



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 7

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1974**

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL**

February 11, 1974, Tape 146, Page 1 -- apb

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

PETITIONS:

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

HON. L.D.BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave at this time to present a petition on behalf of the people of Parker's Cove in the District of Placentia West. Their petition is a request for a new water system. Mr. Speaker, on meeting with them this weekend, these people made it clear that they were satisfied with the money that they had received in the past year in an attempt to fix up the water system that they had carried over from the previous administration but finally it became apparent this winter, with waterlines freezing up again, that the existing system could not take any more patching and something had to be done. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island:

MR. S.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the petition on behalf of the residents of Parker's Cove in the District of Placentia West, to have their water system improved.

Sir, I might suggest to the minister when he is discussing this with his colleagues, that it might be a good idea if the government took a good, hard look at a new technique that they are developing over in England for sewer systems for small communities. They are developing a sewerage system now for communities of thirty, forty, fifty, one hundred families and it seems to be very successful. I think this is one of the big problems that we have in Newfoundland, in places like Parker's Cove, where it may not seem feasible at the moment to install water and sewerage. I think with this new technique that it will be possible to install water and sewerage at the same time in these smaller communities. I also hope, Sir, that the people of Parker's Cove do get their improved water system this year.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I have a further petition I would like to present on behalf of the people of Spanish Room and Rock Harbour in the District of Placentia West. Their petition is to the effect (it is lengthily worded) that they request that the four mile stretch of road leading from the Burin Peninsula Highway down through Spanish Room and on to Rock Harbour be upgraded and paved sometime in the near future.

Here I point out that in many communities, not just in Spanish Room and Rock Harbour but in other communities in my district, the workers in these communities do a lot of commuting from their homes in these communities to places of employment in Marystown, Burin and so on. It would be a definite advantage to them if the roads were upgraded. Of course our government is aware of this and over the past several years, as the petition points out, there has been over \$50,000 allocated for this road but because it was in such poor condition that did not go very far. There are improvements here, Mr. Speaker, and basically what these people are asking is to see if we can speed up these upgrading moves as the budget allows.

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

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the petition presented to the House by the honourable member for Placentia West. I do so particularly as I know the road quite well, especially the road from Rock Harbour to Marystown which is part of the road which the honourable member mentioned. As I was once a resident of Rock Harbour for two years, I have walked this road many times. I believe the distance from Rock Harbour to Marystown was, at that time, ten miles. I think the road the gentleman is indicating right now is about four to five miles. Of course, it is a road that I was over, I think it was last summer. I drove out over there and it is in very poor condition especially when you consider that these people from Rock Harbour and Spanish Room have to commute on a daily basis to Marystown. I think at least eighty per cent of the workers do because they find employment in the area of Marystown. So, we on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, gladly support this petition and we are quite sure that with the new DREE agreement this will enable the department to find money to have this undertaking carried out this year.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, before we do reports of standing and select committees - I am not quite sure if this is in order but I think I will be pardoned if I went out of order in saying that we on our side would like to say how pleased we are to see the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations back with us in the House, hirsutely adorned as he is, that we genuinely welcome him back and we look forward to having him participate in the debates and taking part in the work of the House. I am sure the government do to. I am sure that they will be much the better because of his return to his desk. We are delighted to see him back.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS:

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to move the following resolution seconded by

my honourable friend the member for Bell Island:

WHEREAS serious questions have been raised in this honourable House concerning the circumstances surrounding the dissolution of the Thirty-Fifth General Assembly;

BE IT RESOLVED: That this House directs the government to appoint forthwith a commission of enquiry to investigate the circumstances surrounding the dissolution of the Thirty-Fifth General Assembly of the House of Assembly with particular reference to the role of Mr. William P. Saunders, former member for the electoral district of Bay de Verde in connection with such dissolution and that all hearings of such commission of enquiry be open to the public and that such commission of enquiry be directed to report to the government without undue delay and that the report of such commission of enquiry to the government be tabled in this honourable House or released to the public at the earliest opportunity following its receipt by the government.

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

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

HON. LEO D. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question no. 391 asked by the honourable member for Bonavista North in the last session, which I would like to file. The reply is fairly lengthy.

I also have the answer to question -

MR. NEARY: A point of order. The questions on last year's Order Paper are finished now. They are over and done with, are they not?

MR. BARRY: He does not want the information. That is fine.

MR. NEARY: We wanted it a year ago. We do not want it now.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order raised by the honourable member for Bell Island is quite in order. It is understood, I think, that all questions on the previous Order Papers die when prorogation takes place.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question, a rather

urgent matter, to the Minister of Public Works. Would the minister indicate to the house what steps his department has taken to correct fire hazards in Confederation Building as reported by the fire commissioner late last fall?

MR. J.G. ROUSSEAU (MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SERVICES): You will have to excuse my voice. It is still not very good. It will be about a week to ten days before I get back at full force but at least it is there and it is better, thank God.

Thank you very much, first of all, if I may, for the kind words from across the House. I hope the same kind words would be passed along with such graciousness at the end of this session of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is equal to the perennial daily news question. There was a study taken after the allegation made by the fire commissioner. Presently, the whole question of the fire safety and hazards that accompany it in the Confederation Building is a subject that is being studied by the Federal Bureau Management Committee and which is studying the need for expanded space in the Confederation Building area. That will be a part of the study. It is an on-going part of the study. Indeed we have had some preliminary reports that could be done. It is going to be done. It is not an easy job. It is a job when you get roasted and I accept that, where you just do not do something and change a building around in a matter of months. It is being looked at. I can assure this honourable House that what can be done will be done. It is a subject of current discussion with the Bureau Management Committee, who are now studying the enlarged facilities at the Confederation Building site.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I direct a question to the Hon. Premier? Would the Hon. Premier indicate to the House whether it is the intention of his government to proceed with the construction of a new provincial building or extend Confederation Building, as was indicated two years ago by the Hon. Premier?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I think probably that question would be more appropriate for the Order Paper. The reply is that no decisions have been made at this time. When they are, this House will be advised.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Would the Hon. Premier indicate to the House if the leases that are being entered into with companies like Trizec are long-term leases or short-term leases, in view

of the fact that the government have not yet taken a decision to build a new building to expand Confederation Building?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, at the present time there are no leases.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Energy. Would the minister indicate to the House if the government have received a petition from residents of Central Newfoundland, concerning public hearings on a request by the Newfoundland Light and Power Company for a rate increase? If so, what does the government intend to do about this matter?

HON. L. D. BARRY (Minister of Mines and Energy): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any petition having been received. It would be highly unusual for government to get involved in the hearing which is being held before an independent tribunal, the Public Utilities Board, in which hearing a decision has already been brought down, or did not the honourable member know?

MR. NEARY: That is not the point, Mr. Speaker.

The prayer of the petition asks to have the decision set aside until such time as proper publicity is given to the hearings.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

The Hon. member for Bell Island seems to be making a speech. I would request him to state his question.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will ask the honourable minister if he is aware that the public hearings on this question were not publicized well enough in Central Newfoundland. This is why they are asking to have the new rates set aside.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, this is a government that operates according to law, not according to whim or capriciousness as past governments have. By law a hearing is supposed to be publicized and if this hearing were not publicized, then it is the right of any citizen to apply and to state that the hearing is not carried out pursuant to law. To my knowledge, I have not received any information that proper publicity was not given to these hearings. I have not received a copy of the



petition to which the honourable member refers. I can only say that if the citizens of this community or any other community feel that something is not being carried out by law, then they do not have to rely upon government interference in the hearings, an independent tribunal or government favoritism or patronage or anything else, they have rights in law, and this government will see that they are upheld.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to cause any undue stress or strain on the Hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. I wonder if the minister could inform the House if his department has received complaints from the St. Lawrence Workers' Protective Union, charging Alcan, Newfluor, St. Lawrence with unfair labour practices.

MR. SPEAKER: I think this is a question which could really be placed on the Order Paper. It is not one that requires an immediate answer

MR. P. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable the Premier, Could the Premier inform this House what percentage of the cost of gear lost by the fishermen on the northeast coast in 1973 will the government be paying? It is an urgent matter. They want to know right now.

MR. F. MOORES, PREMIER: Mr. Speaker, I will take notice of the question.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education on Wednesday promised to get an answer to my colleague the member for White Bay South in connection with DREE funds for schools, I wonder if the minister has the answer to that question now?

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER, Minister of Education: The question was the government's policy with respect to DREE schools in general, that was the question.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I could remind, if I am allowed, I could read the question to the honourable Minister if he would give me leave to do so.

This is coming from the member for White Bay South; "I would like to direct a question to the honourable Minister of Education: Would the minister inform the House whether he or any of his colleagues have entered into negotiations with Dree, any officials of the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion to have the specifications or standards of what is known as DREE schools lowered to the point where it becomes viable economically for this province to support and maintain the schools?"

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I will answer that question and one related to it, asked I believe a day or two after it, with respect to DREE schools in general.

The recent agreement signed between the provincial and federal government makes specific reference to human resource development. Part of the preamble reads, "Whereas the province wishes to develop its human resources to their fullest potential in a manner which will allow the people of Newfoundland to develop their

personal excellence within the framework of the distinctive quality of life in Newfoundland..." There was explicit reference to human resource development in that agreement.

The agreement emphasizes the need for economic and socio-economic development through the identification and implementation of development opportunities. It appears that the emphasis is for the preparation of persons for anticipated job opportunities.

In other words, within the agreement and the wording of the agreement, certainly there is an emphasis in human resource development in the areas of vocational, technical, in which I include fisheries education.

Now with respect to the day-school system, there is no specific reference in the general agreement to the day-school system. The agreement is of course for a ten year period and is open for review or amendment on a yearly basis.

The information which the department now has would establish that not only in terms of capital costs, in terms of construction, but in terms of operating costs which are on a continuing basis. The cost not only to government but to school boards is very considerably more for these schools than for other modern schools built outside the programme.

There is no evidence to indicate that the quality of education in the DREE schools is any better than the quality of education in the new and excellent schools, but less costly in terms of construction and in terms of operation. That there is any correlation between the increased costs both in capital and in continuing expenses and operation expenses, there is no evidence to indicate that.

We are therefore reviewing the whole area in terms of day schools with respect to the DREE agreement and in the light of that review and in the light of the information we shall have which schools which were agreed to in the amendment of last year. When that data is finalized, then we shall be in a much better position when a review or an opportunity for amendment comes up in a year's time to

February 11, 1974

Tape NO. 149

NM - 3

see what the position is there.

We intend now, at present, to push for

federal provincial co-operation in the area of vocational and technical and fisheries education. When the opportunity comes up in a year's time, then we will know. In light of the schools agreed to last year which are not yet constructed, we will be in a much better position to see whether that disparity and costs not only the one shot capital cost but the continuing year after year operational costs whether that is justified.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. So the minister is saying that he does have that and he does have proof and evidence suggesting that the maintenance cost and construction cost of the DREE schools are much higher than that for day schools. Is that correct? A further supplementary question. Is the minister prepared to table such data and proof, Mr. Speaker?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly willing to make it available in the House. It can be either tabled or it can be brought up and discussed during the estimates of the department. I am certainly willing to make it available to the House, no doubt.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Hon. the Premier. According to Standing Rules on page 22, Your Honour, I refer you to it. "That the facts on which a question is based may be briefly set out - provided the member so doing makes himself responsible for their accuracy -".

It was my understanding in answer to a question, Sir, last Thursday, that the Premier indicated that no DREE money would be sought for educational purposes, which seems a contradiction to the Minister of Education's answer to a question on the day before. Could he qualify that please?

MR. MOORES: I am sorry that the honourable the member for St. Barbe North did not - I realized at that time I was talking about it in the true academic sense as we have known it. As the Minister of Education has hopefully explained it to his satisfaction, he now knows the difference of the two emphases that we as a government have taken regarding the DREE expenditures.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works and Services. I would like to ask the minister if his colleague, the President of the Council, has given him any information regarding his taking notice of a number of questions concerning Mount Scio House that were raised in the House last week and the minister undertook to get the answers to these questions. If the minister does not have the answers would he undertake to get them as soon as possible?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I gave an undertaking last year and I understand that the word of a member of this House is behind it. I said during the four-day sitting last year that when the information was available, that any participation of my department in Mount Scio Road would be made available to the House. I made that to the honourable Leader of the Opposition. I made that to the honourable member for Bell Island. The Premier also made that same statement. And I can assure the gentleman that when the information is available it will be made available.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable minister would have no way of knowing that the matter came up last week in the House. A number of questions were put to the Acting Minister of Public Works who said that he would get the information and bring it back to the House this week. So I know the honourable minister does not know them.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I stand again and say that when there is information available, I have made an undertaking as a member of this House, I would hope that my word is satisfaction that when there is information that I feel is necessary for the House, if there is some information that has some depth in it, one that has some depth into it or something that I can prepare then certainly it will be done. Right now I am not in the position to release any information because I do not have any. I would caution members that possibly they are building up their hopes too much on what might be available.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, regarding to the question last week I understand even though I was not here at the time that the Acting Minister

of Public Works at the time said that - when I returned to the House that the question would be asked. It will be answered in detail very shortly but as it stands right now, Mr. Speaker, I undertook to say what the conditions would be as I understood them. I do think it is of great public interest but I do not think it is a matter for this House but I will gladly furnish that information.

The fact is that the house is being rented to me by Memorial University, the Administration of Memorial, at a rent of \$500. per month, unfurnished plus \$140 for light and heat, for a total of \$640 per month for the unfurnished house. The Department of Public Works - the honourable the member for White Bay South said his cost that, so I am delighted. I hope they are in the same name.

Mr. Speaker, having said that the Department of Public Works

will not be bearing any cost, renovations to the house. The university are paying normal costs and anything over and above the refurbishing of the house itself is for my personal account. They are paying the normal cost as they do for any other building under their auspices and I am sure the information is available from the President of the University, upon request. But there is no payment of public funds from Public Works whatsoever.

Regarding my position, I offered the university to actually buy the house at an appraised value, with an option to re-buy it back at the same cost, over a five year period. They saw fit not to accept that offer.

When the total detail comes forward and I have it, Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to make it available to the House, as I will at that time, if this is going to be a personal session, a great deal of other things that affect possibly a few people who do not want to be affected.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question to the Hon. the Premier: The President of the Council indicated that the Public Works workers were doing the renovations at Mount Scio house and the Premier now more or less contradicted that and said that the Memorial University were at least paying for the renovations. I wonder if the Premier could clarify that a little further because -

MR. MOORES: A great many of the Memorial University buildings are the property of the government, Mr. Speaker.

I understand and I will get the detail on this, that there are people from Public Works doing work on behalf of the university but it is the repainting of the place when it was vacated after the years of occupancy and the university is paying the cost of it and not the Department of Public Works for that function.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Could the Hon. Premier then inform the House as to what the estimated cost of these renovations are going to be?



