



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 6

VERBATIM REPORT

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

I would like to welcome to the galleries today all visitors, but I would particularly like to welcome to the Speaker's gallery the Mayor of Stephenville, Mayor Jean Fowlow, and in the galleries, we have thirteen grade eleven students from the Centennial Central High School in Victoria Cove, Gander Bay with their teacher, Mr. Frazer Lush and Mr. Frances Brinston. I would like to extend a cordial welcome to these persons as well.

MR. H. R. V. EARLE (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I think it is particularly appropriate today with the Mayor of Stephenville in the visitor's gallery to make an official announcement that the amalgamation of the towns of Stephenville and Harmon have been agreed by cabinet and that the details of the amalgamation are now being worked out. In other words, the boundaries of the new town and all other details pertinent to this amalgamation are presently being worked out by the government and that the amalgamation and election for a new council which will in future encompass what was formerly Harmon and Stephenville will be held as soon as possible.

I am very proud and happy that this is being accomplished after a lot of negotiation and discussion with the people in the area and I feel that it will be of great benefit to the whole area of Harmon and Stephenville and I congratulate the people on their decision in that direction.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize the honourable member for Port au Port: First of all I would like to mention, for the benefit of the member from St. Barbe North, I did not get a chance to do it yesterday evening, that his resolution was found to be in order and it will appear on Monday's order paper.

Secondly, with reference to some remarks made by the honourable

February 8, 1974.

Tape 121

RH - 2

Leader of the Opposition yesterday concerning the alleged conduct of
Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker: I studied very carefully
this morning the transcript of the remarks made by the honourable
Leader of the

of the Opposition and found them to be, indeed, out of order. I refer to Beauchesne Standing Order (232), sub-section (2); "If a member wishes at any time to call in question the conduct of the Chairman in the execution of his duties, the proper course is to give notice of a motion to that effect in due course."

I also refer to a section in Erskine May, page (351), "Rules governing subject matter of motions." It says; "Certain matters cannot be debated save upon a substantive motion which admits of a distinct vote of the House. Among these are the conduct of the Sovereign, the Heir to the Throne and other members of the Royal Family, the Governors-General of the Independent Territories, the Lord Chancellor, the Speaker and the Chairman of Ways and Means."

Again, on page (417) of Erskine May it says; "Unless the discussion is based upon a substantive motion drawn in proper terms reflections must not be cast in debate upon the conduct of the Sovereign, the Heir to the Throne and other members of the Royal Family, the Lord Chancellor, the Governors-General of the Independent Territories, the Speaker or the Chairman of Ways and Means."

I would like to add that any references or inferences alluding to the conduct of the Chairman of Committees, the Deputy Speaker, in that capacity, in anyway in the future, except under a proper motion, will be dealt with most severely in this honourable House.

PETITIONS:

HON. E.M. ROBERTS (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if I may make a comment upon the Ministerial Statement made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs; May I thank you for your guidance on the other matter, Your Honour, I assure you that I shall be guided by it fully and completely.

I, in behalf of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, welcome the announcement that the government have decided to amalgamate Harmon, the Harmon Area, the former Harmon Complex and the Town of Stephenville, into a new municipality. I am not sure if the minister

gave us the name but I assume it will be called the Town of Stephenville and in due course and very shortly I hope it will become the City of Stephenville, an area growing very rapidly. We welcome it, Sir.

In so saying though, I must regretfully add two comments. I do wish the government had seen fit to move more quickly on this matter. The council pressed, the people pressed -

AN HON. MEMBER: Is the honourable gentleman asking a question?

AN HON. MEMBER: The honourable member is out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not asking a question.

AN HON. MEMBER: Then the honourable member is out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, do I have the right to be heard without interruptions from "what's-his-name" over there?

AN HON. MEMBER: The honourable member knows the name.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Secondly -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I remind honourable members that any member speaking does have the right to be heard in silence and I request them to adhere to that rule.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can only hope the gentleman from St. John's West will show the same tender deference to Your Honour's rulings as I do, Sir. As I was saying before I was so rudely and deliberately interrupted, the government should have moved more quickly. The council in Stephenville wished them to move more quickly, the people, speaking through their various organizations, expressed that wish.

Mr. Speaker, if that is planning it would have taken God seven-seven days to make the world and not seven, the sort of planning the Tory Party indulge in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Was it? It took Him six days and on the seventh day

He rested. Is that what the honourable member is talking about?

DR. T.C. FARRELL (President of the Council): About one mistake He made.

MR. ROBERTS: I see thirty, Mr. Speaker. Not only that, I see thirty mistakes the people of Newfoundland made.

Mr. Speaker, secondly; I do wish there had been some process, some formal process involved whereby the people of Stephenville could have been formally consulted. I realize their elected body, the Town Council, which speaks for them spoke on this matter and I do not in any way take away from their mandate to speak or their right to speak but I do wish there had been some process other than a badly handled, according to the press, gerrymander not gerrymander not even gerrydoodle but a badly handled meeting, chaired, I believe by the gentleman from Port au Port.

I do wish there had been a better process evolved. I had expected more from a government that formerly made such a fetish about consulting the people.

Sir, those are two relatively minor points because the important thing is that it has been done and the right thing has been done. The people of Stephenville will welcome this and my colleagues and I welcome it also.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I too welcome the announcement of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing that the amalgamation of the Town of Stephenville and the Harmon Area is imminent. It should be a legal fact within a few days,

The remarks by the Leader of the Opposition are typical of the Leader of the Opposition. In 1966 -

MR. NEARY: On a point of information, Mr. Speaker. I would like to raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: Your Honour I still have the floor. I am not yielding to the honourable gentleman.

MR. ROBERTS: A point of order is always in order.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member for Bell Island rising on a point of order? If so, would he state the point of order.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Sir. My understanding, Sir, is that the rules of this House clearly indicate that a ministerial statement can be commented on only by the Leader of the Opposition or the leaders of the parties in the House and should not develop into a full-fledged debate. If so, Sir, then we all have the right at this moment, when the member for Port au Port is finished, to participate in the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island is basically correct although there some leeway was given to honourable members on this matter before. I feel that perhaps the same should be done now as long as it is the feeling of the Chair that the thing is not abused.

MR. ROBERTS: Since it is not a precedent, we will consent to allow the gentleman to comment.

MR. STAGG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the benefit of persons here who are not as well acquainted with the situation in Stephenville and the Stephenville areas as some of us are, the Harmon area could have been amalgamated a long time ago. The year 1966 was when it was formally handed back to the Newfoundland government. There was a period from 1966 to 1971 in which the previous administration could have acted on that.

Today is an auspicious occasion both from the point of view of amalgamation and indeed there is a new industry coming into Stephenville. The announcement came today. I believe it is one of the reasons why Her Worship is in the capital city today, that the Labatt's Brewery has taken over the Atlantic Brewery, Bison Brewery. We were certainly very pleased with this. We think that this is an

indication of things to come, that the Stephenville area is certainly on the way up to be a strong economic unit of the West Coast and indeed of the whole province.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES:

HON. WILLIAM W. MARSHALL (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): I ask leave to table the report of the committee appointed by the House of Assembly on rules, standing orders and procedures. Of course, this select committee, Mr. Speaker, died with the first session. There is probably really no need to reconstitute it because it will not make any difference to the report but I table it as a report anyway, Mr. Speaker. If Your Honour thinks that it shall be reconstituted, it will be.

HON. T.A. HICKMAN (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): I table the following regulations made under the Motor Carrier Act on June 5, 1973, December 11, 1973 and regulations made under the provisions of the Private Investigators Security Guards Regulations Act, January 3, 1974.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS

CAPT. E.W. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move the following resolution: "To move that this House regrets the failure of the government to develop and to implement a comprehensive programme for the development of our fisheries including in particular measures for the conservation of our marine resources and urge the government to develop, make public and implement such a comprehensive programme immediately."

MR. MORGAN: I give notice that I will no tomorrow introduce the following resolution:

WHEREAS foreign fishing vessels are extensively fishing on the fishing grounds known as as the Hamilton Banks;

AND WHEREAS the Hamilton Banks are the spawning grounds for species of fish commercially caught by Newfoundland fishermen;

AND WHEREAS it appears that stocks along Newfoundland, Labrador and the Eastern Coast of Labrador and the Eastern Coast of Newfoundland are being severely reduced because of the fishing on the Hamilton

Banks during the spawning season;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this Legislature urge the Federal Government to make a strong case at the up-coming Law of the Sea Conference and at the up-coming

International Commission of North Atlantic Fisheries that at both these meetings a ban be placed on all fishing on the grounds, known as the Hamilton Banks, during the spawning season.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

HON. A. J. MURPHY (Minister of Social Assistance): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to answer a question that is not on the Order Paper. I took notice of it from the member for White Bay North and the member for Bell Island. It is with reference to any prosecutions under the new Social Service Regulations. There were none to my knowledge. There are many investigations going on, Sir, but to this date, I do not think there have been any prosecutions as such.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Would the minister inform the House when the vacancies on the St. John's Area Metropolitan Board will be filled?

