as saying he is going to bash my face in, him and about seventeen others.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: He is going to say something? Say that.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: If I were to believe, Sir, everything I read about the honourable gentleman, he would have been incarcerated at the Waterford Hospital for a number of weeks in 1971 while he was dealing with Mr. Smallwood.

MR. SIMMONS: That is not the fellow.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, that is the same fellow. I am not saying I believe it. I am just saying if I were to believe everything I read about the honourable gentleman. He was carried, as I recall it, carried into town and there are some interesting recordings around of tape recordings of phone conversations in which the honourable gentleman figured.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Kidnapped.

MR. ROBERTS: He was then making deals, wheeling and dealing.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Order!

MR. ROBERTS: Order. I guess it is not in order. But, anyway I just wanted to say that.

MR. BARRY: A point of order ... were you taping or tapping ...

MR. ROBERTS: No, I was not.

MR. BARRY: He was kidnapped.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is right.

MR. DUNPHY: I do not know what the so-called honourable gentleman is beating his gums about presently. Usually he mumbles -

MR. SPEAKER: (STAGG): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. DUNPHY: - he mumbles things that, you know, so to make it ambiguous. But, if he has anything to say about the honourable Member for St. George's I suggest that he say it clearly and distinctly so I can hear him, and I will take it from there.

MR. SIMMONS: A point of order, Alec. Personal. Personal.

MR. DUNPHY: Oh, drop dead.

MR. ROBERTS: A point of order, Sir. I cannot help it if the honourable gentleman from St. George's cannot understand. That, Sir, is a problem well beyond -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: That, Sir, is a problem well beyond my ability. Sir, one can lead a horse to water but one cannot make him drink. One can even

lead half a horse to water, but it cannot make him drink. Nor can one make the gentleman from St. George's understand.

MR. DUNPHY: It was suggested some time ago, you know, we are listening to a horse or the east end of a horse going west. Nothing has changed.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, will Your Honour - if he wants to speak, let him speak.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Go upstairs for the tapes.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): I ask for silent contempt if there is going to be contempt.

Now, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition is embarking on a course which the Member for St. George's has no choice but to reply to. It is provocative and insulting -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Slime!

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! Order, please!

However, the Chair is charged with the responsibility of keeping order and these remarks are basically of a personal nature. I think that they would be better not discussed. If they are to be discussed, they should be discussed in some other theatre than this.

MR. ROBERTS: Probably in a square boxing ring, Sir. I thank Your Honour, and I agree that it would be better not to discuss the Member for St. George's. Now, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: They all seem to be a little jumpy today, do they not? It is too bad we -

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: - we did not get on the ombudsman today.

MR. BARRY: What about the wire tapping?

MR. ROBERTS: What about the wire tapping? What wire tapping? I did not mention any wire tapping. The honourable the school boy debater, Sir, had better go back to studying his mentor's in Japan or somewhere

between here and Japan accompanied by geisha girls and much sake, I have no doubt. I say to the honourable gentleman that he is but a pale shadow of his master. John the Baptist, Sir, went before his master. The honourable gentleman from Placentia West, Sir, comes after his, but he is but a patch upon the ability, the debating ability or the intellectual ability of his colleague from St. John's West.

MR. NEARY: They are falling apart. Crosbie is in Japan and they are falling apart over there.

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe that is why they are sending the Norma and Gladys to Japan, to bring John Crosbie back. That is why she is not seaworthy.

Now, Sir, I say to the House Leader - are we going to adjourn this at six or do you want to go to nine tonight?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Six.

MR. ROBERTS: Six. All right.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are only seven minutes left then for me to speak unless -

MR. MORGAN: You are a long time saying nothing.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Put the adjournment will you.

MR. ROBERTS: Will the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South please listen to his House Leader? The poor man is trying hard now.

MR. MORGAN: Inaudible.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, six o'clock.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker - six o'clock is time enough, I feel, Sir, I and I -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, we all - I will call it six now if the honourable gentlemen wish. Want to move the adjournment? I move the adjournment Mr. Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, they cannot make up their minds. Mr. Speaker, I will move the adjournment. Let us put that to a vote and then if it does not vote, well we will see what happens. I move the adjournment of the debate, Sir.



MR. BARRY: Stop wasting time, boy.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The honourable member has moved the adjournment of the debate. Those in favor "Aye". Those against "Nay".

MR. ROBERTS: I do not think we need to count. Now that we have proved they do not want to adjourn the debate, we will carry on.