MR. MOORES: I have no idea, Mr. Speaker, but I am sure the university has that information and if the honourable member from Bell Island approaches the administration he will get it the same as any other information about the university. It seems because I happen to be the occupant of that house, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member has a very real interest in it. I think it is typical of the personal approach that the Opposition have taken for a long, long while. I think it is typical of political expediency, the honourable member from Bell Island particularly and I do not think, Sir, we can in the future expect any better than we did in the first.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, may I remind the Premier that it is the taxpayers money that is involved in this house.

MR. MOORES: Where? Where?

MR. NEARY: The taxpayers of this Province are paying for the renovations. Mr. Speaker, two further supplementary questions for the Hon. Premier rising out of his answer: (1) Would the Premier indicate to the House if snow-clearing, security and gardening are involved in that \$140.00 a month, heating and lighting and so forth? (2) Would the Premier also indicate to the House if the lease is a long term one or a short term one, is it a regular lease?

MR. MOORES: The lease is a regular lease, Mr. Speaker, month to month.

MR. NEARY: Month to month, that is good.

MR. MOORES: That is the same as an ordinary lease, yes.

MR. NEARY: That is good.

MR. MOORES: The snow-clearing and gardening, Mr. Speaker, is not in the accounts that I provided. As a matter of fact I am not even sure; the grounds and the area, I think is a Pippy Park responsibility, I am not sure about that, but if it is my responsibility I shall look after it, and I hope the member from Bell Island does the same thing with his own funds.

MR. NEARY: I do. I do. I look after mine quite well with my own funds, not with the taxpayers money.

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

MR. MOORES: Who pays him? The tax .... (inaudible)

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

I have noted in the past, - Order, please! Order, please!  
I have noted that in the past few days that when in the position held by me, when the Speaker calls order several members on both sides of the House insist on making comments and speaking after I have done that,

I am sure that they are aware that they are not suppose, not allowed by the rules to do that and in future I ask them to adhere to this particular rule, otherwise they shall have to be ruled out of order and maybe further action taken.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition adjourned the debate last night.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, let me say what a pleasure it is to carry on again in this. I have only a few more points I wish to make in this initial round of the debate. I am anxious to get them done in a hurry because my colleagues tell me that the speaker who is to follow me is the gentleman from St. John's East, the House Leader and I am looking forward to that. I gather from no less than two of my colleagues that the gentleman is building a very strong personal attack upon me and I am, naturally, most anxious to hear this. Apparently he has something up his sleeve that is of the utmost embarrassment. One of my colleagues in fact told me that it was even worse than last year. I quiver, I am shivering in my boots, I have my resignation written out, almost like Mr. Saunders had his written out and I am really anticipating with great delight the contribution from the gentleman from St. John's East.

He will have to bear with me for a little while, Mr. Speaker, because there are still one or two preliminary points I want to make with respect to this Throne Speech, the debate on the Address in Reply. If the gentleman from St. John's East would contain himself and restrain himself he will have his day and he will have the same opportunity to speak as does any other honourable member. I say to him now that I will not be able to hear him if he speaks tomorrow because I, sometime ago, made an arrangement to go to the West Coast tomorrow. Perhaps he could wait until Thursday because I would very much like the pleasure of hearing his contribution. It will be the first contribution he has ever made to a debate in this House. It will be very worthwhile and I would anxiously anticipate it and very much look forward to it. I am particularly interested in this embarrassing personal revelation and I anticipate this with great eagerness. I may add, for his delectation as well, that since he attacked my father last year, my father will be away. He is leaving Newfoundland, I believe, tomorrow, for about a month, so perhaps the honourable gentleman could hurry and get his attack in before my father is gone away and cannot even speak in his own defence.

MR. CROSBIE: Get on with the speech.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker,

MR. W.N. ROWE: What is wrong with old "Crusty?"

MR. CROSBIE: I have not even spoken yet and he is getting on with all this foolishness. (Remainder inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: That is fine! He has already distinguished himself in this line and I am merely saying that I hope he will get on with it. I am eagerly anticipating his contribution.

Now, Sir, let me also say that I am most disappointed but not surprised by the lack of response (including the gentleman from St. John's West, who as always could not restrain the urge to say a few hundred ill-chosen words) the lack of response to my quite serious invitation that the government institute an enquiry into the somewhat mysterious events surrounding the resignation of the former member for Bay de Verde, Mr. William P. Saunders.

AN HON. MEMBER: The honourable member is living in the past.

AN HON. MEMBER: Paranoid.

MR. ROBERTS: One says that I am living in the past, another says: "Paranoid," I do not think either of those is true. I think what I am beginning, Sir, in my naivety to feel is that we may be on the verge of seeing a group of men trying to hide something. If they do not - they can laugh and they can jeer and they can say whatever they want, they can smirk and they can do as they wish but every honourable gentleman opposite, Mr. Speaker, will have to decide for himself whether on the facts that I presented the other day there is a case for enquiry. The people of Newfoundland have made up their minds. I do not think there is any doubt, any doubt at all that all the people of this province, and the speech was quite well reported, are anxious to see the matter gone into because they feel that on the facts presented, not one of which has been rebutted to any degree by any man, be it Mr. Saunders himself who I gather has declined to make any comment on the mysterious events or any honourable gentleman opposite, not one of these facts has been rebutted, not one has even been

questioned. I would submit, Sir, that the people of Newfoundland expect an enquiry, an impartial, a public and a full one. If they do not get it every honourable gentleman opposite will have to answer to his own conscience. He will have the opportunity as well Sir, I assure you, at some point, to record his vote on that so it will stand as a matter of record whether honourable gentlemen opposite were for or against an impartial and an independent investigation. I say now, Mr. Speaker, that if this government do not investigate this matter then they are guilty of trying to hide something and the people of Newfoundland will judge them accordingly.

I hope that they will set up an investigation and if they have nothing to fear they will do it. If they do not do it, Sir, it follows that they must have something to fear, someone, some, many, some, all have something to fear. Each of them can judge for himself, Sir. Every honourable member opposite is in the same position as every honourable member on this side and that is that he must answer to himself and to his constituents for what he does. There is no such thing as a secret session in the parliamentary system. The only times they have ever been used are during war-time.

There is no such thing as a secret session. There is no such thing as a secret vote. Honourable gentlemen opposite, whether it be on the resolution proposed today or notice which was given today by my friend and colleague the gentleman from White Bay South, honourable gentlemen opposite will have the opportunity to stand in their place at the appropriate time and record an "aye" or a "nay" as to whether or not they want this matter investigated.

I have no doubt the people of Newfoundland want it investigated. Indeed I think the people of Newfoundland have probably largely made up their mind as to what happened. I suspect they made up their minds long before I raised the matter. Now that it is raised again I think they would like to know the truth, so would I.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Finance does not want it investigated.

MR. NEARY: Why I wonder?

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Finance will have to answer for himself as best he can. I find it amusing though, Mr. Speaker, in an ironical way, the gentlemen opposite who are such relentless - "Witch Hunt Willie" for example as one of the gentlemen opposite is sometimes referred to, the gentlemen opposite who are such relentless probers into alleged and perhaps actual misdeeds of the past, be it last week, last month or twenty-three years ago, are not quite as tender when it comes to investigating events of a year past or a year and a half past.

Well, Sir, the truth is the truth and wrong is wrong and it

does not matter what point in time it occurred, it should be exposed and it should be dealt with. Honourable gentlemen opposite will have to answer if they do not deal with it. I invite them to deal with it and to deal with it honourably and to deal with it as men and the only honourable way to deal with this, Sir, is to appoint an independent enquiry, a commissioner under the act, and to have out the facts and get out the facts.

I have more information that I would gladly give to any commissioner. I do not wish to bring it up in the House because it is highly prejudicial but I would gladly give it to an impartial commissioner appointed to enquire into the matter and with the authority to subpoena such things as bank records, such things as income tax records within whatever limits are prescribed by law, to look into all of the events. I would gladly give this information, Mr. Speaker, to a judge of the Supreme Court or some such person appointed to look into it and he could then deal with it as he saw proper and saw fit.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to bring it out now even though I am protected by the parliamentary privilege because to do so would be unfair. Much of the information I have of necessity of that type, this later type information, falls into the category of hearsay or second hand evidence but, as I say, it would certainly be the sort of thing a Royal Commission could go into. Certainly it is at least as substantial as any evidence presented initially to the honourable Mr. O'Dea when he had his Royal Commission, the one we used to hear so much about but have not heard of recently.

MR. NEARY: Nor the Ruth Thompson Enquiry.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the Ruth Thompson Enquiry was hearsay in most cases -

MR. WM. ROWE: And violation of privilege in others.

MR. ROBERTS: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to go on with that. There will be other opportunities in this session and if the government do not deal with it, if they do not do the honourable thing, if they



do not appear to be men who seek the truth, and who do not fear the truth, then there will be other opportunities here and in other places to deal with it.

Let me say a few words now, Sir, about the question of the flag and I am glad that the Minister of Tourism is in his seat, because he is the gentleman who has sinned so grievously when it comes to the questions of a flag for this province. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am as prepared as the next man to welcome a new flag for this province. It is not a question of having a flag as Mr. Albert Perlin has told us a number of times in comments in "Wayfarer", the column which he writes in "The Daily News" and has been writing I think for more than fifty years.

We have a national flag in Newfoundland. We have had one for some time. The legislation which the honourable gentleman in due course will bring in, the Minister of Tourism, I assume and suspect will have to include an amendment to or a removal of the present legislation, in addition to legislation establishing the new flag. I welcome it. I am prepared to say it is a good thing. I am prepared to say we should have such a flag in Newfoundland. I do not think it matters a hoot when compared to the problems of Newfoundland.

It is going to do nothing to find jobs for those 27,000 people who are out of work. It is going to do nothing to give us roads and pavement down in Placentia West. It is going to do nothing to give us water and sewer systems. It is going to do nothing to help to house those who do not have good housing. It is going to do nothing to help the school boards that are on the verge of bankruptcy. It is going to do damn little for damn all, if the truth were known.

The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, the government have chosen to make it a priority. It is one of the biggest things they have accomplished and so we must deal with it on that ground.

Mr. Speaker, if we must deal with it, I very genuinely regret and in this I am as at least as sincere as the Minister of Justice is when he tells us how sincere he is. I quite genuinely regret, I am quite sincere, I am oozing it, the way the minister oozes,



MR. HICKMAN: I watched you ooze on Friday.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman had reason to watch me ooze on Friday and I would like nothing better than to see him ooze his signature onto a commission to one of Her Majesty's judges. Nothing would impress me more. If the honourable gentleman is as honest as I believe him to be, and is half the man that many people claim him to be, then he will sign that document.

MR. NEARY: Or be guilty by association.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the flag should not be a partisan political issue and I fear that the present Minister of Tourism is doing his very best to make it a partisan issue whether he is doing it intentionally and knowingly or deliberately or not. His course of action throughout has been most unfortunate and I stand here today to appeal to him not to make it a partisan issue, not to allow it to become a political issue. We saw that across Canada.

Mr. Pierson made what I believe to be the tactical error of unveiling a flag design outside the House. The Heavens fell in. The Tory Party of Ottawa, of Canada, spent months filibustering in the House of Commons; for months the whole business of Canada was held up while the great flag debate went on and eventually a select committee was appointed. The Chairman was a Newfoundland member of Parliament, Mr. Herman Batton, who was then the member for Humber St. George and St. Barbe and the select committee comprising representatives of all parties in the House of Commons, sifted through I do not know several hundred designs and eventually made a recommendation, which recommendation was accepted unanimously; unanimously by the committee I believe, it certainly was not by the House of Commons. I do not think Mr. Diefendbaker has accepted it even yet. Maybe some of his party are with him on that point; and it has become a Canadian Flag.

I think that is what we should do in Newfoundland. I think it is most unfortunate that the Minister of Tourism, who can be pardoned because he does not know much about parliamentary procedure, and I do not

think he has much of a feel for the House of Assembly and for the traditions it represents. I think it is most unfortunate that he should chose to unveil this flag and try to make it a partisan issue. He made the initial mistake of announcing it will be pushed through the House and I expect any day now to see the National Flag Act, whatever it is to be called, the Newfoundland Flag Act, to come bustling into the House and be trundled along through the Order Paper as quickly as possible, so that on midnight on March 31, the minister can unveil it or whatever you do with a flag, unfurl it.

I think that is wrong. I would like very much to see, if we are to have a flag, and it is not my decision to have a flag, if I were leading a government, the flag would not be high on our priorities. It has nothing to do with feeding people who are hungry or helping the school boards or doing anything about unemployment or doing anything about the cost of living or doing anything about the hundrds of things that need to be dealt with in this country today.

I would like to see a select committee set up, instead of the government bringing in a design which by its nature will be partisan, and I may add a design which judging from the letters in the press has won far less favour than it has condemnation and because the letters to the press have been more against it than for it, though the minister shakes his head. Maybe he has some high-price staff member keeping track of them, I do not. The letters, as I read them, have been far more against the flag design than for it.

What he should do is bring it in, bring in a motion to set up a committee, give them a deadline so we will not bog down and be here in July talking about what is to be the flag, give them a period of weeks. Any interested people can make submissions. The school children on Bell Island who sent in those two little designs last week could send in their designs and perhaps every school child in Newfoundland could and then let the committee decide. Now the minister shakes his head - he has made up his mind.

AN HON. MEMBER: I change my mind every day.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the honourable gentleman changes his mind every day. He has made public his design. He is getting designs every day. Well if they really want, Mr. Speaker, to involve

the people of Newfoundland in this twenty-fifth anniversary celebration. Let them be open minded and let them say to the people of Newfoundland, if you want a flag or we tell you you are going to have a flag, tell us what the design should be and let us see what comes in. Maybe the design the honourable gentleman trumpeted a fortnight or so ago will become the design. I do not know. Maybe it is the best. It is going to look like a dirty flour sack, I fear, when that white flap is hung and gets a little weather on it. Maybe it will be or maybe it will not be but that is not the point.

The point is that a symbol that should be above politics, that should be like the Crown and the Throne itself, above the day-to-day partisan debate, it is going to become a very partisan issue because the Minister of Tourism and the administration have made it such because they are treating it as of a Tory device instead of a Newfoundland device. It should not be Tory and it should not be Liberal. It should not be New Democratic Party. It should not be anything except a Newfoundland contest. If the minister were really being intelligent, he would get a panel of outside people to advise on it and to judge on it instead of whatever process went on. Whether it was he and the Premier or whether it was the minister alone or whether he drew straws or whether he threw them out of the eighth floor and the one that landed last got the prize it does not matter. Whatever process he got to come up with the design, he did. I think it is wrong.

All I can do now at this stage is stand here and say that I appeal to the government and to the minister. It may be the only thing he achieves in four years. Men have done less. One of the things that Lester Pearson did for Canada was to give us a flag. John Diefenbaker did less in five years as Prime Minister than that. I do not think it is an unworthy achievement. It may be the Minister of Tourism's only achievement during his only term of office. Fine! Let it be the achievement it should be. Let it be an noble act, an nonpartisan act, a Newfoundland act. Let it involve all of the people of Newfoundland. Let it not become the subject of partisan debate. That is what it must

become if it is treated the way it is proposed to treat it now.