MR. EARLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, actually I had to request nominations, as is required from the City Council, for the two members. They have now advised me of the two members of council they wish to sit on the board. It is presently before the cabinet and as soon as it has been confirmed, the announcement will be made.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Hon. Minister of Education. Would the minister inform the House why slides for other departments were charged under the Department of Education?

MR. SPEAKER: I have to rule the honourable member's question out of order as it does not require an urgent answer and it should be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Hon. Minister of Education. Will the minister inform the House specifically for what areas of education his department intends to seek DREE funds for capital construction?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what I have to do to appeal the ruling, Sir, but I have received two different answers to the same question on two different days and I think the situation should be clarified.

MR. SPEAKER: I think I made it clear yesterday that the purpose of the whole question period is to ask questions which are basically of an urgent nature and require an answer almost immediately. Otherwise, they should be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I submit that this question is of an urgent nature, Sir. Yesterday a question was asked to the Premier -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The Hon. member for St. Barbe North is making a speech.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Finance. I would consider this matter to be fairly pressing, Sir, fairly urgent. Would the minister give the House some details of the agreement that was negotiated with the Barvarian Brewery, I think it is Labatt's, to take over Bison Brewery at Stephenville? I would like for the minister especially to tell us what has happened to the outstanding taxes that are due the province by Bison Brewery?

HON. J. C. CROSBIE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, this question comes as a surprise and a shock. The honourable member is asking an embarrassing question. Since he has asked it, I suppose I have to harp back to the past and answer him.

The position, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this is: It was announced today that Labatt's had acquired assets of the Bison Brewery at Stephenville, that ill-starred adventure, and will be operating a brewery at Stephenville.

Now in connection with that, the House will remember that a number of years ago, when the last administration were still in office they failed to collect from Atlantic Brewing Company Limited an amount of (I cannot give the exact figure) \$410,000, that Atlantic Brewing should have paid the government, the Newfoundland Liquor Commission, in commissions on beer sold. Atlantic Brewing, the House will remember, paid none of that, although they were supposed to pay it monthly. In any event, when Atlantic Brewing went out of business, the amount was still owing

to the government which has acted negligently and improperly in not collecting it, despite the efforts of the then Minister of Finance.

When Bison Brewing Company Limited took over the assets from the creditors of Atlantic Brewing, or from the persons who had a trust deed, it was announced in this House by the then Premier, who was Mr. Smallwood as I recall -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not answering the question.

MR. CROSBIE: I am answering the question, yes. It was then announced Mr. Speaker, that Bison Brewing Company Limited had agreed with the government to repay the amount of four hundred and some odd thousand dollars over a period of ten years and that they would give the government revenue bonds and that this amount would be paid out of revenue.

Unfortunately after we assumed office and investigated that whole matter, it turned out there was no agreement between the government and Bison Brewing Company Limited that had any binding effect whatsoever, that Bison Brewing would repay this amount of \$410,000, approximately. Although we tried to pursue the matter and have the revenue bonds forwarded to us, that was never resolved and our legal advice when Labatt's said they were interested in acquiring the Bison assets and the question arose in connection with the \$410,000, is that we had no claim against Bison Brewing Company Limited at all in connection with the \$410,000. So the simple position is that the \$410,000 negligently left uncollected from Atlantic Brewing will always remain uncollected and the matter therefore is not any part of the arrangement between Labatt Brewery and Bison.

Now in connection with the purchase by Labatt's from Bison, we have said that there would be no sales tax exemption. It is not our policy to grant sales tax exemption. They are paying sales tax on the assets that they are acquiring from Bison. We have also told Bison that they are not having tax exemption. When Bison originally

purchased the assets from Atlantic Brewing, the then administration of Mr. Smallwood promised them a sales tax exemption. They never paid any sales tax. But that was never carried into effect and we have said we are not carrying it into effect and we have insisted that that sales tax be paid, and that will also be paid. So we will be paid the sales tax that should have been collected when Atlantic Brewing sold to Bison Brewery. We will collect sales tax now on the transfer of the assets but the four hundred odd thousand dollars will never be collected. It could not be collected now from Bison because we have no legal way of getting it from them and they did not volunteer to pay us the \$410,000.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, just as a matter of curiosity, to at least give me the feeling that there is no conflict of interest here, I personally think that \$400,000 could be collected. Certainly I would like to know if the honourable minister is still connected with that brewery in any way, I think it was Bavarian Brewery.

MR. CROSBIE: That has no urgency.

MR. NEARY: This is urgent, Mr. Speaker, I want to find out if there is any conflict of interest, why this \$400,000 is not being collected.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, we are used of course to the low and degrading habits of the honourable gentleman from Bell Island and if he wish to know about my connection with anything at all, he only has to go down to the Auditor General's Office and go in and have a look at the statement that is filed there.

The honourable gentleman might be able to collect the \$410,000 from us if he would use his influence with his friend, John C. Doyle, and have him pay the money voluntarily. We have no influence with Mr. Doyle. The honourable gentleman may have as he is a close associate of the honourable gentleman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whom to direction this question to. Who is the Minister of Public Works on that side now, who is acting? Well I will ask the Acting Premier, Mr. Speaker, if the Acting Premier

can tell us if the government abandoned its idea of putting an extension on Confederation Building?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is not a question for the Order Paper.

AN HON. MEMBER: I was looking for the Premier. I did not know who was on duty today.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I suggest that it be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Acting Premier tell us what kind of a deal is being made with Trizec, Sir, the persons who are going to put up this building downtown to rent office space? And are public tenders being called? This is urgent, Sir, because

MR. NEARY: my understanding is that this is apart of the deal -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The honourable the member for Bell Island is proceeding to make a speech and I will rule him out of order. The question that he just asked could be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they will have the building up before we get the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the member for Bell Island is out of order. The Hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy:

HON. L. R. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, in reply to a question raised by the honourable member for Bell Island yesterday, asked previously -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! If the honourable Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources would carry on.

MR BARRY: I was trying to stand up, Mr. Speaker, with the Leader of the House -

MR SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Energy can answer the question by leave of the House. Does the honourable minister have leave of the House to answer the question? It is agreed. Agreed!

MR. BARRY: The honourable the member for Bell Island asked a question relating to the disposal of funds on the sale of houses on Bell Island formerly owned by DOSCO?

MR. MURPHY: This should be interesting. Is it like the assets?

MR. BARRY: Whether or not the funds are still retained by the St. John's Housing Corporation?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Ninety-nine houses belonging to DOSCO on Bell Island were acquired in the name of the St. John's Housing Corporation. In November 1969 the administration, maintenance and/or disposal of all houses with the except of the staff house, was transfered from the St. John's Housing Corporation to the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

MR. MURPHY: In 1969?

MR. BARRY: In 1969. At the time of the transfer the balance of funds left with the St. John's Housing Corporation amounted to \$38,690.66. This amount was reduced by \$7,500 which was paid to the Bell Island Community Fund in accordance with Para (5) of a Minute of Executive Council - 421-71, and represented the proceeds of the DOSCO guesthouse. Interest earned on term deposit receipts has increased the fund to \$35,560.57 which is still retained by the St. John's Housing Corporation.

Officials inform me that on the instructions of the former Chairman of the Corporation, Mr. O.L. Vardy, the balance of funds were not transferred to the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation at that time. As I understand it, the instructions were that these funds were to remain with the St. John's Housing Corporation indefinitely until instructions were received to the contrary and, of course, instructions were never given.

The Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation also have monies on hand from the Bell Island houses as follows: \$5,058.10 obtained by way of rents; \$1,200 received on payout of a mortgage; and \$25,100 realized from the sale of eight DOSCO properties for a total of \$31,538.10.

The Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation commenced repairs on the DOSCO houses. These have not yet been totally completed. The cost of repairs has not yet been fully established. It may be possible to go into the monies that are on hand in order to carry out the cost of repairs. They may not be met from the rental received from the houses.

Once repairs have been completed a decision will be made concerning the disposal of the balance of the funds in the hands of both the St. John's Housing Corporation and the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

MR. MURPHY: Who is the beneficiary of all these homes?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the people of Bell Island will be the beneficiary of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: A very wise thinking on the part of the former administration.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would inform -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the member for Bell Island is not permitted to make comments regarding the answer given by a minister. If he should rise to ask a question, then I suggest that he do just that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the minister a question. I know Your Honour is clamping down but we do not have to have complete closure in this honourable House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the honourable minister if the government, if his department will consult with committees and with the people of Bell Island before they dispose of whatever the balance is going to be left in that account after the repairs of the DOSCO houses are paid for?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it is the policy of this government to always consult with the people involved, the responsible people, I might add, and I might note that there has been a very responsible council and new mayor elected on Bell Island recently and there is close consultation with this mayor and there will continue to be close consultation and

co

operation with Mr.