Now, Sir, the biggest single need in White Bay North -

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: It is a new member. That is the biggest need they have.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: How, how, how, how, how -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They will vote you out, that is how.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, if the people of White Bay North, Sir, wish to vote me out, that, Sir, is their privilege and their pleasure and they know how to do it just as they voted Ambrose Peddle out, overwhelmingly. They voted him in and they voted him out. You know, they know how to do it, just as the people of Grand Falls voted Ambrose Peddle out. They voted him in and they voted him out.

MR. COLLINS: What has Ambrose Peddle got to do with this?

MR. ROBERTS: Nothing! What has Ambrose Peddle got to do with anything? Nothing! Now, Sir, the honourable gentleman opposite is talking - the honourable gentleman opposite, is he sober today? Is the honourable gentleman inebriated today? Is the honourable gentleman inebriated today?

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. ROUSSEAU: On a point of order.

MR. DUNPHY: You rotten scum!

MR. ROUSSEAU: One second now. One second now. On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

If the honourable member will - the Chair is charged with the responsibility of maintaining order. The remarks of the Leader of the Opposition are probably the most provocative I have heard since I have been in the Chair. There have been provocative things said and they are extremely difficult for any honourable member to restrain himself. I would suggest to the honourable Member for St. George's to do so,

however. I would then request for the second time -

MR. DUNPHY: And apologize.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): - request the honourable Leader of the Opposition to speak for approximately four minutes at which time the six o'clock curfew, the six o'clock time limit will take over and maybe we can retire to a pleasant evening and come back tomorrow in better humor.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear! Hear!

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying -

MR. DUNPHY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. No honourable member, so-called honourable member has the right to make the accusation that the Member for White Bay South just made, that the honourable Member for St. George's is drunk in his seat. I resent it. It is not true, and everybody knows it. I ask him to withdraw it and apologize immediately.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I have no intention of withdrawing anything I have said about the honourable gentleman. The honourable gentleman outside this House has threatened physical violence against me, and that what I say I say in the House and I will say it outside. If it is out of order, the Speaker can rule it out of order and I will then answer with the Speaker. I am not going to be bullied by the gentleman from St. George's or a thousand like him.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The honourable the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: I suggest that the statement made by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition was quite unparliamentary, and knowingly cruel because he knows that the suggestion that he just made is not true.

MR. ROBERTS: What?

MR. HICKMAN: Concerning the honourable gentleman from St. George's.

MR. ROBERTS: I know nothing to be untrue and everything to be true, his actions support it.

MR. HICKMAN: I am sure that any other honourable gentleman sitting on his own side of the House agrees with me when I say that that was a knowingly cruel and unparliamentary comment.

MR. HICKEY: Typical.

MR. HICKMAN: And so it was.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

I have already ruled on this point of order, and the remarks of the honourable Member for St. George's are basically not relevant, although I have respected his right to say them because he was the person for whom the remarks were made in the first instance. Whether the remarks are unparliamentary or not, I am not quite sure. I think they might basically be a difference of opinion between two honourable members. They may or may not be that. It matters little really whether the remarks are parliamentary or unparliamentary. They are certainly unbecoming of any member. But, I would hear argument as to whether or not they are parliamentary, and at that time will make up my mind on it. I am not prepared to do so at this time however.

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

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: There is no point of order.

MR. MORGAN: There is a point of order. I am standing on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the point of order is this, that no honourable member of this House of Assembly shall knowingly insult and make derogatory comments about another honourable member of this Assembly. The honourable gentleman from White Bay North did make derogatory comments about the honourable gentleman from St. George's, insulting comments to the point that he was casting insinuations that the honourable gentleman from St. George's was drunk in the House of Assembly-

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - which are not true.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

I wonder if the honourable member would permit. We are nearing six o'clock. Since this matter has become one on which honourable members do not wish to let it go by and ignore the matter, I will have to make a decision on it, but I will have to listen -

MR. ROBERTS: You made a ruling.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

I will have to make a decision on the tapes. There is further argument on it. I will listen to the tapes tomorrow and make a ruling at the first possible time.

I do believe now that it is six o'clock, and I leave the Chair until three o'clock tomorrow.

MR. ROBERTS: There is no motion, you cannot leave.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Very good. We will entertain a motion.

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

On motion that the House at its rising do now adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 6, at three of the clock.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

APRIL 30 AND MAY 5, 1975

APR 30 1975

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Energy, in reply to the Question No. 46 (Mr. Neary, Bell Island) Order Paper dated 24th April, 1975

QUESTION 1 (1) Are any contracts or agreements or any payments made by the Department of Mines and Energy during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974, to date, to Cabot Group 4 Limited?

ANSWER 1 (1) No payments made to above mentioned company in fiscal year 1973-74.

(2) If the answer to (1) above is affirmative, what was the total amount paid to said Company for any work done?

(2) Not applicable.

(3) If the answer to (1) above is affirmative what was the total amount paid, or to be paid, to said Company?