The minister has made some mistakes, in my judgement. He has made some mistakes but they are not irretrievable. I think he has made them from good motives. I do not think he set out to make it a Tory design but the danger is there and I appeal to him now to back off and to announce that - maybe what he should say is that this is what the government were going to do all along. We would have to believe that. We would accept that, that they intend to have a select committee or they intend to have a panel of outside people who will invite designs from all over the province. Maybe they will get some perfectly horrible ones. Maybe they will get some better ones. I do not think the design that we have now been given is particularly good from any point of view. The Knights of Columbus have opposed it, I believe and written a very strong letter.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. W. ROWE: What is the matter with him?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, why should I not be concerned about them. They have written to me. The honourable gentleman thinks because I am a Protestant I have no concern for the Knights of Columbus. I had a letter today from the Bishop of St. George's, possibly the same letter as every honourable member. His Excellency, Bishop McGrath sent me a letter. Should I send it back to him and say, "Dear Bishop, Ank Murphy says since I am a Protestant I cannot talk to you." Do not be so stund "Ank". Even for you, that is beneath contempt.

The Knights of Colurbus, Mr. Speaker, were worried that this proposed design did not adequately reflect Newfoundland and Newfoundland's heritage, particularly the Irish Heritage. It should be of concern to a man with the name of Doyle which is not an old middle European name. But the Irish are an important element in our ethnic heritage, our heritage of the people. Perhaps they do not feel the Union Jack adequately represents their interests. I know many Irishmen who do not feel that the Union Jack represents their interests. I know many Newfoundlanders who feel the Union Jack does represent their interests.

There are many, I am sure, who feel that they would like to see something in addition to it, besides that.

So, I make the suggestion genuinely and positively. I put it forward in the hope that it will receive consideration. I think the minister would like this to be a proud monument to his name and that is a worthy ambition. I think he is genuinely concerned with trying to make it not something that becomes a partisan rag that is regarded by people of all parties as being identified with one party. Mr. Pearson nearly fell into that trap. Nearly but did not - he pulled back. We had the committee and out of that I think we got a better design. I think the red maple leaf with the two red bars is a far better flag to look at as a piece of design than would have been the original flag which, as the minister recalls, was two blue bars with a red maple leaf parked in between.

So, let him invite suggestions and let him turn over. If he does not want to turn over to the committee of the House, let us get three or four people who have an eye for colour and an eye for design and an eye for our history and let them advise the committee. I would like to see the selection made by a select committee of this House and I think perhaps it could be and I hope it could be a unanimous selection, not a political one, not Liberals versus Tories. I put that forth genuinely. I do not think it is the most important question confronting Newfoundland today but if we are to deal with it, then that is the way, in my view, we should deal with it. I urge the minister and I ask him to consider that and to discuss it with the appropriate people and possibly it is what the government had already made up their mind to do. If he is being a smart politician and they decide to do it, he will say that we had already made up our mind that that was that and we will do it that way. "It is what we had in mind all along." Yes, I think that is enough on that.

Mr. Speaker, let me, at the risk of raising the awesome ire and wrath of the Minister of Finance and even the Premier, say a few words about the energy issue. By the way, I have finally seen a letter, a

public voice raised in defence of the government's position. Friday's edition of the "Daily News" had in it, next to the funny section, next to the comics, a letter from a gentleman who spoke in defence of the government's position, a gentleman named Mr. Claude Dawe, a gentleman of considerable position in the community, a man of some substance and standing, a man who has taken a firm partisan stand. I believe he was the unsuccessful candidate for the Tory nomination in Port de Grave. I am not sure if he was anti-confederate or pro-confederate. He may have been pro-confederate. If Claude Dawe was, he has fallen away since then. He and Mr. Smallwood had quite a falling out. I have never heard the rights of both sides but I could tell one side but it would be highly scandalous and so I shall not.

MR. NEARY: Well, do not go too hard on him now because he is holding my mortgage on my house.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, there is a conflict of interest involving the gentleman from Bell Island, Mr. Sneaker, on this matter because his mortgage apparently is held by the company with which Mr. Dawe is associated. Mr. Dawe has raised his voice in defence. It is a lukewarm defence. He claims that Mr. Smallwood would have done the same thing. Claims, mind you. I am not so sure now if the Minister of Finance will not go and rewrite all those position papers on the sense of that.

MR. CRISBIE: Mr. Smallwood would never have thought of it. He was never prepared for these meetings in Ottawa.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Smallwood was never prepared for these meetings in Ottawa? Well, if he was not prepared I would take a thousand of his nonpreparations to the stand put on by the Minister of Finance and the Premier and whoever was in Ottawa last week. If that be preparation, then God grant us unpreparation

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who was it?

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know who was up there.

MR. NEARY: I know a couple of the civil servants that were up there from other parts of the province that had no connection with anything.



MR. ROBERTS: Well, that was just a free ride. The airplane was going anyway. When we get the list of passengers on the airplane we will know.

MR. NEARY: What were the drug clerks doing up on an energy conference?

MR. ROBERTS: Who knows. Maybe providing energy pep pills to the delegation.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make that statement because I had said on Friday - I had not seen the "Daily News" at that point - that no voice had been raised anywhere in this province publicly in defence of the government's energy position. Well, one has been raised publicly and it is Mr. Claude Dawe. Mr. Dawe is a man who speaks on his own merit. He signed his letter. He put his name to it. He is a frequent correspondent in the papers.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He lacks political sanction.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, he must lack political sanction, he could not even win a nomination. He had a bit of an unsuccessful try for the council here. I think he came about fifteenth or twentieth and only, of course, eight candidates were elected.

Anyway, he did raise his voice. Let it be recorded that on one side is Mr. Claude Dawe and the government and on the other side there is everybody else in Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the energy conference, as it developed, did not become an energy conference. It may have started out as one. I am not sure of that but it certainly did not end as one. It ended as a constitutional conference, as a conference that was going right to the heart - Mr. Speaker, I do not resent for a moment the Premier conferring with his colleague but could he either confer more quietly or outside the House because the Premier's voice is a very good one I am pleased to say and really maybe my ears are too good but I can hear every word. If the Minister of Health needs direction on some point, could he seek it elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, the energy conference became a constitutional question



a conference that was really debating one of the "gut" issues of Confederation, the federal/provincial relations as we know them in this province.

I think the position our province took was wrong and was contrary to the best interests of Newfoundland. I know what the Minister of Finance is going to say. I can hear his speech now. As a matter of fact if I were sufficiently hipped up I could probably duplicate his speech in some mean and poor way. I could see him being very grandiloquent and talk of handouts and beggars and then his intellectual baggage boy, the Minister of Energy, will carry the same argument out.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I thought that was not bad by the way "John". I thought it was very accurate as well.

MR. ROBERTS: Will carry it out and I can hear it now. I have heard them already that we somehow want -

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable member has heard nothing yet.

MR. ROBERTS: I can believe I have heard nothing yet. That we are going to Ottawa on bended knee and that we should beg from Ottawa - one can hear all the charges being rung right from point A to point Z and back again.

Well I will have to put up with that, just as I will have to put up with the continued references to offshore rights as if they somehow were relevant to the conference. There was no question of ownership. The Premier delivered himself of a great statement written for him on offshore rights.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): And underwhelmed everyone.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, that is a good phrase "underwhelmed" the entire conference. It was never an issue. Whether we own the oil or not has nothing to do with the Ottawa conference. It may have a great deal to do with the Government of Canada. The government are quite properly, in my view, pursuing this matter outside. I am glad they are now going to try and settle it by negotiations because I fear for us if we go to the courts. I think our case may not be as strong as it is sometimes painted.

Also, I do not think the Supreme Court would be biased, I think they would render the best judgment they could. There are nine men or however men here hear it.

But having read the British Columbia reference, I feel that there is a policy decision. It is a policy decision on offshore mineral resources, does not favour the provincial stand as opposed to the federal stand. I would commend that to the Premier as a thought when he helps to shape our strategy.

But in any event, Sir, the question of offshore resources was at best an oily herring. It was not an issue before the conference. The one issue before the conference as I followed the meeting and read about them, the one specific issue was, could Ottawa tax exports? The Premier gets very uptight about that. He has been going around making speeches saying they can tax our lumber and tax our fish and so forth. Well I do not pretend to be a constitutional expert, Sir, as I read the RNA Act Ottawa has the power to tax all exports because trade is a matter falling within the Government of Canada. If they had the right before they have it now and vice-versa, if they did not, they do not. I would suggest though, if the Premier thinks they do not, he will refer the matter or have a test case taken to the Supreme Courts. They are the people who will decide legal questions. If Mr. Lougheed does not feel that they have the right to tax exports, then Mr. Lougheed could go to the Supreme Court - I do not quite know what the Premier of Newfoundland is doing in political bed with the Premier of Alberta.

In any event, Sir, we also saw an attempt to drag in the question of cost of transmission. The Government of Canada, as I understand it from their public statements, have a well defined policy of sharing in the cost of transmission facilities. There are numerous precedents. There is the Beechwood Development precedent in New Brunswick, indeed in Newfoundland the Bay D'Espoir would not have been possible, the Bay D'Espoir Hydro system and the generating and transmission facilities are a part of it, had it not been for a grant of \$20 millions and a further \$4 million which came later for a conversion from fifty cycles

to sixty cycles. That money came from Ottawa and that is what made it possible.

Mr. Speaker, I do think we should have a quorum call please.

AN HON. MEMBER: Terrible. Terrible.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Clerk count the House please? There is a quorum.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am relieved to know that my count was wrong. Mr. Speaker, do I have the right to be -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, there was a much larger issue raised at Ottawa, a much larger issue than transmission costs or offshore resources or ownership of oil even if those things had come up. The issue that was raised at Ottawa was the question of what kind of Canada we want to see as between the - (Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman for Harbour Grace cannot be polite, at least he could be silent). Mr. Speaker, the issue raised at Ottawa was the issue of what kind of government we wish to see at Ottawa, with what kind of resources and what kind of powers as against what kind of governments we want to see in the provinces, with what types of financial resources and what types of powers to implement their policies.

This administration, Sir, have taken a direct anti-federal-government stand. They have done it consistently. They have done it as a matter of deliberate, studied, intentioned policy. I say it is wrong and I say it is against the best interest of Newfoundland. The obverse of that is not as they will claim, what they will tell you was a begging attitude to Ottawa was not an approach of handout: That is not the answer. They will attempt to say that is my position, but that merely shows the intellectual desperation and the lack of depth in their position.

Sir, this government, the Tory Government, have taken as a matter of studied policy, since they became the government they have taken two stands with relation to Ottawa both of them strongly and each of them directly contradicting the other. On the one hand they have their hands out. I hear the Minister of Justice saying he wants Ottawa to build

penitentiaries. I hear the Minister of Education saying, he used to say, he wanted Ottawa to help and build schools. The Minister of Tourism even wants Ottawa to finance the Twentieth-Fifth Celebrations and tells us we cannot say what it is going to cost because we do not know what Ottawa is going to cost. He made that statement in his very own voice. The Minister of Finance goes on and on about how he wants more money from Ottawa for this or for that. The Premier wants money from Ottawa for transmission on the Lower Churchill. The Minister of Industrial Development wants money. The Minister of Social Services wants money. They all want money from Ottawa.

Well and good. To hear this crowd talk the Government of the Province does nothing. Any ill that arises, Sir, should be solved by Ottawa. Any ill! They do not do anything. All they do is point out, be it something as simple as the Administration of Justice which is clearly within the British North America Act and that might not be the best constitution in the world, Mr. Speaker, but it has lasted for 107 years now, not too bad, There are not all that many constitutions that are that much older or were that much better. The Minister of Justice wants Ottawa to build our courtrooms for us and wants next to pay the magistrates and the staff in the courtrooms. What the devil are we going to end up with? Why are we going to have a Justice Department here? The Minister of Justice anytime a problem is raised goes, his instinctive response, he cannot get anywhere with his colleagues, he cannot persuade this administration that any money should be put aside for the administration of justice for discharging that responsible of this province, instead he runs to Ottawa.

I am all for co-operation. I am all for working from Ottawa. The other nine provinces are not up there trying to degut Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, let the honourable gentleman make his speech later if he should wish to

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my facts may not be correct, I do not know that, I am only relying on the minister's public statements. Whether they are facts or whether they are correct or not I cannot say. I have listened to this now for two years. I have listened to the Minister of Health go up to Ottawa - he is gone, I will say he is gone - go up to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker,

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I will not hear talk of integrity from the Minister of Social Services.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: That is like hearing about it from a bird.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: That is like an inmate of the bordello talking about virginity.

MR. MURPHY: .... guarantee you that.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health goes to Ottawa and says that we should have a Health Financing Plan and takes the side of Quebec and of Ontario against all the other provinces, provinces that are wealthy, that have access to great financial resources, that may have problems true but not the problems that we face in Newfoundland. Then they do it again on the energy crisis. Well

you cannot have it both ways, Sir, because the issue in Ottawa, the issue that was before the country two or three weeks ago when that conference met, the issue is still not there because it was not sold, it is whether the Government of Canada are going to have the resources to help the have-not provinces and we are a have-not province. Maybe we will not be five years from now if there is oil there in commercial quantities. 'If' and that is an "If." If they discover it and that is a big "IF" and if they decide to exploit it, that is a big "IF" and if they can get the technology to bring it ashore and to make use of it and that is a further "If" and is four "IF's" so far, Mr. Speaker. If it is there in commercial quantities, that has not been shown yet; if they discover it and that has not been done yet; if they get the technology to bring it ashore. and no where in the world is oil yet being tapped in the conditions that would have to be used in Newfoundland. The technology is still not present.

The North Sea is not the same, the Gulf of St. Lawrence is not the same, the three "If's," the four "If's:" If they decide to go ahead there is much oil in this world yet that is not being tapped. For one reason or another the Athabaskan Tar Sands in Alberta, perhaps the best example. There are billions of gallons of oil there that can be recovered, there is no technology difficulty, it is there in commercial quantities. They have discovered it, the technology is available but the economics are still against it though they may be marginal now with the increase in the cost of oil. Even if all those things come to pass we may then become a have province and like any Newfoundlander, I would to Heaven! that we could and I will be the first man to shout; Hosanna! when we do. Until we do, Sir, until we do we must deal with our fellow provinces, with the Government of this Country, the Government of Canada according to our own best interests and not according to some wild-eyed gamble of what may or may not happen twenty years from this day.



That is what the Premier did in Ottawa. It was the biggest sellout of Newfoundland's position since John Cabot only got ten pounds.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is all part of an attitude being taken by this government. They are seeking a scapegoat but what they are beginning to realize, they are beginning to realize what the people of Newfoundland have already realized, that this group of men cannot come to grips with the problems facing this country and do anything about them. They have been in office now for two years and have funk'd, they have backed away. This document, this Throne Speech is the most empty one - it is not even literate, it is as barren as the Funks. Barren as the Funks. Not only that, the Funks are covered with a certain substance and that is what that Speech is made of.