MR. FRED ROWE (St. Barbe North): Mr. Speaker, in view of the urgent and numerous requests that I have had from educators and members of school boards would the Minister of Education confirm or deny the statement that the Premier made yesterday when he said that no DREE funds will be sought for the purposes of education in this Province, which is quite contrary to what the minister had said the day before.

MR SPEAKER: The honourable member's question should be placed on the order paper.

MR F. ROWE: MR. Speaker, the question is an urgent one

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: On his knees! The honourable member for St Barbe North is out of order.

The honourable Member for Fogo:

MR WINSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If I may direct a question to the honourable Minister of Fisheries: It is a follow-up to the question I asked him the other day. I am sure he will not mind telling the House, what way does he propose paying the fishermen for storm damage? Will it be made payable direct to the fishermen or by other means?

MR. H. COLLINS (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, there has been no change in the way in which fishermen were always paid with regard to compensation and storm damage and that is that the fishermen go to the supplier of their choice, and there are several of them around the Province now. After having established a claim, of course, in the first place they go to the suppliers, whoever they might be, and having obtained the gear which they are looking for, then we will reimburse the supplier what their provincial portion of the cost would be.

MR. WINSOR: A supplementary: Do I understand the minister to say that that is the way it was always done? There is a deviation there from former practises, is there not?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, maybe I should not say that is the way

it has always been done, but that is the way it has been done in recent years. One of the reasons for that is that we want to make sure, of course, that the money which is expended is going into fishery gear and there are certain kits which we insist on the fishermen buying. I am not sure that the honourable member is not getting confused with the other programme, the Federal Government's Compensation for Lost Time Programme which we have nothing to do with but the Federal Government mails cheques directly to the fishermen - in this case we reimburse the suppliers after having supplied the fishermen with gear.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to create an argument with the honourable minister but if I recall correctly in 1970 or 1971 payments were made direct to the fishermen and about, maybe eight or ten years ago it was done in the way the minister outlined. If that is so then I think it is a retroactive step. It sure does not follow that plan now!

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would have to tell you that under advisement; to check into what happened eight or ten or five or six years ago. I can certainly do that but that is the programme this year.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I direct a question to the Minister of Rehabilitation. Would the minister tell the House if all the grievances that occurred at Exon House a year ago have yet been settled and if any legal action has been taken as a result of a recent unfortunate situation at the Boys Training Home at Pleasantville?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Order paper, my eye.

MR. SPEAKER: Did you sign the order paper?

MR. NEARY: Who has been talking to Your Honour out in the corridors the last day or so?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member from Bell Island is out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is what they would like, Sir. Obviously, we are not going to get any information today but I am going to try the Minister of Agriculture, Sir. Would the Minister of Agriculture tell the House what time the government intends to set up the Newfoundland Conservation Core as announced in the Throne Speech in 1972?

MR. E. MAYNARD (Minister of Agriculture & Forests): It is not urgent.

MR. NEARY: Not urgent. It is only two years old. There is nothing urgent with the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Would the minister answer the question?

MR. MAYNARD: I cannot set a specific date on when the Conservation Core is going to be set up, Mr. Speaker. It is a matter relating to two or three different departments and has to be worked out over a period of time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, may I direct an urgent question to the Minister of Social Services. Would the Minister of Social Services inform the House if the forty dollar special allowance granted to the spouses of old age pensioners who did not qualify for the old age pension is still in affect or not?

HON. A. J. MURPHY (Minister of Social Assistance): I will check with my department on that, I am not quite aware of the fact. I will check and

I will let the honourable gentleman know this afternoon if he wants to or tomorrow. Would the honourable gentleman kindly make a note of it? My mind, it is hard to retain all the questions with all the excitement. If the honourable gentleman would kindly put it on the Order Paper or a bit of paper, anything at all just so I can have it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Do not let Peter Harrington throw the honourable member.

MR. MURPHY: Peter Harrington will not throw me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: I wonder if the same minister would also get me some information as to what measures have been taken to assist senior citizens to try and keep them in their own homes, as announced in the Throne Speech in 1972?

MR. SPEAKER: That question will be placed on the Order Paper.

The honourable member for Bonavista North:

MR. P.S.THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Fisheries could inform this honourable House as to what percentage of the cost of the gear lost in storms in 1972, will be paid to the fishermen? That is, what percentage of the total value of a fisherman's gear will be paid?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think that is a question which could easily go on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: No! No, Mr. Speaker, this is an...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I could get an answer to a question from the Acting Minister of Labour. I will wait for the minister to go back to his seat. It is my understanding, Sir, from high-ranking officials of the labour movement that applications are piling up before the Labour Relations Board. Now I realize, Your Honour, and I think you will permit me to say this; that we are very conscious of the fact that the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations is ill at the moment but there is an Acting Minister of Manpower and

Industrial Relations and I wonder if the minister could find out if this is true; if applications are piling up and that the Department of Labour is gradually grinding to a halt?

MR. BARRY: Applications for certification?

MR. NEARY: Before the Labour Relations Board for certification.

MR. BARRY: I can attempt it. I may not fully answer the question, Mr. Speaker, but the fact was that there were two members of the Labour Relations Board whose term expired as of either December or January, I forget the relevant date. Our government, as is its policy, prior to appointing a second member, the employee representative to the board, we consulted with labour, specifically with the Newfoundland Federation of Labour and other union representatives and requested nominations from the labour movement for a suitable new member for the Labour Relations Board.

Unfortunately there was some delay, approximately a week or two weeks delay in finalizing this consultative process which our government believes is very important with the labour movement and which we feel we have gone along way in constructing. A proper consultative process.

MR. NEARY: Cut out the nonsense.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down.

MR. BARRY: As I understand it, the...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. MURPHY: Sit down and let the minister finish.

MR. BARRY: Being a novice, as I understand the labour movement, I understand the proper consultative mechanism was not laid down. I may be wrong. There may have been consultation prior to the I.W.A. decertification and so on. Maybe the honourable member can clarify it. In any event, there was an approximate week or two weeks delay in filling the membership of the board, specifically because we wanted to ensure that the employee representative was somebody in whom the trade union movement in Newfoundland could place great trust and confidence.

Because of this delay the Labour Relations Board missed one meeting, we understand. The honourable member may be correct but I have only had notice of one meeting being missed. These appointments have now been made to the Labour Relations Board and I understand the normal process is occurring where the certification applications are being considered. I understand there are no problems as far as processing these is concerned.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable minister be in a position to give us the names of the new appointees to the Labour Relations Board?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Fred Russell was re-appointed as the representative of industry, of the employer and a Mr. Pinsent from Grand Falls, Mr. Michael Pinsent from Grand Falls was appointed as the employee representative.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry the honourable member has to leave too because he will miss a better speech than he has given in a long time in this House.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few words I wish to say yet on the matter of the Address in Reply and by leave of honourable gentlemen opposite I shall attempt to say them. Let me first of all, Sir, deal with the statements or one or two of the statements made yesterday by the gentleman from Labrador South. Let me say at the outset that I do not have the transcript of the honourable gentleman's remarks because, of course, Hansard is lamentably late again. We are into the sixth or seventh day of - no this is the sixth day of our session, Sir, and we have received Hansards for, I believe, three or maybe four days only. Hansard is lamentably late. If we are this far behind already it will be probably much, much further behind before the session ends. All that means is simply that

Hansard is ceasing to become a useful tool for members of the House in debate.

In any event, all I know of the honourable gentleman's statement is what I read in the morning paper, I have not even seen the...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: That is what I said. Yes. It is true I did charge the Premier with misleading the House. He did mislead the House. All I know of the honourable member's statements is what I read in the "Daily News" this morning. The "Daily News" report was not lengthy, I do not even know if it was accurate or not. I have not had the opportunity to chat with the honourable gentleman to see precisely what he did say.

I am referring, of course, to his remarks, the ones which quite deservedly got some deal of publicity. Three, six, nine - Mr. Speaker, let us have a quorum called to start the day. We are going to have fourteen on the other side throughout.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Good idea.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Would the Clerk count the House, please?
We have a quorum.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is a matter of grave, gross discourtesy to the House for an honourable member to call for a quorum call and then leave the chamber himself. It makes a charade, a fraud of the rules and Standing Orders of this honourable House.

MR. MURPHY: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Would Your Honour care to give us a ruling on that point of order, Sir, in light of the Standing Order's provisions on the point?

MR. SPEAKER: The rules are clear on the point that an honourable member calls for a quorum and he need not maintain his place in the House while the quorum is being counted. It is up to the honourable member whether he wishes to demand that the quorum always be maintained by the group on the other side of the House. If he chooses to do this,

of course, there is very little that the Chair can do but enforce the rules as they have been to this point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, do I have the right to the floor or will this jackanapes over here - if he does not know the rules of the House, he should at least be quiet in the hope he learns. I may say, Sir, that the reason the energy policy of this administration is in such trouble was just shown quite graphically by the honourable gentleman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you manage to read it?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have read it but the problem is with the honourable gentleman, would not only read it but understand it.