(3) Not applicable.

(4) Were public tenders called for this work and, if so, on what basis were contracts awarded for this work?

(4) Not applicable.

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 48 ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE  
MEMBER FOR BELL ISLAND ON ORDER PAPER DATED  
APRIL 24, 1975

---

MAY 5 1975

QUESTION

- (1) Are any contracts or agreements or any payments made by the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974 to date to Cabot Group 4 Limited?

ANSWER

No contracts, agreements or payments were made by the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations to Cabot Group 4 Limited during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974 to date.

## Contents

May 5, 1975	Page
<b>Statements by Ministers</b>	
Mr. Rousseau detailed actions relating to refurbishing of the Forest Fire Air Fleet as carried out by Field Aviation under a Federal-Provincial agreement and subsequent press coverage.	5965
Mr. Roberts commented.	5976
Mr. Rousseau announced the appointment of Thomas B. Grandy as Director of Communications.	5977
<b>Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given</b>	
Mr. Maynard tabled the answer to Question No. 48 placed on the Order Paper of April 24, 1975 by Mr. Neary.	5978
<b>Oral Questions</b>	
Query concerning the situation at the Labrador Linerboard mill in Stephenville, the number of shut-downs scheduled, the possibility of permanent layoffs, and what government action is planned to remedy the situation. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	5979
Situation at the North Star Cement plant in Corner Brook. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores, Mr. Doody.	5980
Situation with Atlantic Gypsum. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	5982
Request for information on plans of Price (Nfld.) and its Grand Falls mill. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	5982
Query as to when the Government will bring in a program to replace the cancelled Mothers' Allowance. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	5982
Query as to when the appropriate time will be for such an announcement. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	5982
Report sought on the strike of employees of Newfoundland Liquor Commission. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	5983
Query as to whether any clubs or taverns have run out of liquor. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	5984
Query as to whether a site has been selected for the facilities for the Summer Games. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doyle.	5984
Query as to whether the minister would be advised of the site by federal authorities. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doyle.	5985
Assurance sought that the Government's tendering procedure will be followed in awarding of contracts connected with the Summer Games. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doyle	5985
Information sought on reports of a news blackout imposed on the <u>Norma and Gladys</u> project. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	5985
Query as to ministerial awareness that the owner of the shipyard at Clarenville where the <u>Norma and Gladys</u> is being refurbished stated there is a news blackout. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	5986
Request for a tour of the <u>Norma and Gladys</u> by newsmen and photographers. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	5986
Query as to how the project could be damaged by a press tour. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	5986
Clarification sought as to whether the minister said he would not permit a press tour. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	5987



Contents - 2

Oral Questions (Continued)

Information sought on the locations for ten Tourism information plazas. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	5987
Rehabilitation of the Lower Battery. Mr. Neary, Mr. Peckford.	5987
Possibility of having the Lower Battery designated under the National Historic Sites Program. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	5988
Query concerning design work for the Conne River Bridge. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Rousseau.	5989

Privilege of the House

Mr. Speaker ruled on the question of privilege raised May 2, 1975 by Mr. Simmons who had contended Premier Moores breached the privilege of the House by misleading the legislature concerning a letter written to the Canadian Radio-Television Commission dealing with cable television in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker ruled that a prima facie case had not been established.	5989
--	------

Orders of the Day

First reading of a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The City Of St. John's Act," ordered read a second time on tomorrow.	5990
--	------

First reading of a bill, "An Act To Impose Taxes On Income From Mining Operations Within The Province And On Income Obtained Or Derived From Persons Holding Rights To Mine," ordered read a second time on tomorrow.	5990
---	------

Address in Reply To The Speech From The Throne (Amendment moved previously by the Member for Labrador North)

Mr. Simmons (continued)	5990
Mr. Roberts	6002
Mr. Roberts adjourned the debate.	6023

The House rose at 1:00 P.M. 6023

The House resumed at 3:00 P.M. 6024

Address in Reply (To the amendment)

Mr. Roberts (continued)	6024
Mr. Hickey	6052
The amendment was put and defeated on division.	6065

By leave Mr. Hickman tabled the report of the committee appointed pursuant to Standing Order 84 (a) to prepare and report a list of members to compose the Standing Committees of the House. 6065

Address In Reply To The Speech From The Throne. (continued) 6066

Mr. Martin	6066
Mr. Roberts	6076

Point of Order: Raised by Mr. Dunphy objecting to Mr. Roberts' statements that the Member for St. George's was intoxicated. 6117

Spoken to by Mr. Roberts, Mr. Hickman. 6117

Mr. Speaker heard argument as to whether the language used was parliamentary and took the matter under advisement. 6119

Adjournment

6119