Mr. Speaker, they are trying to blame Ottawa. They are trying to blame Ottawa and they have it put about that Ottawa is somehow responsible for their failures to deal with the problems of this country. I hold no brief for Ottawa. Let the men in Ottawa speak for themselves no matter what side they belong to but I do want to see a confederation, Sir, that has a federal government with some resources, strong resources and I submit that is to Newfoundland's benefit. If it were not for Ottawa, if it were not for the equalization payments and the national programmes, the two great ways in which we get help, it would be a sorry place indeed, Sir. The problems that we have now pale into insignificance compared to what they would be if there were no medicare schemes where we are equalized up to the national average, nor no Canada Pension Plans, nor all of the other, the family allowances, the other great social security plans whereby Ottawa attempts to put into effect that basic principle of confederation, that basic principle that says that every Canadian has a right, is entitled to certain minimum standards of public services. Then equalization, \$150 millions or \$160 millions a year at current rate. What this crowd would have if their theory

was accepted was an Ottawa with no resources and provinces that were rich or poor according to whatever God may have given them and what they may have done with it. That is not the way confederation should work, Sir. It is not the way it has worked and it is not the way it should work. I do not care what they say or how they twist or distort those are the facts.

There was a commentator on the CBC here, Mr. Richard Butler, I do not know the gentleman but I am told that he is a professor in the Political Science Department, who I thought put it well. I have here a transcript of his remarks: On the vital issue of a national energy policy the Government of Newfoundland, in his view, has miscalculated badly and has adopted a position that is politically unworkable, economically unfair and for want of a more delicate term, just plain greedy.

The Premier has stated that Newfoundland intends to support Albert's position, namely, that natural resources belong to the provinces. (That cannot be quoted, that is a matter of law, clear law.) Thus all tax revenues from their sale and their export, and their export (and the Minister of Energy is now going to make a devastating point. Come ahead)

MR. BARRY: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I would be delighted.

MR. BARRY: Is there anything less in having ownership? Is it not a mere empty shell if we do not have the revenue from what we own?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if tomorrow were not Tuesday it would be Thursday a week past and that is the answer to the honourable gentleman's question which is a leading question in law. The owner of a property has the right to sell it for whatever he wishes. The owner of oil has the right to sell it for what he wishes.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Governments tax it.

MR. ROBERTS: Governments tax it. My friend from White Bay South owns a house, Mr. Speaker, municipalities tax, provinces tax, Ottawa taxes. Among the powers that Ottawa have to tax is the power to tax



exports. What Ottawa has done as I understand it is tax exports. Oil that goes out of the country.

MR. BARRY: Okay! Let us assume that Alberta just raises the well-head price.

MR. ROBERTS: Let us assume, Sir, the moon is made of green cheese.

MR. BARRY: Well they are doing that. They have done it as a matter of fact, has the honourable member not been reading the newspapers?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I also read in my newspapers that a gentleman from Nova Scotia, a gentleman who is surely as interested in the interests of his province as any Newfoundlander is in the interests of Newfoundland, and he says as does Mr. Hatfield, who happens to be a Progressive Conservative, the Premier of New Brunswick - How come we have seen a principle that has escaped all these other gentlemen? Can they be wrong and we be right?

MR. BARRY: We are thinking for ourselves.

MR. ROBERTS: We are thinking for ourselves and by God! it is pretty poor thinking, Sir. The problem is that we are thinking only of ourselves, we are not thinking of our own true interest.

MR. BARRY: The honourable member never answered my question though.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have answered the honourable gentleman's question.

MR. BARRY: What if Alberta takes all the revenue at the...

MR. ROBERTS: Alberta has the right, assuming it has not alienated the oil, of any owner, and the right of an owner, if I own a piece of land and the honourable gentleman from Placentia West wishes to buy it I have the right to charge him just as much as I can get from him.

MR. BARRY: That is what they are doing now.

MR. ROBERTS: No quarrel with that. Who has quarrel with that?

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker, their stand. Their stand is that the federal government have no right to tax but it is a far more basic point than that. Their stand is that the federal government have no

right to take advantage of resources across Canada to help all parts of Canada. They are for a Canada of ten greedy little competing provinces...

MR. BARRY: Face up to it now.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, not only do I face up to that I face up to the honourable gentleman. They stand for a Canada that has ten completely independent provinces with no regard for the national wheel and that is it. I stand for a Canada that is a Canada and that has ten provinces and a national government and the national government looks out for all Canadians.

MR. BARRY: Right. So you stand for a federal government taking the revenue from Alberta at the well head.

MR. ROBERTS: I stand, Mr. Speaker - if the honourable gentleman wants to make a speech he may make it.

MR. BARRY: At the well head...

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, do I have the right? This ignorant gentleman used to be Deputy Speaker.

MR. BARRY: Oh my! Oh my! Oh my!

MR. ROBERTS: At one stage he was purported to know the rules of the House. I said I would take a question from him. I did and I answered it.

MR. BARRY: No, the honourable gentleman did not.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, do I have the right to speak or do I have the right to be heckled?

MR. BARRY: Sorry, Mr. Speaker, but...

MR. EVANS: Speak for a change instead of what the honourable member is doing.

MR. W.N. ROWE: We are involved in a schoolboy debate...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to engage in; 'Yes you are

February 11, 1974, Tape 156, Page 6 -- apb

no you are not," that is the way the honourable gentleman wants to  
deabte. My concern is with a very great principle,

If they disagree with that principle, then in due course let them stand and say so. I say that the position this province took at Ottawa, two or three weeks past, was a position that would lead to a Canada of ten greedy little provinces -

MR. W. ROWE: Arab sheikdom.

MR. ROBERTS: Arab sheikdom was the way somebody put it.

MR. W. ROWE: Blue-eyed Arabs.

MR. ROBERTS: Blue-eyed Arabs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am being perfectly serious. Let the honourable gentleman hold his tongue. Mr. Speaker, that is what they stand for. I stand for a Canada that has ten strong provinces. The essence of a federal system is a strong province and a strong national government. The honourable gentleman, Sir, wants a system of government roughly equivalent to the confederacy, the articles of Confederation of the United States in 1776, which is replaced by the present constitution. He would like the sort of Ottawa that René Levesque wants when he talks about an associated state, and Ottawa with some minuscule powers or maybe with wide powers but with minuscule resources. I say, Sir, that the Government of Canada have the power to redistribute wealth from one part of this country to another. I believe they should have that power.

The honourable gentleman can twist, distort, misrepresent and be as intellectually dishonest as he has been on this point. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that the policy which he and his colleagues advocated in Ottawa - he has the pride of an author - he must defend it.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Let him be quiet, Mr. Speaker. Let him speak when he has the opportunity to speak. If he says I am wrong, then let him expose it. I say, he is wrong. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the policy which he and his colleagues have advocated is against the very basis of Confederation as we know it today in Newfoundland and as we have known it these twenty-five years past.

I find it the ultimate in ironies. They are an administration that is going to fling away a couple of hundred thousand dollars in coins and whatever it is going in. This energy thing is not the first time they have done it. The health financing proposals a year past were the same way. Go to Ottawa and say, to hell with Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, to Hades with them in a hand-art. What we got, we got and what they have got, we have got to. This is the same crowd that had the gall, the unmitigated gall to put in words in His Honour's mouth on Opening Day, in the Speech from the Throne, the following great words:

"Full general development of our human and physical resources is unattainable without concerted action by both Federal and Provincial Governments." (Of all the Governor generalities ever put in a speech from the throne, that ranks near the top, Sir.) "Because of the wider taxation fields exercised by the Government of Canada," (that is right, because Ottawa can level direct taxes or indirect taxes and we can only levy direct) "my Government" (that is the Queen's government, not the government of the gentleman from Bonavista South, the Queen's government) "must look to Ottawa for revenue to sustain its programmes. However, it is the Province which, within the context of Confederation, must determine the priorities of social goals and the quality of life of its people." That is one of the few statements in the speech that happens to make sense. Yet, it does not represent adequately or accurately the policy of the honourable gentleman and his administration. They are wrong and the fact that other than Mr. Claude Dawe, whose letter speaks for itself, not one voice publicly that I have heard, has been -

MR. BARRY: Thousands! Thousands!

MR. ROBERTS: Thousands? Oh, yes, there have been meetings out here in front of Confederation Building, six nights last week.

MR. BARRY: Thousands.

MR. ROBERTS: Hundreds of thousands. Down in Northeast Crouse, Sir, in my constituency, there are seven families there. The seven families got together by candlelight (the government have not given them lights) and they passed a resolution that said: "Resolved, that we, the free citizens of Northeast Crouse, congratulate the gentleman from Placentia West and his colleagues..."

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if it were not such a serious matter, it would be funny. There has not been, other than Mr. Claude Dawe - Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be interrupted. Let him speak.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker, because the honourable gentleman's leading question is designed to distort and twist and not designed to elicit information. If it were a court of law, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman would be ruled out of order. He should be ruled out of order here but on different grounds. I have the right to speak.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am being perfectly serious. I do not take the honourable gentleman seriously. I have had the opportunity to read (a difficult job though it was) his article in the "Evening Telegram." I have had one or two associates, some acquaintances of mine in the Political Science Department who think -

AN HON. MEMBER: Typographical errors.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it named his name and the fact that they printed it, two typographical errors. But, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's former colleagues in the Department of Political Science - Mr. Speaker!

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

MR. ROBERTS: I would rather be a biological error than a biological excrescent as is the honourable gentleman. Your turn "Leo."

Mr. Speaker, if I could carry on without the low, crude humour of the gentleman from Placentia West. There has been no voice

raised other than Mr. Claude Dawe in this province and the members of the administration. I have no doubt that the members of the administration are very vocal.

MR. BARRY: Thousands.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, as I say, thousands, thousands, thousands, thousands - at least one and that one is -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: A hot line. There have been meetings in the stadium down here in St. John's East, Sir, which has been taken seven nights this week past for meetings and they have had to turn them away.

MR. BARRY: The second biggest bluffer since -

MR. ROBERTS: On Bell Island, the Monsignor Bartlett Area, they are going to have to put an extension on it. If we had an arena on the Burin Peninsula (we are not going to because we have been told by the Minister of Finance that they should be ashamed even to ask for it) they would have been queued up from Goobies to Grand Bank just to get in to sign a resolution. Why the great covenant that the Ulstermen signed in the early years of this century, when Sir Edward Carson, signed in blood, the great covenant. It bears nothing, Sir, to the petition which is being gathered. They are going to start at Nain and every community from Nain, Sir, to Hopedale, to Rigolet, to Makkovik, all the way. We will even get the Spotted Islands and Black Tickle in. Every person there, Sir, is rushing forward to put his name - Mr. Speaker, one can have fun. I mean it, I expected better from the honourable gentleman.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: He and I disagree on partisan issues and perhaps agree on some other issues. But, Sir, I had really expected and hoped that this province would adopt a policy that stands for Newfoundland and at the same time stand for a Canada that could help Newfoundland. They have not done that. They have not done that, Sir. They have not done that. They can say that that is what they have done but the fact remains that



it is in fact not what they have done. Make them condemn, not just by me. I could be expected and certainly be accused of being partisan. It is very little this government could do that would please me. In fact if they were to resign, I would want to know the hitch in it. I am somewhat like Prince Metternich at the Congress of Vienna, 1815, when somebody ran up to him and said, "Prince so and so," a delegate from the other side, "has died." Prince Metternich considered and very softly he said, "How curious. I wonder what his motives were." My feelings about this administration are much the same way. Judging by the comments that have come (I have not heard from thousands of people, but I have heard from one hundred or two hundred, which is a hundred or two hundred more than the honourable gentleman.) and judging from the comments that I have heard, Sir, and the people, the position the editorials have taken, the various organs of public expression in this province today, this policy, Sir, is like a donkey; it has no pride of ancestry and no hope of posterity.

Mr. Speaker, we will go back to energy. It may be the subject - we will have a big debate in our caucus, Sir, on no-confidence motions. We are sorely tempted to take a week or two just to talk about the government's energy policy. Let them have at us, we will have at them, because we believe that the press will capture the essence of the debate, as only the press can, Sir, a minute on the television to cover three hours of debate.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, they have had every opportunity to explain it to me and to the people of Newfoundland. We think perhaps we should have a debate, both sides in on it. We have not had any contribution to it yet. I thought the gentleman from posters, the gentleman from Green Bay - I was delighted to see by the way he was having lunch today with the Tory candidate, putative former in Hermitage, glad to see that he is in such good health. I guess he is still on the rural development



authority, that nonpartisan agency that hands out loans for rural development on a nonpartisan basis.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Green Bay in his remarks favoured us with very little on the energy

I thought he was waiving a file about as he prepared to speak. I thought he had had fifty or one hundred letters from people on the Northeast Coast or in Jacques Fontaine or maybe down in Lance Cove or perhaps somewhere out in Fogo Island.

"I take pen in hand to write to you Mr. Premier, to tell you how much we enjoyed what you said in Ottawa and how good we thought it was." Those letters may be there. There may be thousands of them. All I can say is not one of them has been presented publicly, not one of them has been presented publicly.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: ... got it all on the eight floor.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I were on the eighth floor, I would be the only member of the public who has been there in two years.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that was well said, Sir. It was well said. I congratulate Your Honour on coming right to the heart of the problem and summing it up succinctly and putting it forcefully in accordance with the traditions that were started in 1253, I think at the parliament of Simon de Montfort of Leicester. Simon de Montfort later lost his head, Sir, and I devoutly hope that will not happen to Your Honour.

Mr. Speaker, I had a note here. I wanted to comment on the Speech itself but really I have not got the heart, Sir. It is such -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, no. I have not got the mind. I agree because my mind, Mr. Speaker, could only come to grips with the tangible and the real and this Speech is almost a serial. Salvador Dali, in his weakest moments, Sir, would have produced a better document than this. It is filled with inconsistencies. It is filled with abominable language. I doubt if the governor has ever been so ill-served as he was by

whoever wrote this particular collection of words.

There are just one or two points I wanted to touch upon because we will have other opportunities. This debate will go on for a day or so yet, perhaps two or three more members will speak in it.

I want to touch upon the Court of Appeal and I want to issue an invitation to the Minister of Justice and I am glad he is here today. I welcome the fact that we are going to have a Court of Appeal in Newfoundland and indeed my colleague, the gentleman from White Bay South, not only made a public statement several days before the Speech, urging the government to do it but when he was Minister of Justice acting for a period of several months in the fall of 1972, he began the steps that lead and will lead to this creation of this court.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Two years later.

MR. ROBERTS: Two years later. Now, that is the point. Two years have gone by, two years have gone by and there are all sorts of people who have all sorts of reasons to why two years have gone by. I hope we will see the legislation that is promised in the Speech. I can assure you it will have our full support and I can assure you, Sir, that we will do what we can to make it come quickly.