I was saying that the gentleman from Labrador South, he made no specific charges as I heard. Although I did not hear him in the House, I did hear him on both television stations last night in an interview. What he appeared to be saying was that some of the senior civil servants were taking direction (and perhaps he could correct me if I misquote or misrepresent him on the point) from my colleagues and from me not from their ministers. Was that essentially - if the honourable gentleman wants to say a word I will yield, of course.

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that what I said be understood correctly. I will try to get it verbatim, the way I said it yesterday but I may be forgiven if it does not come out exactly that way in Hansard. I will not try to retract what I said yesterday. I pointed out the fact that lacking direct orders from their ministers, that certain members

of the civil service were, therefore, continuing to take directions from members on this side of the House. I believe I phrased it, "From former ministers who are now on this side of the House." That substantially is what it is.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Let us see who on this side is a former minister. My friend from White Bay South was a former minister and will be a minister again; the gentleman from Labrador North; the gentleman from Fogo; the gentleman from Bell Island, all of them were ministers in the latter years or months of the administration of which Mr. Smallwood was the leader.

I reject the charge on their behalf. I reject it categorically and emphatically. I really can say no more. I do not think I need say any more unless there are some specific instances of where it is alleged a minister or an ex-minister (I am sorry) has given an official an improper direction.

I am often in touch with officials. I spoke this morning, i.e., with the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs. As a matter of fact, I telephone to him and subsequently he telephones me. If there is a matter affecting my constituency, I ask him a factual question and in due course the gentleman very courteously, you know, gets me the answer. This sort of contact goes on. I would assume that all honourable gentlemen are involved in such communications with officials, particularly in view of the inaccessibility of the ministry and their inability to answer in any event. If you want an answer, you have to go to an official.

Certainly I reject, merely for the record. If the gentleman wants a debate, let us have one at the appropriate time. I reject quite categorically any statement that any of my colleagues and me - I was the Minister of Health for two or three years. I spoke with the Associate Deputy Minister of Health this week. I asked a question about an ambulance programme affecting Port aux Basques, because some people in Port aux Basques had been in touch me. The

Lion's Club there said, you know such and such, could we get a new ambulance? I rang the Associate Deputy Minister, the man in charge of the programme and he gave me the information.

I do think the honourable gentleman, if he wishes to pursue it further, should at some point be a little more specific. I invite him to be so if, in fact what he has said has happened has in fact happened. That is a very serious matter. It is very serious for the civil servants who have been taking direction improperly. I quite agree with what he has said in the absence of direction from the ministers. Of course, anybody (I suspect this was the real weight of what he was saying) who has had anything to do with the administration of this province in the last couple of years, Mr. Speaker, knows that the civil service is dithering and is leaderless at every level. I hear this from all over the province. I hear it from community councils, town councils, school boards, hospital boards, from almost every agency, body or individual that has any type of dealing with the government. I did not say every individual, agency or board that dealt with the government. I said every type of dealing with the government, any type of proper dealing with the government, finds that this administration is hopelessly incompetent and it cannot run the affairs of this province. It has no direction, no leadership; things are being studied,

The situation with the Labour Relations Board and that very weak and lame answer by the (Acting) Minister of Labour as an example; the fact that Mr. Pinsent and Mr. Russell were not reappointed respectively for six or seven weeks really has nothing to do with the fact that apparently a backlog has built up and that the work of the board is falling further, further and further behind. We asked the question because we have had representations from responsible members of the labour movement who are more and more coming to us as people are -

AN HON. MEMBER: I have not heard a word of it.

MR. ROBERTS: I can quite believe the honourable gentleman has not heard a word of it. That may merely show how far out of touch he is. The mere fact that he has not heard of it is not proof of anything, except that he does not know what is happening. I am quite prepared to believe that.

I do, Sir, reject quite categorically the inference, if inference there be, (the gentleman from Labrador South, I do not know if he made a specific charge. I do not think he did.) that any of us on this side are improperly interfering. We have no rights, other than the rights of members of this House, any of us. We are all constantly in communication with officials. I am, Sir. Many of the officials are men with whom I have worked for eight, nine or ten years. Many of them, I hope, are my friends. We have not asked them to do anything improper and I have no hesitation in saying that no official would do anything improper, even if he were to be asked.

I would think that the gravity of the honourable gentleman's charge is, of course, the very serious fact that the administration are not in command, that the civil service, the policy-making and policy-implementing staff of this province, is largely leaderless and without direction and drifting because this government have failed to come to grips; have failed completely to come to grips with the problems affecting this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are following the good examples that are being set -

MR. MARTIN: It is quite obvious.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Labrador South says that it is quite obvious. He and I do not always agree on political issues. I think we can agree on this one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may say a few words about my Constituency of White Bay North, the one in which some neophyte members of the House feel that because I happen to live in St. John's,

I cannot represent the district. I may add that there are some members such as the gentleman from Burgeo, who live in his district and, therefore, cannot represent his district. The electorate will take care of that at the next crack.

Mr. Speaker, let me outline briefly but I hope comprehensively some of the immediate needs, some of the problems, the public services which must be provided immediately in White Bay North. None of these, I suspect, will be new. The need has been there for many, many years, in some cases one hundred years, in some cases fifty years and in other cases, five, six or seven. All of them I believe have been brought to the attention of the ministers concerned, either by me, as the member, or by other bodies, the councils in the area, individuals or what have you.

The most important need we have in White Bay North, Sir, is one whose solution lies in the hands of the gentleman who is Minister of Municipal Affairs and that, of course, is the provision of water and sewer facilities. We have in White Bay North only four communities that can be considered to have adequate water and sewer.

Mr. Speaker, the new Community of Bight Arm, which has no public debt, has water and sewer facilities. If they have a public debt, it is quite small. It was provided by the people themselves. Let that be recorded. They took their resettlement grant and bought their land serviced. Then the money that paid for the land went to hire the people to put in the services. It was a classic case of your hiring my wife, Sir, to do your washing and my hiring your wife to do the washing and everybody being fully employed.

The Community of Englee is now getting water and sewer. The system I believe is largely completed. That is a project that was begun during the Smallwood administration.

The Community of Roddickton is in the same position. They are making good progress.

Mr. Speaker, there are only twelve in the House on the other side. I would hope the whip will get a couple of more in.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The Community of Roddickton is well-advanced in their project, Sir, getting water and sewer. They have a way to go yet and I hope the government will provide the extra money which is needed.

The Community of St. Anthony - I suppose St. Anthony, Sir, has had public services as long as any community in Newfoundland, except St. John's and Harbour Grace. There may be one or two that have had services for the same length of time but St. Anthony or parts of St. Anthony have had water and sewer systems since the early 1910-1920 period, the early years of this century. Five or six years ago a proper public system was put in and most of the homes in that community now have the same access to services as do the homes in Stephenville or the homes in St. John's or the homes in Gander.

That leaves, Sir, seven large communities where the government must take up the toll and the government must provide water and sewer. In each case the responsibility rests squarely and fairly upon the shoulders of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, whoever he may be from time to time.

The Community of Conche, about five hundred people, have requested a survey. I am not even sure if one has been underway. The minister has been somewhat dilatory in answering his mail. The community council there are pushing to have at least a survey done that will give some indication of the costs and then we can go on.

The Community of Main Brook, Sir, six or seven hundred people, is now at the stage where the plastic pipes which they have in the ground have frozen and what water they get is because a \$1,500 grant was prised out of the Department of Municipal Affairs and as a result a conveyance can be hired to take water around.

It is the sort of thing that would be only too familiar to the gentleman from St. John's South because of his constituents in the Shea Heights area having to put up with that for many years.

St. Anthony Bight, the minister sent an engineer down last summer who told the people there that he would be back in a month or so and of course that is the last they have heard of him. The people of St. Anthony Bight are beginning to lose faith in the desire or intention of this government to do anything for them. That is the reason why.

Quirpon needs water systems, Sir. I do not know if it needs a proper sewer system. I sometimes think we can over-engineer these things in small communities. The tidal action is still the most powerful septic disposal method that we have. Subject to the engineers telling us, I think there is still sufficient capacity in the sea off most of our coasts to absorb what is after all bacterial organic matter. It is not inorganic. It is quite part of the natural cycle of what the biologists tell me is called an "echo system". I am sure Your Honour is intimately familiar with many "echo systems".

The community of Ship Cove, Sir, have written to the minister and have had the back of his hand. They have had no satisfaction, no help, no hope held out to them.

The community of St. Lunaire and Griquet have about a quarter or two-thirds of a system installed in the ground. It is incumbent upon the minister and his colleagues to find the money this year to finish that system.