I do hope though that we will at the same time see legislation and a fifth judge for Corner Brook. It will be said that the Federal Government says that there is not enough work for the fifth judge. I understand that it is up to us, this legislature, whether we create a fifth judge or not. The Law Society of Newfoundland have asked for it unanimously. Even the St. John's lawyers have supported that recommendation. They have come around. A few years ago when Mr. Wells and one or two of his colleagues from Corner Brook first raised the issue and the Minister of Justice was then Minister of Justice in another light, nobody agreed with it except Corner Brook people. Well

now, I would like to see us create it. We can create that position. If Ottawa then chose not to fill it, that would be Ottawa's decision, because, Sir, as Your Honour is intimately aware, although this House can create courts and create judges, we cannot appoint them. The power of appointment vests with the Minister of Justice and with the Governor-General at Ottawa.

So, let us bring in the legislation when we amend the Judicature Act and indeed if they do not we can because there is no cost to the Province. So an amendment will be proposed, Sir, from this side. So we will put it to the test. Let there be provision in it for a fifth high-court judge in Newfoundland. Our bar now, I submit is large enough that we could have the three judges of the Court of Appeal. I assume that is the number and five judges of the high court or the trial division - eight judges. I think there are enough men and women at the bar that eight numbers can be found from among their numbers.

If Ottawa says then that they do not think there is enough work -  
AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: My information from Ottawa is different than what, than that which is alleged to have been said by the honourable member. Then let Ottawa take the responsibility.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: But let us act. We can do it and as I say, if the government do not put it in their bill, Sir, we shall propose the amendment and if the government will not accept it they will have to take the onus of turning it down. But the profession feel there is a need for a fifth judge, Sir. They feel that justice would be served more speedily and more effectively and at less cost if there were to be created a Supreme Court judge sitting at Corner Brook.

Now, Sir, at the same time, may I express the hope that we will have the Minister of Justice with us in this House until at least the next general election and I invite him when he speaks, when he speaks,

to state categorically that he intends to stay in this House and to serve his constituents from now until the next general election, whenever it may come. I invite him to say that. I think the House has need of his talent. I think the profession down town would be very happy, a legal profession. He is brethren at the bar, our brethren at the bar throughout Newfoundland, would be genuinely pleased; perhaps when the ministry introduces the bill for second reading, if he were to say categorically that he will be a member of this House, given health and life, until the next general election; he will not leave this House for any reason because we need him in Newfoundland. I think the ministry should make that statement categorically and I invite him to do so. Indeed I have had numerous representations, one or maybe two from Burin district saying they want him to stay on. I know of six people who want to run against him, each one of them wants him to stay on so they can have the pleasure of beating him at the polls, but that is another issue. I am not asking him to run. What I am saying is, I invite him to give us the assurance as only the Minister of Justice can.

There are a few of us, Mr. Speaker, who can be as sincere as the Minister of Justice when he is being sincere and I invite him to give us the assurance that he will be a member of this House at least until the Thirty-sixth General Assembly of this Province is dissolved and we all return to whence we came, the electorate. I raise this point now so the minister will have time to consider it and to make a statement. I suggest the ideal time would be on second reading.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I mean, there are reasons, of course, for this. There are those less noble and those of us on this side who feel that the reason we have the delay in bringing in this legislation which is very simple and could have been drafted very quickly, the reason we have had our completely unwarranted two year delay is not unconnected with my request. It was drafted last year and sent to Ottawa. Why was

it not drafted the year before and sent to Ottawa? Why is it not brought back from Ottawa?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible

MR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Speaker, I did not ask what the urgency was. It is the only thing the government has done this year, so they should have to tell me what is the urgency. I do not invite the honourable gentleman from St. John's West to say that he will be in the House for the next two years. I hope he will be. I have heard no suggestion he will not be.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Certainly better than Magistrate Crosbie.

MR. ROBERTS: I thought that better than Magistrate Crosbie, Sir, Yes, that would be infected, downgrade the magistrates. I apologize to all magistrates of Newfoundland for having suggested that the gentleman from St. John's West could become a magistrate. Not only that, even the magistrate in Grand Falls, a gentleman, Magistrate Oldford, would not necessary welcome the gentleman from St. John's West to the magisterial branch.

But I make the invitation to the Minister of Justice. I do not make it to any other legal gentleman officer. I would not ask the gentleman from St. John's South or the gentleman from St. John's East or the gentleman from White Bay South or the gentleman from St. John's West or the gentleman from Placentia West. All of those are members of that band of public servants who labour night and day at little recompense in the public interest, the members of the bar of this Province, the people who were kept so well employed by the gentleman from Bell Island.

Mr. Speaker, in closing my few brief remarks -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Where is Witch Hunt Willy? Oh, there he is.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, he is gathering himself, arming for the fray.

February 11, 1974.

Tape 158

RH - 6

Let me merely throw out for discussion a few suggestions, a few matters which I believe the government should deal with at this session of the House.



MR. ROBERTS: I do not propose to try to present a Throne Speech. I do not propose to try to touch on all the matters which should be dealt with by the public at this session, the public business but I would like to make a few suggestions that I think should be acted upon by the government of this province. Meaning that, Sir, I would like the assurance publicly in the House, I think it has been given outside the House but I am not sure and that is why I ask for it now, that the Report of the Task Force on Forestry will be tabled, will be made public and will be made public in plenty of time to enable gentlemen to study it and then to take part in the debates.

The legislation which we are to get, we understand, and with respect to forest tenures and to forestry generally will be among the more important bills ever brought into Newfoundland that will be brought into this House. We should have the Task Force Report to help us in studying it because the legislation I gather is in large measure dependent upon the task force reports and is shaped by them. So I invite the Premier, or any honourable gentleman opposite who speaks to the ministry on this matter, to give us that assurance that we will have it so we will have the opportunity to study it and to consult with other people in the forestry field so that when the debates come we shall be all able to take part in them, the forty-two of us, Sir, on an informed and knowledgeable basis. If the government do not table that report, Sir, as I said elsewhere, not only will their policies be suspect but their motives will be suspect also.

In fishing I would hope that the Minister of Fisheries would give us an assurance that the Fishing Industry Advisory Board will be constituted and will be made an effective body. In this I am joined by that journalistic knight, that paragon of the pen, Mr. Wick Collins of "The Evening Telegram", a gentleman who is high in the esteem of Her Majesty's ministers but who wrote the following comment which appeared in the yellow dog of journalism, by which I mean "The Evening Telegram" and I rely upon the Premier as my authority for that statement. It was an off day but he did say it on Saturday, October 27 past. The headline

on this little tidbit, Sir, is "Fishermen Shafted Again." I used to think that shafted was an inelegant word, Sir, but again we have the Premier's authority for saying that it is a perfectly acceptable word and so Mr. Collins has used it.

I will just read the first five paragraphs;

"The fishermen of Newfoundland have been shafted before." And he is not talking about the honourable gentleman's grandfather either. "Shafted by the merchants. Shafted by the weather and a lack of fish. Shafted by their own stupidity but now it looks as if they are going to get a royal shafting." Mr. Collins is a bit of a monarchist. "Yes, shafted by Her Majesty's Newfoundland Government and what could be more royal than that?"

I could answer that question but I do not think it requires it. "It all has to do with the recently appointed Fishing Industry Advisory Board, the Board that was going to be the greatest stroke of luck that ever came the way of the fishermen.

"For the first time in our history the merchants would not be able to spin their web with half truths about foreign markets and the many and varied reasons why they could not pay a better price for the fish.

"By having the Board to do the work for them, fishermen for the first time would be the equals of the merchants when the price was being decided.

"Like a lot of other people, I looked on the Board as the salvation of the inshore fishery."

That is Mr. Collins speaking and I think his words are well said. I think the Fishing Industry Advisory Board could be a most important part of the whole fishing industry and of the public policy towards that industry and now that the Minister of Manpower is with us, again back at work, I hope that he will immediately put his attention to this. Unfortunately, in his absence there was no real ministerial attention, and I do not blame him, no ministerial attention paid at all to his department, it just drifted along without the guiding hand of the minister.

"What a fool I was ever to believe the government would allow the Board to do its job properly. Mind you I was full of suspicion that the Board would be shoved into a corner and told to shut up but I kind of hoped that at long last the Premier was really going to do something for the fishermen." Mr. Collins I would venture to say, will not be hired by Mr. George McLean on the basis of this.

AN HON. MEMBER: We have a new one now, Horizons Communications.

MR. ROBERTS: We will have a talk about that.

"That turned out to be a wasted hope for already the Board is not worth the piece of paper that was used to appoint it. For all practical purposes the Board is dead."

That was written following the resignation of Mr. Anderson as the Chairman of the Board. Now, Sir, that was on October 27 and October has gone and November has come and gone and December has come and gone and January has come and gone and here it is now about mid February and we still have no chairman, but I hope we will have one shortly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well legislation is within the hands of the government. They have had two years to bring it in. They have had two sessions of the House. The House Leader, the gentleman from St. John's East, has told us we put through literally hundreds of bills, some of them the most earth-shattering ever as we took out a comma and replaced it with a full stop.

If the Board do not have the power they need and they may not, then let the government bring in the legislation. We asked them last year to bring it in. It did not come in last year. Maybe it will come in this year. I hope so. Then let there be a chairman, let there be a chairman appointed and let this Board get to work but I ask the government to do that and I urge you to do it and I urge you to do it immediately. The chairman can be appointed this day or tomorrow. The legislation can come in tomorrow and it will be through the House

by weekend, with our full co-operation on this side, but I want action quickly, before we get well into the season. Now is the time to move.

I hope we will see the regional offices of the Department of Fisheries. The famous Throne Speech on March 1, 1972, promised we would have regional offices in the Department of Fisheries. It named a whole raft of communities that would be honoured. I do not know what has happened. There have been no regional offices, maybe because there have been no elections. Was it just a cynical election promise to try to hook a few votes? Is that why one was promised for Lewisporte?

Recently I saw an advertisement in the paper attempting to hire people for this. Why did it take two years? When are we going to see some action there? When are we going to see a government policy aimed at getting our fishermen into one hundred and twenty foot boats, into the big multi-purpose boats that we have heard so much about? When?

I do not believe any as yet have been launched. There were a couple being built at Marystown as a make-work project. I do not know what has happened to them.

AN HON. MEMBER: To what?

MR. ROBERTS: These multi-purpose boats that Mr. Cheeseman used to talk about.

AN HON. MEMBER: Make-work projects.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, make-work projects, I know because it was a great project of ours to set up the Marystown Yard and to get John Rannie in. There was a period when the yard did not have a lot of work and Roy Cheeseman sat in his chair behind the honourable gentleman, the honourable gentleman was not then an honourable gentleman, he was just an honourable gentleman, and what an honourable gentleman if you follow me, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well talking to babies, I use it. He said, Mr. Speaker, that there would be boats built at Marystown, multi-purpose boats. They may have been built for all I know but what has happened to

them? When are we going to have some meaningful fishery development? We have had nothing. Two years in office and no more done for the fishermen, no more done for the fishermen than the Tory Party has ever done for them and here comes the expert on fisheries now, the gentleman from St. John's Centre, and he is fishing, Sir. He was in Topsail Pond last summer.

While I am on it, Sir, it has been suggested to me that I might wish to ask what the government know about a firm called "Horizons Communications", whether they have been hired full-time to do public relations work for the government for the rest of the year in connection with our twenty-fifth anniversary? Whether it is the firm's twenty-fifth anniversary, whether it is a new firm that has been set up? Who are the principles in it? How much are they being paid?

Is this a little like the slides counting, \$12,000, when the Auditor General tells us they cannot find the slides, they cannot find what they were for and they cannot find the contract; all that they can find is that the money went to Mr. McLean.

AN. HON. MEMBER: We will find it all soon.

MR. ROBERTS: I hope the honourable gentleman does find them and I will say that it is probably the most useful thing he will have done in the last two years if he can find them, If he can also find out who authorized the payment to Act III, I am looking forward to seeing that voucher, Sir,

his word as seeing that voucher as to who signed it because, Sir, that money could not have been paid to Act III unless some official signed for the \$517. Is the honourable gentleman doubting the Auditor General's word? The money could not have been paid to Act III by the Department of Finance unless some officials authorized and initialed the voucher. I would like to know who that official was.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Fire him more than likely.

MR. ROBERTS: I would not fire him. I would like to find out who he was and if there is an official who authorized him to sign it or for what reason he signed it. It would be very interesting.

Mr. Speaker, to turn to education, I hope that the Minister of Education will come to grips with this. He has had a year and a half now fuddle-duddling, of skating hither and yon, weaving a web of words that have nothing to do with the real problems of education. I am beginning to think that the gentleman from St. John's North, in whom we had a limited degree of confidence as Minister of Education, was perhaps more of an asset to the educational world in Newfoundland than is his successor the present minister who gives the appearance of being all knowledgeable and of being a very fine fellow which he is but of just refusing to come to grips with the issue. How long can you go on studying? How long can you be a student? We are going to have some new schools. Every school board in Newfoundland has now announced - I do not know if they have announced formally but it is a well-known and very public fact that there will be no new schools built of any significant value in the next two or three years unless the government increases the \$8 million per annum grant.

The \$12 million offer which the Minister of Education made to the school tax authorities at the school boards' meeting here in October has been spurned by them. The letter which they have written back is one of the better public pieces I have seen in some time. It certainly explodes the holiness of the government's position. I would like to see them come to grips with current account financing. I understand almost all of the school boards in Newfoundland today have massive current



account deficits incurred not by extravagance but incurred because they have been hit these last few months with costs beyond their control, cost rises.

The Minister of Education, I understand, is now to meet this week with these boards. I hope he is going to reverse his most unfortunate position, the position where he said he would do nothing for them in this current fiscal year. The debts they have this year they will have to live with. Well, that may have been hammered out of him.

I would like to see a positive approach made to DREE for capital assistance. The government seem to have turned their back on that now. The standards are too high and surely the answer is to go back to DREE and say that and to negotiate around. Instead what they have done is they have thrown away the opportunity to receive \$11 million or \$12 million a year. We have been spending that. We have the schools. If the schools are not the right schools, Sir, then this government agreed to them. This government have built them. Surely the answer is not just to turn their backs on a source of money. Why not go to Ottawa and ask DREE for assistance on current accounts? There is nothing inconsistent or illogical about that. Why not do it?

The Government of Canada gave us an extra \$20 million last year to help with school financing. They changed the equalization formula. That got to be pretty small potatoes when it got into the school boards' hands. My concern is not so much with the school boards as it is with the students who must use those schools, Sir, who must go study in inadequate facilities and their parents who have to pay the assessments and the taxes that will be needed. I hope the government will make a meaningful and positive policy on student aid. If there is one thing that more than any other stands to the shame of this honourable crowd, it is their student aid policy where they have been bullheaded and pigheaded and obstinate in the extreme and the results have been exactly as they were predicted.

A study done by Dr. Parsons and his associates is pretty conclusive



evidence that the government's lack of a policy or the government's change in policy has done grievous damage to the numbers of students who want to come into university. There are other reasons but that appears to be the major reason. I do not want to say, we told you so, because we take no pride in that. We did hammer for two years at this government and they crassly and stupidly refused even to listen to the arguments. Well, Sir, let them listen now. I am not even going to say that they should be men of their word. They made commitments to those students during the election campaign, commitments which I think earned them an amount of support. They have reneged on those but I am not using that argument. The argument I use is a simple one of social justice, that our Newfoundland children have the same right to education be they rich or be they poor. Given two years of a Tory Government and your chance of getting an education depends on whether you are rich. If they do not change that policy, Sir, Memorial will become an elitest institution. I mean, that is bad for Memorial and it is even worse for Newfoundland. Let them this year deal with that.

Finally, Mr. Speaker - when I look at the honourable member from Burgeo my faith in the efficacy of education is restored because if ever there was an argument, Sir, for education, it is the honourable gentleman from Burgeo.

Mr. Speaker, let me touch very briefly upon housing a subject - it is hard to believe the government have been as bad as they have been on housing. When I look at the Minister of Municipal Affairs I can understand part of the reason. Mr. Speaker, let me read the words in the Throne Speech having to do with housing. That is health. That is pathetic. Where is the housing thing?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Does Your Honour feel that the House is not in order, Sir? Where is the housing thing? My! Oh my! It leaped out and it sunk back into the morass now. I said morass. That is one word, for the benefit of those opposite.

Before we come to that - my friend and colleague will find it

for me - let me just read one or two little figures that show how far we have come under the beneficent administration from the gentleman from Fortune Bay, that paragon, he tells us, of integrity and courage and virtue. He did not say intelligence nor would I. Mr. Speaker, if we look - these are statistics Canada figures - if we look at the number of permits issued, number of building permits issued in millions of dollars and bearing in mind our housing is more expensive than anywhere else in Canada, where does Newfoundland come? We rank tenth out of the ten provinces in the value of our housing. \$13 million, that is the figure for the first ten months of 1973, the most recent figures that statistics Canada can give to me. We rank tenth in the value of new building permits. New buildings, n-e-w, new as opposed to old, o-l-d. I do want to be sure the gentleman from St. John's Centre is with me.

For the first nine months of 1973, Mr. Speaker, dwelling units started in all areas of Newfoundland. We ranked eighth across Canada. We have 7.4 dwelling units started per thousand population. Eight other provinces - little Prince Edward Island has twice as many per thousand population as we do. If we look at dwelling units completed, all areas, not just St. John's but the whole province, again in Statistics Canada we rank that same eight. Nova Scotia was ninth and Saskatchewan was tenth but we know the population in Saskatchewan is falling.

If we look at dwelling units under construction in all areas, a three month average for the first three quarters of 1973, we rank eight across Canada. Mr. Speaker, if we look at the number of housing starts, from January to October per thousand population, the national average is 8.2. The figure for Newfoundland is 3.7, less than half. We stand eighth across Canada.

Mr. Speaker, that is a sorry story. It is a sorry tale. We are building more houses this year than we built last year but that shows how far behind we were last year. So, I make a proposal now to the government and I hope the minister will get his little pencil and write it down.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: How many existing homes purchased?

MR. ROBERTS: How many existing homes purchased? I do not know.

A new home that is purchased, Sir, let me try to explain to the gentleman from St. John's and it will be difficult. An existing home that is purchased does not add to the stock of housing in the province. If Your Honour owns a house and sells it to me, it gives me a house but it does not give Your Honour a house.

MR. W. ROWE: There is nothing said here about housing.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, there is a reference to housing.

MR. W. ROWE: Well, it is awfully well hidden.

MR. ROBERTS: It is well hidden and it is meaningless. Let me put a proposal to the ministry, Sir; let them survey the housing stock of this province. Let them make a provincewide survey of what houses we have

and where they are grade them, maybe Grade A, B, C and D. That will go from the most expensive house in on Mount Scio Road or over here in St. Andrews Place all the way to a tilt or a hovel, wherever our people are living the hundred and some odd thousand families in Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hogan's Pond, Topsail Pond.

MR. ROBERTS: It would include Topsail Pond and it would include Hogan's Pond.

Mr. Speaker, when we know what the housing stock is, let us erect some standards of what is adequate housing. I think we could do that. What is the minimum that a person and family can live in? The minimum of square feet and the minimum amount of space and the minimum degree of protection from the elements? Those two calculations, Sir, will tell us the gap that has to be filled and there is a gap. Any honourable gentleman would know there is a gap. The members who sit for St. John's are perhaps more aware of it. I think the gentleman for St. John's Centre is perhaps more aware of it because many of his constituents are living in housing conditions that are not very good at all.

MR. MURPHY: Since 1962.

MR. ROBERTS: Some of them living there longer than 1962, I fear.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, all right. I give him credit for that. I give him credit for that. I would wish that he would do something now that he is in power but I give him credit.

Mr. Speaker, the housing problem in Newfoundland is not confined to the urban areas. The rural areas, those of us who sit - the member for Ferryland has a rural constituency, I suppose the largest community this side of the Town of Bay Bulls which is a suburb in many ways, a bedroom suburb of St. John's. I am sure there are many areas, many communities in Ferryland District have homes in them that are not adequate by any standard. Every district, Trinity North is the same way; my own. I cannot name a constituency in Newfoundland except

Labrador West because everything there is new, and by definition there is very little poverty, financial poverty, lack of wealth in Labrador West.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, as I may say, his constituents are hard up but by comparison with most parts of this province there is relative affluence in Labrador West. Certainly the housing there is the envy of most of us.

But there is not a district other than Labrador West, Sir, comes to my mind where people do not have serious housing problems. The existing programmes are not adequate. The Social Service Department cannot deal with them. I would be the first to admit it. I was frustrated at this point when I was there and I think my colleague for Bell Island was and I am sure the gentleman for St. John's Centre there are days when he could almost kick the wall in fury at not being able to do what had to be done but it is beyond the purview of Social Assistance as such.

AN HON. MEMBER: ... Gaskiers.

MR. ROBERTS: That is true.

MR. MURPHY: .... quarter of a million in my district now.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Yes they did. Oh, yes they did over on the Southside and Mundy Pond.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, once we know what the gap is - once we know what the need is for housing then we can work out quickly and adopt a programme to meet that need. I am going to say to the House now that I believe that the Government of this Province and I do not care what the party - the Government of this Province must accept as an obligation, as a right of every citizen, the right to decent and adequate housing. I think that is the next step forward.

We have done it with medical care, we have done it with hospital care, we have done it with education. Fifty years ago, education depended on money. Twenty years ago, if you got sick and you did not have money

you had to look to charity or you did without it. Well now let us accept housing as being a fit subject for the use of public funds. I do not mean just low rental or subsidized units. I do not mean just central mortgage although we are not taking any advantage of central mortgage. Let us make a major social commitment in Newfoundland to say to every Newfoundlander that you are guaranteed a minimum,adequate, decent standard of accommodation and housing and you will pay for it according to your means, if you have not the means you will get it anyway. We do not say to a person who is sick and comes to a doctor "Boy you are only making \$3,000 a year, you cannot afford a \$1000 operation." There is no question of that.

There is no question of that when it comes to education. A child from a family living on social assistance has as much right to go to the university as does a child whose father is making \$50,000 a year.

MR. ROWE: W.N. Let "John Crosbie" cut out the tuition.

MR. ROBERTS: We would all agree on housing. If the government are looking for something to do and they certainly have not found much to do judging from the Throne Speech, let them take this, Sir, as a major goal. The need is there. I cannot give Your Honour figures because they do not exist but I have outlined a method which I believe would enable us to get the figures and to get them reasonably quickly.

There are many possible answers, Sir, perhaps we should not just have land banks perhaps we should end the speculation in land. Let it be, Sir, all land for development is purchased by the Crown, developed and sold. Let there be no private land development,

AN HON. MEMBER: Sold, rented or leased.

MR. ROBERTS: Well sold, rented or leased. Perhaps we could take the developer right out of the land business because I understand that every commission and agency who looked at this has agreed that it is the developer, the speculator who makes a big hunk of money on the way through. We should end that. We could do it. We have the financial resources. We will get our money back. It would be a revolving fund.

The St. John's Housing Corporation have for twenty or twenty-five years developed lots and sold them at cost, they may even make a little money on it for all I know. They sell them and I believe they are considerably cheaper than the private market. Certainly they are as cheap as can be. Then maybe we should get into subsidies.

The Government of the Province can do this, Sir, end all land speculation everywhere in this province. It could be done. It is not difficult. It is not impossible. It would not be overly costly on a revolving basis. We got into subsidies, that is another story.

Then let us look at what it cost to build houses. Let us look at what it would cost and how we could help people to get them. That could be done, Mr. Speaker. That, Mr. Speaker, could -

MR. MORGAN: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: That, Mr. Speaker, I can do without the gentleman for Bonavista South, so could his constituents, but that is another story.

MR. NEARY: Rossie will take care of him.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, let us then reduce the cost as much as we can; let us then look at a programme to help people and not just low rental or subsidized rental. I think one of the great needs of our time is for people to own something, to own a bit of land, own a house.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us be positive.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman says "Let us be positive." I am putting up the most positive plan that anybody in this House has put up for the past two years. I do not particularly find myself surprized that the gentleman for Bonavista South does not understand it. He has been primed to come into this House and spend the rest of the session being a gashouse gang and saying "Be positive" and to heckle. He hopes it will get him into the cabinet.

AN HON. MEMBER: What a joker!

MR. ROBERTS: He is trying. I mean you see the man bucking for a promotion and unfortunately he does not realize it, to win his way into the cabinet he will have to do the sort of thing the gentleman for St. John's.



South is doing. I am not suggesting the honourable gentleman for St. John's South is trying to get into the cabinet indeed he has too much courage and taste to do that.

MR. WELLS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I am not suggesting that the honourable member for St. John's South - indeed my understanding is he told us so, with respect to Intergovernmental Affairs, publicly - that he could not accept it or would not accept an invitation to enter the ministry.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Do not make him too weak.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman for Bonavista South would not turn it down. As a matter of fact, if the Premier were to whisper to him now you would see a streak from here to Government House, and the streak would be the gentleman for Bonavista South to be sworn in. The road runner would be a cripple.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, all I am saying to him is that the way to get into the cabinet is not to come into the House and to say, "Be positive" and to say "Twenty-three years" and all the other intelligent comments which the honourable gentleman for Bonavista South has honoured us with.

I have listened with great interest to his speeches when he makes them. Sometimes he has had some good ideas. Sometimes he has had the courage of his convictions. I admire him for that. I think he is doing himself a disservice. I think he is doing his constituency a disservice. I would venture to suggest he is doing his party a disservice.

Mr. Speaker, it has been three days and the honourable gentleman should be grateful for the opportunity and let him, Sir, be the man to propose as we look into the Saunder's case. Let the member for Bonavista, that paragon, that pillar of integrity -

AN HON. MEMBER: Human Rights.

MR. ROBERTS: and the Human Rights -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: I said in my speech, if we wish to investigate Mr. Shea and Mr. Burgess and Mr. Oldford I will be all for it. I would be all for it, Sir. I will be all for it. As a matter of fact, I would be as interested as the next man to read that report.

Now, Sir, I am trying to put up a positive programme. I am trying to be serious. The gentlemen opposite are not at all interested in letting me do it. That in itself - we have seen in this House the last three or four days an organized attempt by the government, they are running scared. They are not over the jitters. The member for Port au Port was wrong. The member for Port au Port was wrong. He said that they were over the jitters. Well they are not. Their backbenchers have been whipped up at caucus. A frenzy of pep talk. "Get in their boys and show them." They come trotting in and we are seeing the results.

AN HON MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to the rest of this session on these terms. This honourable crowd, Sir, I beg

Your honour, the honourable crowd, we are seeing now their contribution. They used to talk about the House. We are seeing now the sort of contribution, the people who come to the galleries see it, we see it, the press see it and Your Honour sees it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: That is exactly what I mean, Sir. I could not ask for a better example than that.

What I am talking about, Sir, is what I believe to be a great social need in this province and I am putting up a meaningful and positive approach to it. I invite the government to adopt this and do it. I invite the government to do it.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman has tender memories of 1971, and the constituents of Bonavista South took care of him. The honourable gentleman then went on to win.

MR. W.N. ROWE: No? Well, he had to have a landslide.

MR. ROBERTS: He won. In a landslide he won. Mr. Speaker, let the government show their concern. What does the Speech from the Throne say? "My ministers are gratified that in keeping with the general aura of prosperity which permeated our province, 1973 witnessed a significant increase in the construction of dwelling units." (Not homes, dwelling units.)

MR. W.N. ROWE: What is a dwelling unit?

MR. ROBERTS: "Nevertheless, my government is keenly aware" (Living in Mount Scio House they have every right to be keenly aware) "That escalating costs continue to place home ownership beyond the means of a rising number of our people." (It is rising now to about eighty percent.)

MR. MURPHY: Bob Hope is not...

MR. ROBERTS: "My ministers have been working diligently" (Not just working, Mr. Speaker, but working diligently) "To alleviate this great social need. Measures will be presented to this honourable House to meet the problem of providing adequate housing within the means of

our people." I venture to say, Sir, that the Minister of Housing has no more measures up his sleeve than he has support in his district and that is precious little. Time will tell, Sir, and "Life" will show the pictures.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I do not see what is so funny. Let us have a programme. Let us not just come in with what we have had, a few house built here and a few there. Carrying on, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, when it was set up by the then Minister of Housing seven or eight years ago, was probably a step forward. We went into Marystown and we built three or four hundred units. At that time we were accused, I was not even in the cabinet, the honourable member for Fortune Bay was in the cabinet, Sir, we were accused of building houses that would never be used. Now, Marystown is short of accommodations.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: If the costs are too great as they probably are...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Of course they are. It remains to be seen what this government can do now. We are going to have tilts and wigwams, the Tory tilts.

AN HON. MEMBER: Fifty-four thousand...

MR. ROBERTS: Yes! Sure! One hundred and fifty-four and it is going to cost how much to clear the snow away from Mount Scio House? There is their housing programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: The member for Humber East stood here and said that the Public Works Department...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: That the Public Works Department are doing work on Mount Scio House and today the Premier trots in and says; "No."

MR. W.N. ROWE: NO.

MR. ROBERTS: No. "No!" He said, it is being done from his own account.

We will find out. We will find out who is going to pay for the snow clearing and we will find out whether one hundred and forty dollars a month covers the light and the heat on that house. It does not, it will not. We the people of Newfoundland will be subsidizing that house and that is why it is a public issue.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the imported stone?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh yes! The imported stone and the television sets and the large playboy-style bathroom in marble that is being done. These are all things, Mr. Speaker, that will all come out.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Aw keep quiet, Bermuda shorts!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, let us not hear from the land speculator from Harbour Main. We know all about his trick too and I do not mean the junior gentleman I mean the senior. Senior in votes if nothing else.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the snow clearing on Roache's Line?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, let us hear about the snow clearing on Roache's Line, Sir and let us hear about the snow clearing on the Higgins Line the Salmonier Line, the Indian Mean Line, the Torbay Road, the Trans Canada and all the other public roads in this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Ruby Line.

MR. ROBERTS: The Ruby Line, the Lance Cove Line. Let us hear about them all, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, let me also make one other suggestion to the government. I would like to see them extend an invitation...