The community of Raleigh recently incorporated themselves after a public meeting and a very large turn out and a very heavy vote in favour of incorporation. The department are considering the request. A survey has been done. I believe it is a matter of \$200,000 or \$300,000 to provide 700 or 800 people in Raleigh with water, potable water and with sewerage systems. It may seem relevantly unimportant, Your Honour. Perhaps to many honourable gentlemen opposite it is of the utmost unimportance, particularly as each of them, I have no doubt, has in his own constituency several communities that have needs

like this.

Sir, in all of these communities almost every source of water available to the people is unfit to drink by any reasonable, medical and public health standards. I think the government should do something. I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs is shirking his duties. He is making a cod of it. Now that the Government of Canada have ended the special area concept which they earlier adopted, I hope that the government will use all the money they are going to get from DREE and all of their own money and that we will see this year a start on each of these items.

My colleague, the House Leader, the gentleman from White Bay South, is going to write to every municipality on the island to invite them to ask the minister for a share of the DREE money. I can assure him that my suggestion to the councils and people in White Bay North, well, they too should get a share of this DREE money for water and sewer. I cannot think of anything more urgent.

A government that can fling out a quarter, three quarters of a million dollars, fling it out on executive aircraft, that can find \$500 to pay for a drunk over at Act III and can find \$2,800 for official entertaining by the Premier, that can find all of the other money that this crowd can waste, a government that does that, that can do that surely can find the money needed to provide people with water. It is not much to ask in this day and age, Sir. It is very little to ask. All the talk of long range planning will not put one drop of water in anybody's cup.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member from Burgeo, I am not going to enter into a debate of wits with him because he is not qualified. I do wish, Sir, he would contain himself and I invite Your Honour to enforce the rules of the House with respect to the honourable gentleman from Burgeo. I have the right and I invite you to discipline him in the appropriate fashion. If Your Honour is impartial, as we are assured, Your Honour will apply the rules.

impartially. I will not be interrupted by the ignorant jackanape from Burgeo. If he wants to make a speech at the appropriate time, Mr. Speaker, he has the same right as does any other member but until then surely I have the right to say what I have to say without being interrupted by his likes. I do not mind intelligent and witty comments, as some honourable gentlemen opposite occasionally proffer. I welcome those but the gentleman from Burgeo, Sir, has disgraced himself and his constituency and perhaps he should try to remedy it by staying reasonably quiet.

As I was saying, Sir - and he might talk too - it was only today that the government have agreed, let it now be announced, to resolve the problem in Port aux Basques, and small thanks to the gentleman from Burgeo and La Poile. If the council had not come in and pressed it, if Mayor Hardy and his council had not pressed it, the government would not today have agreed to provide several hundred thousand dollars to the community to go along with the money which Mr. Jamieson has obtained for them through DREE and federal funding programmes to provide that community with the additional supply of water which they need. I welcome that and I hope devoutly and sincerely that the Minister of Municipal Affairs will try to do something for the people of White Bay North. I know he has many demands upon him but, Sir, he sought office, he sought office very hard. Now let him work equally hard to discharge the burdens of the office which he sought. He owes it to these people.

That is our chief need, Sir, but there are others. We still need roads built in White Bay North. I was glad to see the road being built to Monkstown, or the announcement that it was to be built to Monkstown and Paradise Sound because on a per capita cost, Sir, that road will be one of the more expensive ever built. It is an interesting precedent to enable me to request that the government build a road to the communities of Croque and St. Julien's in Grandois. On a per capita cost the cost will be no larger than the road which the government have announced is going to be built to link the Burin

Peninsula highway to the community of Monkstown.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Where is he getting his figures?

MR. ROBERTS: I am getting my figures, Sir, from a very unreliable source but they are all that I can do. It is the press release issued by the gentleman from Placentia West.

MR. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman attempts to twist and misrepresent me. I did not say that they were too high. What I did say was that they are higher than many roads that have been built and that they are sufficiently high to enable me to justify a request that a road be built to St. Julien's and Grandois. What is fish for one must be fish for another. I am glad the government have set the precedent because every time previously I went to the authorities be they my own colleagues when I was in the Cabinet or be they the present minister or his predecessor, the word came back that the cost was too high. Well, now I have my precedent and I am devoutly thankful to the gentleman from Placentia West.

While I am on it and I see the minister is in the House, the Minister of Transportation, I wonder if he could let me know whether he would be willing to receive a delegation of citizens from Croque led by their parish priest, Father Murphy. I wrote to him maybe a month ago - I guess he has been very busy - but I do not think I have had an answer as yet unless it has come this day.

MR. HICKEY: Maybe there is an answer provided.

MR. ROBERTS: Well there may be an answer provided but it has not come up. Maybe the mail system organized by the Department of Public Works is as bad as the rest of the administration. I have not had an answer yet and I would very much like to have it because I am deeply grateful to the gentleman and I await his answer which I assume will be favourable.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Did the gentleman say a month ago?

MR. ROBERTS: I wrote about a month ago. I forget the precise date

but it was about a month ago.

Mr. Speaker, the road to Croque and to Grandois and St. Julien's leaves only one other large community or one other community really of any size without road connections and that is Harbour Deep, the most southerly community in White Bay North. I would like to see a road built there but I suspect the quickest hope of getting that will be through a forest access road programme because there is the Mooney Block. The Mooney Block is behind Harbour Deep. It runs from Harbour Deep down in behind on the eastern side of the Great Northern Peninsula and down behind Hampden. A large area of timber I am told, as much as 2 million cords, much of it over-mature, much of it rotting, hopefully it will be logged and hopefully in the logging the roads will be built and that will provide us with a way to get a road to Harbour Deep.

Then too we come to the main highroad north, The gentleman from St. Barbe North and the gentleman from St. Barbe South share my views on that. That road must be paved and I hope and expect that more work will be done

this year. The Hon. Mr. Jamieson announced a week or so ago here in St. John's that the Government of Canada will be spending at least \$10 million, providing it to the Government of Newfoundland for roads work this year. I hope a substantial portion of that goes on the Northern Peninsula Highway. I hope particularly that it will go on the northern end to link St. Anthony going west to the Cook's Harbour Junction and then turning to the south and coming down to Corner Brook.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Law Clerk and the member-for Placentia East have a great deal to discuss but could they discuss it a little more quietly, Sir. The honourable gentleman for St. John's North has finished his tête-à-tête with the gentleman for St. Mary's. I have no doubt that they have much to discuss -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland give the orders in this House not the gentleman for Burgeo.

Now as I have said, Sir, the main road should be paved and it should start in my view, work should start from St. Anthony coming to the west and around to the south. That is the road over which children come into the area served by the Vinland School Board, Children come from as far away as thirty miles from Cook's Harbour. It is also the road from the Airport, the only Airport on the northern part of the Northern Peninsula and the one in Hawke's Bay does not have the same sort of schedule service as does the one at St. Anthony. The one at St. Anthony also is the medical centre for, I suppose many patients from Goose Bay and Happy Valley are flown to St. Anthony as their base referral hospital. I can tell you, Sir, and I have been told this by the doctors concerned, there is far more danger of them suffering harm on the sixteen miles of road between the St. Anthony airstrip and the hospital in the middle of the Town of St. Anthony than there is in getting them from Northwest River or from Happy Valley as the case may be all the way to the St. Anthony airstrip.

The road is abominable. Nothing has been done on it. It is worse than the Burin Peninsula Highway ever was. I can remember when the

Minister of Justice used to ooze at every pour with sincerity and eloquence about the need to have the Burnin Peninsula road paved. Well Don Jamieson got it paved and I hope Don Jamieson gets the Northern Peninsula Highway paved.

I hope also, Sir, that we will see road work go ahead this year in some of the larger towns in White Bay North. The Town of St. Anthony have their main road paved, thanks to the former administration. So did the Town of Raleigh. The Town of St. Anthony need their sideroads paved. Now that the government have reinstated this policy I have no doubt that the Town of St. Anthony will benefit from it and I invite the government to start sending the money down now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The byroads in St. Anthony. They would not be directly under the Transportation Department; I do not think. I think there is one under Municipal Affairs under a fifty/fifty programme. The byroads. The main road is done. The main road right around indeed -

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The member for St. John's Centre will try and get the Topsail Pond Road paved. He only got it half done last year.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The Town of St. Lunaire, Roddickton, Englee and Conche and Main Brook, Sir, and Goose Gove should all have their main roads paved. I again urge the government and invite them to do the work this year. If they want to nail me in White Bay North, Sir, if they want to defeat me that is the way to do it, not the way they are going at it, to try and punish the district for having dared to vote as they wished.

The way to do it, Sir, is to go down and say to the people; "Look, we will do it. Robert's and his crowd did not get it done. We will do it for you." So I invite them to do it. If they want to know there has not been a nickel of new construction - let us see, the road to St. Carols has been done, or nearly finished. It was programmed in the

fall of 1971. It did not get finished. The honourable gentleman, I give him full credit, has finished the road, it is almost into the community, I mean the people really have the use of it and I am told by him it will be finished next year. I accept that.

Other than that I do not think there has been a nickel in new construction money spend in White Bay North in two years or reconstruction money. What has been done is the normal maintenance, and God knows that is little enough. If I am wrong, I shall gladly say so but -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, well I mean - I am thinking about paving but -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible/

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I know but we saw how quickly we could get one into Hermitage District. They are sent by airmail, are they not?

MR. HICKEY: Not really.

MR. ROBERTS: No. I thought they were sent by airmail into Hermitage.

MR. HICKEY: They are too heavy.

MR. ROBERTS: They are too heavy. Well then Divine Providence must moved them into Hermitage in November month.

MR. HICKEY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry.

MR. HICKEY: they are too heavy.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I have no doubt that they could have been moved by helicopter. The minister would have had orders to move them by helicopter, there was that sort of urgency. But if they want to know how to beat "Ed Roberts" in White Bay North, Sir, that is one of the ways to do it, go down there and show them what a government that cares will do. Then sent a man down there or find a man down there, I can name at least a dozen people who have told me that they want the Liberal nomination. any one of whom would make it good, a very good MHA. There may be one or two who are so deluded as to want the Tory nomination. They have had trouble before, They have never been able to find anybody from down there to run not in the last two or three elections.

So that is the way to do it; go down and say this is what we have done, look at the money we have spent. I would welcome that even if it cost me my seat. I would welcome that because the people would have the public services. That is what it is all about. Let them spend a few dollars too, Sir, on developing some industry down there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: They have not. Unless something has been done to help Mr. Peter Gardiner in the Canada Bay Lumber Company in Roddickton, and that is a very mysterious subject one on which we are lacking full information, one on which information does not seem to be available and nobody knows quite what is happening. Unless they have spent some money there, the government have spent not a nickel to help any real industry anywhere in White Bay North. A few thousand dollars have been given out by this rural development thing. It has been some help but not very much. I do not think it created twenty jobs in White Bay North.

So let the government if they really care about the people of Northern Newfoundland do something along these lines too. Let them do something to develop the fishery resources that are not developed down there, the scallops in Hare Bay. Let them do something to develop the crab - Fishery Products are going to do it now, using Ottawa money, using the money they got as compensation for their share of the Atlantic Whaling Plant. Let the Government of the Province do something.

Let them do something besides having state banquets, great lavish occasions at which much liquor will flow and there will be much merriment and jollity for the fortunate couple of hundred who will attend but that is all who will benefit. There are people who are trying to raise families on a couple of hundred dollars a month who will not get much out of that, out of the \$3,000, \$4,000 or \$5,000 worth of liquor and wine and beer that will be lashed out in St. Anthony on the 26th. of April, allegedly in celebration of Confederation. This is what they have offered to one of the districts that helped to make Confederation possible.

MR. MURPHY: Did the honourable member hear about the twentieth anniversary

....

MR. ROBERTS: I hope I took part in them, Sir, in a marvelous way.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: That would be a very large group, Sir. If every Liberal poll captain took part in them, Sir, that would be a very large group. It was something like the \$517.00 that the Auditor General tells us - and I would like to know who signed that voucher by the way, I wonder if it was the Minister of Social - Is that a social service?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Is that a social service? Five hundred and seventeen dollars for the Act III?

MR. MURPHY: The men appreciated it.

MR. ROBERTS: The men appreciated it. I am sure, Sir, that the lady in Campbellton, living on \$96.00 a month, appreciates knowing that the government can find \$517.00 to provide liquor and beer to the likes of that.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, by God she is not living on \$96.00 a month! She may be existing on it but she is not living on it.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker,

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I have noticed since this session began, Sir, the honourable gentleman opposite - three, six, nine, twelve, thirteen, I wonder if there is another one around, if not we shall -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, there is one here, I am sorry, crouching. I did not recognize him.

MR. MURPHY: Come on, now we have fourteen.

MR. ROBERTS: We have fourteen.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Why because the Minister of Fisheries is so rude as to come over and interrupt. Mr. Speaker, to turn the honourable gentleman's stomach is something I would do gladly. I mean, I would do very gladly.

MR. MURPHY: Carry on.

MR. ROBERTS: Just looking at him does it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have noticed since the House began that the honourable gentlemen opposite are more than usually sensitive this year. They are getting the message. They got the message from Hermitage. They are getting the message from all over this province that they are a one-term administration. The people of Newfoundland have made up their minds now to turf them, to give them a royal order of the boot -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The royal order of the boot, Sir, is what they are going to get and let them have the election whenever they want. My guess was that they will put it off. I think that the Premier, and I am sorry he is not with us today - Mr. Speaker, could I have some order?

MR. SPEAKER: (STAGG): Honourable members have been carrying on a certain amount of repartee for the past half hour or so. The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition does have a right to be heard in silence.

Occasionally this repartee to go on, however he does have the right to be heard in silence and I would ask that all honourable members observe this long-standing rule of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see the gentleman from St. John's Centre leaving. The only persons who will who will be unhappy about that are his officials whom he will be going to see.

Now, Sir, as I was saying, the government are tender. They are on the defensive. They have nothing to offer and that is exactly what they are offering. The Throne Speech was as barren as the Funks and a little later on in my remarks I shall be going into this in some detail. As a matter of fact I propose to go through the Throne Speech, word by weary, dreary, meaningless word and dispose of what I consider to be some of its inadequacies. It is really the most pathetic document that I have seen and by heavens I have heard and seen and read my share of pathetic documents!

I shall also have the pleasure of reminding gentlemen opposite, I think it is 119 separate promises they made to the electorate, at one stage or another, in Throne Speeches and what have you, and we shall have the pleasure of a romp through those. I think four have been kept. There may be eight or ten which could be conceived to be partially kept and there is something over 100 that by any stretch of even George McLean's fertile imagination could not have been considered to be kept.

Before we come to those delicacies, Sir, there are one or two other goodies I would like to touch upon however briefly. First of all I would like to continue with my few brief words on the Premier, and I am sorry he is not here again today. I understand from the press that he may be ill. I do hope that if he is ill that it is of short duration and that he will again be with us quickly. As far as I recall, I was not in the House myself Monday, but he was not in the House, Tuesday, Wednesday, he was here for half an hour on Thursday and he has not been here today. So I do hope that his illness - he was away for a couple of days on what passes for public business, I

do hope that his illness is of brief duration and I wish him a speedy return.

In the meantime, Sir, I do want to deal in some little detail in any event with the figures he used on Opening Day which in my submission are deliberately - I withdraw deliberate, Sir, are, misleading to the House. I may believe them to be deliberate but I certainly cannot say so, so I do not.

The Premier told us on on Opening Day, Sir, and I have here the Hansard or a photostatic page of page 47 of the Hansard. Apparently I had angered his highness. I had dared to point out that the emperor was wearing no clothes. Anyway he went on, "The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, deserves no apologies." I agree, it deserves none, it requires them but it deserves none. "It outlined a few of the things we want to do as a government. It also mentioned some of the things that have been done. We have a great year of prosperity ahead," he said. "We will for the third year in a row exceed fourteen per cent increase in our gross provincial product which is nearly double the Canadian average."

Then he went on, "The Leader of the Opposition played with figures in a mathematician kick this afternoon." Our Premier is nothing if not colloquial in his speech. "He talks about unemployment increasing in our province. "That is true, Sir, it has but so has the work force. It is a fact that in April 1949 there were 99,000 Newfoundlanders employed." Nobody can give me that fact. It is an estimate at best because apparently at that time even D.B.S. as they then were did not keep this sort of record. But he goes on, "It also was a fact that at the end of December 1971, the last of the twenty-three year Liberal Administration, there were 139,000 employed." That is correct. That information is that which has been given out by Statistics Canada as they now are and by the Fiscal Planning Division or whatever they are called, downstairs in the Executive Council. "That is an increase of 40,000." The Premier's mathematics are correct even if his assumption is not.

Now he goes on, Sir, "It is also a fact that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, at the end of December this year there were 178,000 employed for an increase of 38,000 people. There are 38,000 new jobs. There are 9,000 more unemployed. There is no question about that."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier did not use those figures lightly. He has used them before. Indeed we used to hear a great deal of him trumpeting around the province about the 38,000 jobs that have been created.

For example in his speech to the Corner Brook Rotary Club on January 17, 1974, he said on page two, "When the government took office nearly two years ago the total number of people employed stood at 139,000, at the end of December this year the total number stood at 177,000, that gentlemen is an increase of more than 38,000 new jobs in just two years."

Well Sir, if the figures were correct, his mathematics and conclusions would be. Mr. Speaker, the Premier was wrong. The Premier of this province time and time again has misled the House and the people of this province, has misled them by giving them inaccurate figures or giving them the right figures and saying they mean something they do not. What are the facts?

The facts are, Sir, that in December 1971 there were 132,000 persons employed in Newfoundland. In December 1973 there were 151,000, an increase of 19,000, not the 38,000 claimed by the Premier. The Premier was as wrong as a man could be. The Premier with all of the research of the government, all these high priced civil servants, all these over-rated planners, all these persons who have talked so long and so loud about planning and about priorities and that sort of approach and what did the Premier come up with, he comes up with figures which he repeats time and time again, that are completely wrong.