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, is it only minimum intelligence you are supposed to have to be in the House?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, why does not the member for Bonavista South stick a set of teeth in the member's mouth so we can all know what he is saying?

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible.)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for your help for

your humble servant who is being exposed to the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune here and does not know whether to take arrows against - that would make a great soliloquy, would it not?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Uh, huh!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, let me also suggest that the government might wish to invite a member of the Royal Family to visit Newfoundland during this year. It might be appropriate to have his Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh, Prince Philip, it might be appropriate to ask Her Majesty to visit, if not, one of the other members of the Royal Family if we are to celebrate twenty-five years, I think it is appropriate, Sir, that some member of the Royal Family should be asked to take part at some point. I put that forward as a suggestion, Sir. I do not know the protocol involved, I do not know just what one does. I doubt if one takes up the phone and rings Buckingham Palace and says; "Your Majesty would you like to stop in for lunch?" Given jet aircraft, people can move around very quickly and I am sure that an approach would be received sympathetically. We are Britain's oldest colony and we are proud of that. It would be very appropriate, Sir, if we did have some member of the Royal Family - and remember that Her Majesty the Queen is also by title, by Canadian title, the Queen of Canada as well as the Queen of England, the Queen of Great Britain. Mr. Speaker, I do think we should ask somebody to come.

Now, Sir, I hate to disappoint gentlemen opposite but I have to go to the CBC to do a small interview on Mr. Saunders. They want to have it on film and so do I because each wishes to have his libel lawyers look at it.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Truth is a defense remember...

MR. ROBERTS: I reluctantly shall (truth is a complete defense and it is my defense) have to draw my few brief remarks to a close. I am grateful to honourable gentlemen opposite for the attention they have paid to my remarks. I am encouraged by that because what little I have had to say is a great deal more than has been said on the other

side. I am looking forward to this session with some eagerness. My eagerness is non-dulled by the fact that the Throne Speech is as barren as the Funks. It is an empty document full of wind and pomposity, there is nothing in it. The government may or may not have a great legislative programme, I do not know about that, all I know is that there is nothing in the Throne Speech that outlines or describes it. It is a pathetic example. It would have been a good speech to be written by an administration in office one month and setting forth what they hoped to do, but to think that a group of men have been two years in command of the government of this province with the sort of support they had (no longer have but had) this is a pretty...

AN HON. MEMBER: Still have.

MR. ROBERTS: Still have? Let us put it to the country. Let us put it to the country. If the honourable gentleman wants to run in his district the only problem I have on the Liberal side, Sir, which of about twenty-seven men will get the nomination against him.

MR. W.N. ROWE: He will be defeated for the seventh time.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the administration have failed sadly to come to grips, to come to terms with the problems of this country. They have but it is not too late, they have still three years in their constitutional term. We may have three days, we may have three years until a general election comes but that is up to the Premier. The Premier can advise the governor and under the present circumstances, with such a large majority, His Honour has no choice but to accept that advice. If it were a minority or if it were even that is different, we would need a Bill Saunders then.

Mr. Speaker, I put it to the government that the people of Newfoundland - and there are some men opposite I believe who are genuine. I think the Minister of Manpower is genuine in his desire to help the people of this province. I think the member from Ferryland, the member from St. John's South and others, Because I have not mentioned others I am not leaving them out but there are some who are



not. There are some, Sir, who I believe are genuinely trying to help the people of this province. While we may disagree on programmes, while we may disagree on priorities, we have that in common. Sir, this government, this government has not come up with the means to help our people. They have failed, failed lamentably, they have failed completely, they have failed totally. I hope sincerely and genuinely that within the next weeks and months they will come to grips with the problems of this province and that they will bring into this House a programme to help the people of Newfoundland. They will get our support, they will get our full support and our enthusiastic support. Until they do that, Sir, we shall continue to call on them for action, we shall continue to criticize what has become one of the worst doing administrations ever seen in any province in all of the history of Canada.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, those are a few opening remarks. I believe each of my colleagues hopes to

take part in this debate, including the member for Bell Island, who not as yet has spoken in the debate on the Address in Reply. He will be availing himself of his right under the rules. We will have at least one motion of no-confidence. There is a raging debate in our caucus, Sir, as to what that motion should be. There are so many. We have fifteen topics any one of which would be enough to convince fair-minded people to resign in shame. I do not expect them to resign in any way. They will resign only when the people put them out. We shall be heard from, Sir. We shall be heard from. We intend to keep on.

We find it interesting, Sir, that this government have failed every test of the electorate since March, 1972. Every time they have gone to the electorate, they have come back with less support than they started with. Labrador South, we did not win the district, no, Sir. We held our vote. The Tory vote plummeted, 136 votes. They had more people than that on the payroll down there. The federal election, Mr. Ambrose Peddle, was sacrificed on the altar of this government's expediency. Mr. Fred Woodman paid the price for the Premier, in political terms, just as other honourable gentlemen opposite will. Mr. John Lundrigan very nearly paid the price. Mr. Lundrigan himself told me. He said that ----- (blank) crowd in St. John's cost me 5,000 votes. He and I and the gentleman from Gander were riding together in Botwood last summer when that came out.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Then, of course, came Hermitage, the great watershed, the beginning of the end for the Tory Government, Sir. It will all go in Hansard. Every word of it goes in Hansard. Every word of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is hard to believe.

MR. ROBERTS: Many things may be hard to believe, especially when you look at the honourable gentleman, Mr. Speaker. Every word goes in Hansard.

Let him take it home, read it and learn. He would be the better for it, Sir, and I venture to hope so would this House.

Mr. Speaker, this government have let down the people of Newfoundland. They still have time. I call on them now to do what they should have done two years ago and start to work for Newfoundland. If they do that, they may have a hope of re-election. If they go on as they are now, Sir, the people will take their toll and so they should because this government came into office on a flood tide of promises and on a flood tide of rising expectations. They have let the people down. They have let them down, Sir, they have let them down completely and badly. I cannot think of any more shocking indictment - they will laugh and jeer. Let them, when they go home and think about it, let them realize that. Let each of them search his own heart - a government that came to power under the taint of having lied to the Governor. Somebody, Sir, I believe, lied to His Honour the Governor in connection with that election. Every honourable member opposite who had any knowledge of that, if any there be, come, Mr. Speaker, under taint. There is a taint in the chain of evidence, Sir, and unless and until they expose it, they will all stand condemned and convicted.

Mr. Speaker, I ask them to bring in a positive programme. I regret more than I can say that this Throne Speech is as barren as the Funks. It is, Sir. It is a pretty pathetic effort for two years a government. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have ever sat as long and listened to so little. It is nauseating, sickening and depressing. I am glad he has left the Chamber.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BRETT: Well I can assure you it will not be as long but I hope there will be a little bit more to it, a little bit more substance, I hope.

First of all, Sir, I would like to welcome the new member for Hermitage. He was a friend of mine before coming into politics. I suppose he will remain one. We have witnessed during the past two years, to use some Newfoundland terminology, some rather hefty squalls from that side of the House, empty wind squalls I might say. Probably the new member will add some weight to its emptiness.

I would also like to congratulate the mover and seconder on the Address in Reply. Both honourable gentlemen did a very commendable job.

I am happy to see the Hon. member for Labrador West back in the province and back to his seat in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne which has been classed as barren and empty, (I am sure we have heard that a good many times in the last two days) I thought, Sir, that it outlined very eloquently some of the progress of this government in the last two years, as well as some plans for the future. It would appear, Sir, no matter what you do, the opposition members and a large portion of the news media will criticize it. I think the criticism last year was that the speech was full of promises and this year it said there are none. Sir, it is very difficult to win. As I said earlier, the opposition have classed it as being empty and barren. Sir, I would like for a few minutes, not for two days, to point out to the House how I feel that it is not empty and barren.

From the very beginning, Sir, and I think this is very significant, the speech indicates that it is the government's intention and I quote verbatim here: "to continue its efforts for the betterment of the people by adoption of appropriate measures only after careful and deliberate planning." Now we have been taking some facts from this planning. I gather, Sir, that the opposition are against planning. Maybe they would prefer that we went ahead in a haphazard or ad hoc fashion as we did for twenty-two years. Maybe they still like the policy of develop or perish. They say what they need is action, Sir. Action that results, I think, in government having to write off several millions

of dollars for industries that have failed. This is something that we had to do this year. We wrote of debts to the tune of something like \$6 million, for the rubber factory, I think, and the knitting mill. These two ideas, of course, brain children of the past administration.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech pointed out the task force is comprised of knowledgeable people, both federal and provincial, who were appointed to make recommendations to government.

I suppose one of the most important pieces of legislation that will be brought before this House during the session is the forestry policy. It is as a result of the Report of the Forestry Task Force. The new forestry policy of this government will ensure maximum utilization of all our forests. This new policy, Sir, will mean much to certain sectors of our population and is a direct result of careful planning. Of course, it goes without saying, Sir, that the opposition do not agree with that.

Again as a result of our careful planning over the past two years, our government recently signed a new DREE Agreement with the federal government. This DREE Agreement will result in the spending of approximately \$100 million per year for a ten year period, a total of \$1 billion. This agreement has some particular significance to me. It certainly will be far more beneficial to our province than any agreement entered into by the previous administration. Previously, the District of Trinity North, no section of that district could qualify for any assistance from DREE. This was particularly disappointing as it relates to Clarendville. The Town of Clarendville, I suppose, has to be one of the fastest growing and probably most prosperous towns on the East Coast. Previous to this agreement, it had been left out of all assistance

I think because of the lack of foresight. I am very happy to say, Sir, that this problem no longer exists and I would hope that some of the refunds would be poured into the area.

A lot has been said about our lack of action in the fishery. Still the Throne Speech pointed out that the government is concerned about the future of the inshore fishery. There were no promises, Sir, but there is an ongoing programme for the further development of all sectors of the fishing industry.

In spite of the Opposition's charge of being empty and barren, it does outline the government's concern for the main basic natural resource of our Province. Fishing is not of major importance to all of my district. It is to part of it and I will mention this later on.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech outlines our government stand on our offshore oil. I do not profess to have a great knowledge of this. The fact that careful planning is taking place regarding development of these resources seems to upset certain honourable members on the other side of the House. Whether or not a better deal could have been negotiated for the Upper Churchill, maybe, and I repeat maybe, debatable, however I have to agree with the government that to develop our resources for the benefit of anyone but the people of this Province would be following in the footsteps of our predecessors, certainly not a result of careful planning.

Sir, the development of the Lower Churchill along the lines outlined by our government will result in changes in the economic future of our Province. We are a small island in the middle of the Atlantic with a population of just over 500,000. Our tax base is certainly not sufficient to cater to even the basic needs of our people, to use water and sewerage as an example. Now, without the federal government we could not exist. I qualify that statement hastily.

I realize and agree that as a Province of Canada we are entitled to all we receive from Ottawa. However, Sir, I am sure that all members of this House agree with me when I say that it would be a happy day indeed if we could ever reach the position where we would no longer be classed as a 'have-not' province but rather a 'have' province. Sir, the development of the Lower Churchill and control over our offshore mineral rights could place us in this category and of course, if this could only become possible through careful planning, and I repeat that our official Opposition does not believe in planning.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech outlined the fact that our Government is cognizant of the need for industrial development and at the same time it has shown unmistakably its faith in the rural development of our Province. Now here is another area where we have been clobbered recently by some members of the Opposition. Now I happen to be a Bayman or a rural Newfoundlander and I was recently led to believe that probably some members on the other side of the House were against our rural development policy. Now, Sir, that is not too difficult to understand because I think if I were born and raised in the city of St. John's I probably would not be expected to know very much about the outports either or maybe could not care less whether they were developed or not.

The Rural Development Programme, Sir, as far as I am concerned is one of the better moves this government has made since it has taken office some two years ago. For the first time in our history, we are recognizing our loggers, our boat-builders and many other people involved in our resource base industries. I am reasonably certain, Sir, that the people of Trinity North are grateful to this Government for our Rural Development Policy. Since the formation of the department there has been in excess of \$272,000 in interest-free loans made available. Now, I am not saying, Sir, that every cent that was loaned will be repayed or that every decision by the Rural Development Board



February 11, 1974.

Tape 164

RH - 3

to make the loan was the proper decision. I feel that people will always misuse programmes, government programmes. Welfare programmes are misused. The Unemployment Insurance Benefits Programme is misused and I think, Sir, that this will probably continue as long as we have dishonest people and I do not think the Minister of Rural Development, nor the Premier nor anybody in Opposition nor anybody else can change this because it is a fact of life. The recent criticism of our Rural Development

policy, Sir, by certain members of the opposition. I think it was purely and simply a political expediency. I am sure it was.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do not be so foolish, boy. We would not do that.

MR. BRETT: No, of course you would not.

Sir, there has not been too much reference so far to our plans to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of Confederation with Canada. I believe it is a great thing. I think every Newfoundlander is aware of the fact that Confederation was a blessing. As I stated earlier, Sir, we are a small rock in the middle of the Atlantic and I am sure that the blessings from Ottawa are appreciated even though they are rightfully ours. I am also sure that the majority of our Newfoundland people will appreciate the opportunity to celebrate the occasion.

Our government has been subject to much criticism for a choice of personnel to direct the activities of the celebration. Personally I think it was an excellent choice.

MR. NEARY: Tell us about the rise in communications.

MR. BRETT: That is all right. You will get your turn. If you want to speak twice, you will get it. Yours is coming up.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward with anticipation to the report of the Royal Commission on Municipal Government. There are many problems in my district in this respect and I am looking forward to it as well as the report from the Planning Task Force on Community Service Standards. Unlike the opposition, Sir, I laud the foresight and the careful planning in this respect.

I am also proud of our government's progress in the field of social welfare. I wish I were as articulate and fluent as the Leader of the Opposition because if I were, I could talk on this for a long, long time because I worked with the welfare department for ten years. I feel that I do have some knowledge on the subject.

First of all I want to say that I have listened with disdain - that is a good word - to the ravings - I do not know what else to call it - of the member for Bell Island, the honourable member for Bell Island. He attempts to use the welfare policy and people affected by it for his

own political gain and this is exactly what he has been doing.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: Oh yes. Of course you have.

I understand, Sir, that he was once the Minister of Welfare. Obviously he did not learn very much during his tenure of office. Of course the proof of his ability in this field, Sir, is well known by most Newfoundlanders.

As a result of planning with which again I repeat the opposition does not agree, our government has adopted a welfare policy that is second to none in Canada. This is true whether you want to believe it or not, the honourable member for Bell Island. In spite of what the opposition are saying, Sir, to make political hay, they know as well as I do that people who needed an increase most have received it as a result of this new welfare policy that this government was responsible for bringing in.

The widow with a family of two or three children could barely exist on the old rates. I am not suggesting that she is going to get enough now but I would like to think that her fight for survival will probably be a little easier. Very few people will receive less as a result of the change and a large majority will receive a substantial increase.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote some figures to substantiate my claim that the majority of people who are forced to accept social welfare are financially better off as a result of the new welfare programme which was recently brought in. These figures I obtained from the honourable the minister of that department. Ninety-one per cent of welfare recipients will receive an increase of from twenty-five to fifty dollars. Five per cent will remain the same, that is to say they will not receive any increase or decrease. Four per cent, Sir, will receive less. That is a very small minority.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is not true.