I do not accuse him of deliberately misleading the province. But I will accuse him of being almost criminally careless with his data

and I accuse him of in fact misleading the people of this province. The facts are, and I shall table the data, I will table it, there are copies made for the press, the facts are on the information handed out by the government, the Premier cannot even read what his own statistical persons turn out, the facts are, Sir, that we only have 19,000 new jobs in Newfoundland not the 38,000 the Premier claims. Now will he be man enough to come into this House and admit he is wrong? I know where he went wrong. He took the number in the labour force and confused that with the number employed and I wish to God they were the same but they are not. There is a gap and it is a widening gap and a growing gap. That is one of the reasons why the people of Newfoundland have made up their mind to give this honourable crowd the order of the boot, the royal order of the boot. They got the toe of the boot in Hermitage, Sir, and they will get the heel of the boot the next time they try it and they will get the boots when they go to the country.

MR. WM. ROWE: Weak laugh. It was a very weak laugh.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, let me go on with some other figures. All of them, Sir, all of them drawn from the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador's own statistical data, not something I have made up but rather, Sir, something based on information given out by the government, the generous, honest government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the change in annual average numbers employed, the annual average. We will take the year 1971 and the year 1973, these are the two years that the Premier seems to prefer. 1971, the annual average as given to me by Statistics Canada and by the Planning and Priorities Secretariate of the Provincial Government was 139,000 employed. 1973, 157,300, so it was not 19,000 new jobs really, on the annual average it was 18,300, that is less than one-half of the Premier oft repeated claim.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, he was either criminally careless, quasi-criminally careless or he was -

AN HON. MEMBER: Deliberately misleading.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I will not say he was deliberately misleading but he did in fact mislead. If one looks at the changes in the monthly peaks, the high points, there may be some difference.

In July of 1971 the highest employment for that year, 151,000 persons employed. In July of 1973 the highest for that year 24,000

even that is only three fifths, sixty per cent of the figure claimed by the Premier, even taking the highest month's employment. All right, let us take the lowest peak, December, 1973, and the highest peak in 1971. Even then there were no new jobs created. The Premier's figures, Sir, on employment are totally false and totally misleading and I know it and the 26,000 Newfoundlanders who are unemployed know it and the thousands upon thousands of Newfoundlanders who fear they may become unemployed know it; 27,000 people unemployed, Sir, in December, 1973.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Misleading figures. Maybe they are. They are from the Central Statistical Services, Economic and Resource Policy Planning and Priority Secretariat; 27,000 people unemployed. This, Sir, is the result of two years of Tory government. In 1972, in December, Sir, in 1972, in December there were 21,000 unemployed. That is an increase, Sir. The actual unemployment rate increased from 1971, December to 1973, December, a year of Tory action, increased by 28.0%. That was a result of a year of Tory activity, Sir and that does not even include executive assistance who all were taken off the unemployment roles, some of them off the streets.

How did we do Sir, compared to Canada, because we are a part of Canada? Mr. Speaker, it may be said that the Government of Canada bear a measure of responsibility and so they do. Of course they do but, Sir, it is the Premier who has claimed the good things. Now let him claim the truth. If the Premier had not raised this I would not have to deal with it. So let not anybody over there try to curry a little favour with the Premier by saying, "Oh well, blame the Ottawa government". The Premier, time and time again, was trying to claim success. Well, let him face the truth, though it may hurt. How did we do compared to the Canadian average? Well Sir, you remember I am sure that between December, 1972 and December, 1973, the percentage of

actually unemployed as revealed by the Central Statistical Services, Economic and Resources Policy Planning and Priority Secretariat, the crowd who lived down here on the, I think it is the seventh floor. Ours went in Newfoundland, Sir, twenty-eight per cent. Across Canada, what happened? Between December, 1972 and December, 1973, Sir, it dropped. It dropped by twelve per cent.

So, in other words, Canada is doing forty per cent better than we are. We increased our unemployment by twenty-eight per cent; they decreased theirs by twelve per cent on a national average, and that is the result of Tory activity, the result of Tory government, Tory planning, all the do-nothing crowd. They have given 27,000 Newfoundlanders nothing to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us talk a little about some of the Premier's other boasts. He talked, for example, in Halifax, just the other day. No, I am sorry Sir, it was here in St. John's, at the Rotary Club here in St. John's, just the other day. He talked about able-bodied relief. Short-termed assistance it used to be called and I quote him, "I think you will be as impressed as I was with the performance of the Department of Social Services for the January to December period of 1973." Those words must have gladdened the minister's heart. The Premier went on, "At the first of January last year, the able-bodied case load was 6,274 as compared with 4,617 at the end of last month. That is an impressive thirty per cent reduction from the welfare roles and Sir, those figures, I have no reason to doubt, are correct. The welfare roles are down thirty per cent, able-bodied case loads."

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is only telling half the truth. He is not telling the full truth. Whether he is doing it deliberately or not, I do not know but I do say he is not telling the truth because the other half of the truth is the simple fact that between the end of 1972 and the beginning of 1973 unemployment insurance came in, unemployment insurance raised 31.6 per cent, and we all know Sir, any of us,

who deal with the people who must look to welfare, or must look to unemployment insurance, we all know that the men who were on welfare were often there because their benefits had run out and that many of the men who were living on benefits would be on welfare if it were not for unemployment insurance. Any honourable member knows that. It is a fact of life for thousands of our people.

Well, Sir, there is the reason why the welfare able-bodied case load was down in Newfoundland, not anything to do with the Tory Government, not anything to do with planning and talk and expensive jets and all the rest of it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

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

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

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No! No! I have the floor and I do not propose to yield it. I would yield it to a gentleman, but not to the member for St. John's Centre. A jet is one what makes hot air and I could call the honourable member a jet... (inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Have you ever noted, Sir, Mr. Speaker, that when they cannot deal with the arguments they have to try this low barrack room humor.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, let the honourable gentleman prove that or withdraw it. He has no right to say that I am not speaking the truth.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman has said on two occasions that this government is a jet. There is no jet in this government. I assume he is talking about an airplane. So if he is saying we have a jet in this government, there is no jet. So he is

lying by saying that.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman has used an unparliamentary word. I ask you to ask him to withdraw it or to name him.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that this is really another point of order, an argument, debate between two honourable members, and I suggest that the honourable Leader of the Opposition does have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, he called me a liar. He said I entered a lie in the House. Make him withdraw the statement, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on a point of order. Make him withdraw the statement.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is, the statement made by the honourable Leader of the Opposition is untrue.

MR. ROBERTS: Would Your Honour rule on the statement. What are the rules on this point, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to request the honourable member from Bonavista South to rephrase the statement.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, what I will say is that the statement made by the honourable Leader of the Opposition is not correct, it is incorrect and therefore an untruth.

MR. ROBERTS: Does that comply with your ruling? I mean I am -

MR. SPEAKER: I shall accept the statement made by the honourable member from Bonavista South.

MR. ROBERTS: Well then, we now know that untrue is a parliamentary word. I now can say that the Premier's statements are untrue. They are. They are false as well. They are misleading. Where was I now?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Deceitful. Deceitful.

MR. ROBERTS: No. The Premier's statements are still equally false and he has not been man enough to withdraw them or to explain them or to defend them. I hope when next he comes to the House he will deal with them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could say a word or two about another point made by the Premier. He talks about how incomes have gone up in Newfoundland, personal incomes and again he is taking liberties with the truth. Let me find the precise reference here. Oh, yes, page forty-seven in Hansard for Wednesday, January 30.

Mr. Speaker, this is the Premier speaking, Sir. These are his very own words, from his very own lips in this very own House, "Another figure that might be of interest to the people of this Province and to this honourable House of Assembly is that in 1962, this was twelve years ago, the average personal per capita income in this Province was \$987.00. That was the average for the people working in this Province, \$987.00." He is confused, poor fellow. Per capita incomes are obtained by dividing the number of people living in the Province into the total gross provincial products as defined, not into the work force, but the poor fellow is confused but his figure is right.

"In 1971, it increased by \$1,000 just up to \$2,100." Well, the Premier was taking liberties with the truth again. The actual figure, Sir, as statistics - I am sorry, the provincial government have released the figure. It was \$2,188, so if you round it off it is \$2,200.

"This year, Mr. Speaker, the average per capita income will be in excess of

\$3,000 - \$1,000 per capita increase in three years that previously had taken ten for the same rise in income. The Premier made essentially the same point, Mr. Speaker, when he spoke to the Rotary Club here in St. John's. You have to hand it to the fellow, Sir, when he gets a point in his mind, he sort of beats it to death.