MR. BRETT: Well, it is true, Sir.

MR. NEARY: It is not true. Do not be so foolish.

MR. BRETT: 3,886 widows will receive an increase of sixty dollars per

month.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. BRETT: That is not true either, is it? I see. I should have gotten my figures from you.

Four thousand people who are boarders will receive twenty dollars per month over and above their board and lodging. They were previously receiving ten dollars per month. Four thousand two hundred and forty families of two people will receive an increase of between forty-five to fifty dollars per month.

MR. NEARY: Does that include the family allowance?

MR. BRETT: No, it does not include the family allowance.

MR. THOMS: If it is a widow, yes it includes all the family allowance.

MR. BRETT: It is quite easy, Sir, for the member from Bell Island to take isolated cases which is exactly what he did and to read letters in this honourable House. As I stated earlier, Mr. Speaker, it is generally known that this has been done for

unpolitically reasons, Sir. In my ten years as a welfare officer - and you were not in the field, Sir, but I was - ten years, and I had many experiences and, as a result of it, I could dramatize, make long speeches and tell stories of things that I saw: but I do not think, Sir, that the people of Newfoundland want to hear that - I am sure they do not.

As I said, there is a small majority of four per cent that will receive less than they received before - a small minority.

It is a moral obligation, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure we all know this, that every country should care for the needy, the unfortunate etc. It is rather distasteful, Sir, to see politicians making political hay over such a serious matter and this is exactly what is being done by the honourable member from Bell Island. I do believe, I do not believe I know that this government is cognizant of the need of the less fortunate people of our Province and I think this was proven by a new welfare programme and I think it will be proven even further in the years ahead as we bring in other plans.

Sir, our government has made many worthwhile changes in the Social Welfare Policy as it pertains to the welfare recipient but there is another aspect that I would like to mention as it pertains to the field staff. Again this is probably close to me, being a member of the field staff for ten years. I think that what I am going to relate maybe, will be considered by our Government and this is the problem, Sir, of office accommodations in our welfare office. A typical example is the existing conditions in the welfare office at Clarenville where there are five females and five males on staff. There is one washroom for the entire staff which is also used by the public as well as the janitor of the storage room.

I also understand, Sir, that a serious problem exists at City Welfare here in St. John's where the -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: You got more in the Opposition now than anybody had for the last twenty-five years. A serious problem exists at City

Welfare here in St. John's where there are two or three welfare officers in the one office.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: Would you listen. This is interesting. I hope something will be done about it. I hope something will be done about it.

The fact that there are three workers in the one office, Sir, means that at any given time two or three welfare recipients might be interviewed at the same time in the same office. Now, one of the basic rules taught a social worker or a welfare officer is to respect the rights, the dignity and the confidentiality of a welfare client. I would like to know, Sir, how this rule could be observed under these conditions? I realize, Sir, that the problem is a departmental one and I know that the honourable the minister is aware of it and will do everything in his power to correct what I think is a very serious situation.

Sir, I am extremely pleased that the Throne Speech outlines the Government's intention to bring in a programme to alleviate the great need for additional housing in our Province. Now we just listened to a whole mess of words, I do not know what else to call it, by the Leader of the Opposition. As a matter of fact, our Government is doing something about housing and the programmes will be announced in due course, Sir.

There are many other items that are worthy of mention in the Speech, such as the Government's intention to fully utilize the benefits available to local vocational training institutions. The passing of legislation restoring the right to Memorial University to elect its own president and in this respect, Sir, I am happy that our Government is taking politics out of yet another institution.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: My eye!

The agreement with the Government of Quebec to build a Trans-Labrador Highway as well as the continuing programme of road-building and paving throughout the Province -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: That is fine. It is rightfully ours.

The plans for continued improvement in labour legislation and the aim for better relations between labour and management, these, Mr. Speaker, along with others point out, in my opinion, very forcefully say that the Speech is not empty and barren but rather an outline of our achievements in the past and our plans for the future.

Now, Sir, it is traditional during the Address in Reply for a member to talk about the needs of his district and I welcome the opportunity to do just that. I might add it is with a great deal of pride that I can speak on behalf of the district of Trinity North. It is a fairly large district, Sir, one of the larger ones, not the largest, and when I am talking about it, I usually divide it into three sections.



AN HON. MEMBER: ... Come By Chance.

MR. BRETT: No, no.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: East or West from it.

The first area that I would like to refer to, Sir, is the area from Spillars Cove to Melrose. I suppose I can class this as a small industrial area with almost full employment. The main industry is the fresh fish plant at Port Union which is owned and operated by Fishery Products.

This past year the company have planned expenditures of \$11 million, \$10 million of this will be for new draggers plus \$1 million extension to the plant. As a result of this extension the plant is now a year round operation where previously it was seasonal. The extension to the plant is to facilitate the production of caplin -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: At the moment for fish meal - The Newfoundland Government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: No.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: Right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: The extension. Well, that is to facilitate the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: I believe it is the intention of the company, Sir, later on to protest these caplin for human consumption as well as for fish meal.

The two Towns of Catalina and Port Union depend almost entirely on this industry as well as people from all over the area, I think even from parts of Bonavista South.

In addition to the fresh fish plant there are also two large modern salt fish plants in the area, one at Port Union and one at Catalina. These two plants are among the largest on the east coast.

of the province. Actually I think one of them is the largest. Unfortunately, Sir, neither one of them operate anywhere near full capacity, if they were in full production it would mean another 200 jobs or 300 jobs for the area.

I have talked to the owners of these plants on several occasions and naturally they would like to see them open and to see the salt fish industry revived since they feel that it is dying.

Like other in the province, particularly on the northeast coast, who own salt fish plants, they feel that the federal government have not done enough to promote this industry. The Canadian Salt Fish Corporation appears to be letting the industry die. I should point out here, Sir, though that there is no lack of co-operation on the part of the officials of the Salt Fish Corporation here at St. John's. However it is felt that since the federal government are entirely responsible for this section of the fishing industry through the Salt Fish Corporation then more funds should be made available.

I hope, Sir, that our government in its wisdom will bring pressure to bear on the federal government to see that this industry which is so labour-intensified be not allowed to die.

During the past two years, Sir, the government have spent well over \$1 million in this area, particularly for paving and water and sewerage projects. Last year ten miles of road were paved from the Cabot Highway into Elliston including the roads in the community itself. The first year of this administration the main road in the Community of Melrose was paved. Water and sewerage projects are continuing in the Town of Catalina and Port Union. I am hoping, Sir, that funds can be made available this year for a start on the water and sewerage in Little Catalina.

Other communities in the area are experiencing problems in finding suitable drinking water, particularly, Sir, in the Communities of Melrose and Elliston. I understand that funds have been allocated to these communities through the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing for artesian wells. A new fire truck was purchased for the two Towns of

Catalina and Port Union last year and Little Catalina also received a new fire truck quite recently.

Sir, the greatest need in the area at the moment is for land development and housing. This is brought on as a result of the extension to the fish plant. I understand that plans are underway by the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing in conjunction with the Town Councils of these two towns to develop land. I am hoping that some action will be forthcoming this year.

There is also a great need for recreational facilities and again I believe the councils are negotiating through the Department of Recreation and Rehabilitation for some concrete plans.

The one thing, Sir, that stands out in my mind when I am talking of this particular area from Spillars Cove to Melrose is a unity which now exists among these four or five communities. Two years ago when I first went down there and I met the council, every community was as far apart as east and west. I guess this is typical of rural Newfoundland. For example if Catalina got a new fire truck then Port Union wanted a new fire truck and so on and so this proved to be very expensive to government. I am happy to say that after meeting with all the councils and suggesting that there be more unity and pointing to the Burin Peninsula as a strong example, These councils have now gotten together and there is concrete proof and evidence that they are working as one. A typical example is the new fire truck which was placed in Catalina to serve the two settlements and some more evidence of it was quite recently when the Council of Catalina decided that they were going to build some recreational facilities and on second thought met with the joint councils and decided that they would put something in the area for the whole area, rather than having one facility in the Town of Catalina.

Now then, Sir, the second area to which I refer is a more, I do not know if it is more historic or not but certainly it is a very historic area and that is from English Harbour to Bonaventure. This area, unlike the previous one, has no industry whatsoever. It has potential and in this connection I will be requesting officials from the Department of Rural Development to make a study to determine what would be feasible in the way of some small industry.

Now anyone who has driven over the Bonavista Peninsula and looked out over the hill, well you cannot go that way any longer because of the new Cabot Highway, but in the old section of the road which went over the hill that was known as Breakheart Hill and looked out over the tiny settlement of Trinity, would have to agree that it is one of the

most scenic areas in the province. In addition to the natural beauty, Trinity is one of the oldest and most historic towns in this province and neither the past administration nor this one for that matter, has spent enough money to preserve the beauty and the history that exist at Trinity.

I wish that Mr. White, the gentleman who is very active in this line of work down there, could talk to some of you honourable gentlemen here because the history is fantastic. It is really something. I invite any member here who is in that area, the right season of the year to go into Trinity, to go into the old church and the museums. It is utterly fantastic.

Now while I have singled out the Town of Trinity for its beauty and its history, I would like to point out, Sir, that the whole area is a beautiful area. Of course you will gather from this, Sir, that there is a tremendous tourist potential and while I agree that this should be developed as soon as possible, it still would not provide sufficient jobs for the people in the area. Of course the seasonal aspect would have to be considered.

The Town of Port Rexton appears to have some farming potential and I believe that some officials from the Department of Forestry and Agriculture were recently in the area discussing the possibilities of such a venture.

As I stated earlier, Sir, the greatest need is industry. A large percentage of the men in this area have to leave home to find employment. They go to the Great Lakes. They are gone for about eight months of the year. This is hardly acceptable in this day and age. They leave home in March or April and they do not come back any more until around Christmas. I am hoping, Sir, that something can be done in the not too distant future to find some sort of solution to this problem.

Of course there is a need for more road building and paving. The road to Old and New Bonaventure is a narrow, winding stretch of dust and pot holes, that is all you can call it.

I would like to see some immediate action taken to bring it up to at least a decent standard. I know it would be a very expensive venture but nevertheless if we have people living there we have to bring at least the basic needs to them. Also up on that end of the road there is a great need for water. They cannot find any water fit to drink. I would like to see some action taken in providing artesian wells for these people.

Of course, it is not all bad, Your Honour, there have been many improvements in the area over the past two years which should not go unnoticed. Most of the roads actually have been upgraded and paved with the exception of the Bonaventure Road which I just mentioned. The people are presently negotiating with government for a new fire truck. I have been working with the council and we are fairly optimistic that the area will continue to grow and that government services will be forthcoming as finances allow.

Mr. Speaker, the third and largest area in the District of Trinity North is from Burgoynes Cove to Southport and this includes Random Island. While this is a very prosperous area it is the one most needing of government services, which I will outline later. Clarenville is the centre of this area. Clarenville is a thriving town, Sir, it is often referred to as the hub of the east coast. It is a service centre which is probably what makes it tick. The people in the surrounding area depend on Clarenville for many of their services. Clarenville, of course, also depends on the outlying areas to keep the business houses etc. moving. I suppose you could call it a mutual affair.

Many changes have taken place, Sir, in Clarenville over the past two years and now that we can qualify for DREE funds I expect to see many more. Land development and housing are proceeding at a very rapid pace. However, Sir, more land will have to be developed if we are to keep up with the continuing increase in population. There is a tremendous influx of people into the Clarenville Area and this is largely because

of the Come By Chance development.

The water and sewerage project is proceeding on schedule. I suppose it is on schedule, it is still moving.

Medical services which were very, very poor three or four years ago, have improved I think beyond all expectations. There are presently two resident doctors and a third will be practicing there as of the 1st. of March. A new clinic is under construction, of course this is a private deal. But the new clinic will be capable of housing five medical doctors and a dentist. I am hoping that the doctor in charge there will be going after another dentist for the town. I know, Sir, that the people of Clarenville and the surrounding area are looking forward to this new clinic and the ever improved medical services.

It may sound like I am painting a rosy picture of the area but it is true, Sir, that Clarenville is presently enjoying an economic boom. But then of course economic booms bring their problems also.

The greatest need in the area and one that has existed for a number of years is for a regional hospital. It has been agreed by government to build this hospital at Clarenville.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: Sir, the people of my district are looking forward with anticipation to start hopefully later in 1974 or early in 1975.

AN HON. MEMBER: .... courthouse.

MR. BRETT: There is a new courthouse in Clarenville, a very beautiful courthouse, thanks to the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Justice. It is probably one of the better courthouses in the province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: Generally speaking, Sir, there is full employment in this area either through our resource based industries; there are fishing, logging, boatbuilding or construction work in Clarenville or, of course, the Oil Refinery at Come By Chance.

AN HON. MEMBER: There are only four up there.

MR. BRETT: Four up there.



AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: So much for the rosy side of it, Sir, now for the needs if I may be permitted to go on. Probably the greatest need and the one most talked about is road

construction and paving and this is a very sore spot, I suppose, not only with the people in Trinity North but all over the province. There must be more gravel road in this district than in any other district between St. John's and Bonavista North. I would like to list them in the hope that it might have some impact on this honourable House, particularly on the minister concerned.

The road from Burgoynes Cove to Georges Brook, number one and number two, all the roads on Pandom Island. Well, I am not one-third through them yet. All roads from Deep Bight to Northwest Brook including the road to St. Jones in Hatchet Cove and also Goobies. All the Southwest Arm road from the Trans Canada Highway to Southport. Now, I do not know the mileage here but there are quite a number of miles and I realize a good many millions of dollars to complete it would be needed. Well, if it is all in Ottawa I hope that some of it can be hauled out of there so we can get a start on these roads this year.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What happened to the federal member?

MP. BRETT: I do not know what happened to the federal member, Sir, I do not think anybody has seen him since he was elected but there was at least a correspondence came across my desk today. While on the subject of roads, Sir, I would like to take this opportunity to point out the urgent need for a new highway depot at Clarendville. With several hundred machines to operate, the depot has facilities to service less than fifteen at any one time. So, I ask, Sir, how can we expect to have an efficient operation under these circumstances? I feel reasonable certain that something will be done in this respect in the very near future, this year I hope.

Mr. Speaker, while roads and a regional hospital had to be classed as the greatest need for this area, I must point out that there are others. The Town of Shoal Harbour needs water and sewerage facilities. Many smaller communities are in need of water services. There is a need for more school construction. There are many other needs, Sir, I could go on list them but I feel certain that action will be taken by our government as soon as finances allow.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost six of the clock. I would like to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It is noted that the honourable member has adjourned the debate. So, we give him the opportunity to speak first next day. Before I accept the motion to adjourn, I have looked at the resolution given by the member for White Bay South and found it to be in order and it will be on tomorrow's Order Paper.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at three o'clock and this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday at three of the clock.