Now, Sir, let us look at the facts. I am not even going into inflation, although we all know and any one of us who shop or has people who shop or to whom we pay the bill, know that the price of what a dollar will buy is rapidly being eroded, very rapidly being eroded by inflation. The facts, the figures, if anybody wants them, are that prices in St. John's have increased by 18.1 per cent in two years. It is a staggering rate of increase. Unemployment has gone up 22 per cent. The actual rate of unemployment is 15.3 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier's figures will bear looking at in the light of where the money came from. Do you know where half the money came from?

AN HON. MEMBER: From the taxpayers' pockets.

MR. ROBERTS: No. It may all have come from the taxpayers' pockets. Do you know where half the money came from? The actual increase between 1971 and 1973 - the 1974 figures obviously are not available. This is only February, 1974. The Premier's figure of \$3,000 is a guesstimate but I suspect it is an accurate one. In 1971 the per capita personal income in this province was \$2,188, rounded off to \$2,200 if one wished. In 1973, it was \$2,712, rounded off to \$2,700. The increase in per capita personal income in those three years, Sir, 1971, 1972 and 1973 was \$524; a far cry from the \$1,000 claimed by the Premier but well within his normal batting average of fifty per cent.

Sir, of that \$524, no less than \$225 is directly attributed to increased payments by the Federal Government, the Government of Canada, on Unemployment Insurance, Family and Youth Allowances

and the Old Age Security and Supplement. The increases in those three Federal Government Programmes in Newfoundland, Sir, the increases alone have put in about half the increase per capita income which we can claim. Now how can the Premier boast. His figures are incorrect and his conclusions are even more incorrect. Let him stand exposed again, Sir, for a man who does not do his homework, as a man who makes statements, not off the cuff, we all make statements off the cuff that are not factually nor completely correct. It is an inevitable in the day to day debate in the House. Let the Premier stand exposed as a man who uses prepared text, with all his seventeen or eighteen thousand dollars a year speech writers down there, Mr. Korbai, gentlemen of that ilk.

AN HON. MEMBER: Very outstanding Newfoundlanders.

MR. ROBERTS: They may be outstanding Newfoundlanders but they are sloppy speech writers. Mr. Speaker, they put up the Premier to say that 38,000 jobs are created. The poor fellow is told, Sir, that 38,000 jobs have been created and yet only 19,000 have been created, by the government's own figures. That is all I am saying.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me make a further comment.

This will be a good year in Newfoundland and, of course, we welcome it. I have here a cutting from the "Evening Telegram" of Monday, January 28. It has a very handsome picture of a very handsome gentleman, the junior member for Harbour Main. It is a good picture. He is a handsome fellow. They have him the wrong way around, they should have reversed the picture because he is looking off the page, when he should have been looking on. The honourable gentleman, I think, is all over the spectrum. Pragmatic might be the best word to describe him. He says that it is going to be a good year for the construction industry and that is the sort of thing that should be said when one is speaking to the construction industry, as he was. I do not have a copy of the gentleman's text. I do not even know if he was using one.

AN HON. MEMBER: He can think.

MR. ROBERTS: I could believe that. He can think so he does not need one as does the Premier to have it all written out.

MR. DOODY: I was afraid the honourable member might have gotten a copy of it and -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that is fine but the truth will make ye free. Let the Premier come in and answer, let him argue with the figures, if he can.

MR. DOODY: Can I give you an example of these figures as against -

MR. ROBERTS: No! When the honourable gentleman speaks, he can give all the answers and arguments he wants. If I made a statement that is incorrect, let the honourable gentleman expose me.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am going to praise him; he should not be so tender. Perhaps he should be tender, if I am praising him, I do not know.

Anyway, he said that 1973 saw the completion of such projects as the one hundred million barrel a day refinery at Come-by-Chance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Well it says one hundred million in the paper.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I know it is a yellow-dog rag of journalism. We have the Premier's word for that too. The Premier called it, scurrile, yellow-dog rag. He had been after me long before he turned to such lesser targets as the honourable member.

MR. W. ROWE: That hurt his feelings. Look, you can tell.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister went on: "The completion of the Labrador Linerboard Mill at Stephenville and the putting into operation seven of the eleven giant turbines at Churchill Falls Hydro Electric project..." That is fine. He goes on to talk about some other things that may or may not happen; the development of Churchill Falls

which is his greatest wish for 1974. He told delegates that plans are progressing favourably for the construction of the second refinery at Come by Chance. He talked about what is going to be done this year, other work underway or which will soon get started; to conclude the Health Sciences Complex at Memorial University, three regional hospitals by which I assume he means Corner Brook, Twillingate, and Carbonear.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well again, I was not there. The honourable gentleman should send me a copy of his text.

MR. DOODY: I do not want to confuse the honourable gentleman.

MR. ROBERTS: The proposed airport expansion in St. John's and the St. John's Harbour Arterial Road. The honourable gentleman, they name him, of course, they spelled his name correctly. They did not put it in the upper case though. He says that these are all large projects and will contribute greatly to the construction industry during the coming year.

Now the only point I want to make, Sir, and I think it is one well worth making, is that every one of those projects that are actually underway or will get underway that he listed, was either started by the much maligned Smallwood Administration or is being done by the Government of Canada. Not a damned thing has been done by this government!

MR. W. ROWE: Right!

MR. ROBERTS: Not a damned thing has been done by this government!

AN HON. MEMBER: Bring Mr. Smallwood back.

MR. ROBERTS: One will not have to because he is coming back for the Confederation Banquet. I am sure he will ask the honourable gentleman, as the honourable gentleman will be a prime example of Confederation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that everything underway today in this province referred to by the minister - the Shaheen Refinery may or may not happen. We have the Premier's word for it.

that last July the construction would start in mid-July. Oh, we have the press release.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier announced that everything was coming along famously. Something funny happened.

AN HON. MEMBER: The energy crisis.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the energy crisis so they could not go ahead.

MR. W. ROWE: It started last June, the energy crisis did.

MR. ROBERTS: There is no need for the product now.

We will see about the Lower Churchill. Maybe we will get a statement out of the government. They may or may not come to grips with it. I know they are talking but we will see. We look forward to it. I hope it starts. I would be the first to stand in this House and laud the honourable gentleman. We could even call it the "Doody Generator" or the "Doody Dam" or perhaps, Sir, the "Howdy Doody Reservoir."

AN HON. MEMBER: The Doody Dawe.

MR. ROBERTS: The Doody Dawe? No, it is the Dawe Doody.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, but I was using the slogan the voters use, not the one the honourable gentleman used - the Doody Dawe - no the Dawe Doody when the votes were counted.

AN HON. MEMBER: Howdy Doody.

MR. ROBERTS: Howdy Doody? It sounds like that little bird the kids watch on the "Road Runner," - "I thought I saw a puddy tat," - you know, Dawe Doody.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: You know, Mr. Speaker, it really is -

MR. MURPHY: Tell us about the television shows.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not watch the kids television shows. Could the honourable gentleman tell us what goes on on them?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, when I see the honourable gentleman opposite, I can only again think how wise Sir Cavendish Boyle wrote, when he said: "God guard thee Newfoundland," when I look across the way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having touched in a general way upon a few current topics, let me - there are only ten of them over there. Really, I need a break, let us have a quorum called please, Sir.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, perhaps you could remind the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that you count members and if they do not want to listen to him, I do not see why we should stay and listen to his tripe.

MR. MARSHALL: We can count the House.

MR. SPEAKER: There is a quorum.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I call for a glass of water, Sir?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I hope the honourable gentleman runs.

AN HON. MEMBER: Runs where?

MR. ROBERTS: For his life.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, we have standards.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, invite honourable gentlemen to turn with me to a very, very serious matter, one which I raise only after a great deal of thought, one which I believe should be brought before the House and brought before the people of this province and one which I believe, when I have outlined the facts, will justify my request for a full and thorough judicial enquiry into it completely.

AN HON. MEMBER: Quorum called.

MR. ROBERTS: Is there a quorum called?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, I do not think so. It is my mistake.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, before I go into the reasons which lead me to make this request let me briefly but I hope completely refresh honourable gentlemen's minds on some recent history in this province and also perhaps tell the House, Sir, some facts that some honourable gentlemen might not know.

Now, Sir, the situation arose as did so much else, out of the results, inconclusive as they were, of the 1971 election. When the House was constituted, Sir, there were 41 men entitled to be seated. The man who had been elected for the District of Fortune Bay, Mr. Oldford, resigned his seat.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, and I think history will be most interested to know the full story and I hope it will come out. But I have no hesitation in saying that the present member for Fortune Bay in my

view was in no way involved in what may well have been a discreditable series of events. But I am not talking now about Mr. Oldford. He resigned shortly after we left office. We left office on January 18 and I am not sure of the date of his resignation but within a day or two or three thereafter he resigned as the member for Fortune. He was never sworn. He never took his seat.

The House met that day, Sir, and there were forty members present. There was one member absent. There were forty men only who took the Oath in that thirty-fifth general assembly of Newfoundland. The gentleman from Carbonear, the man who had been elected in the District of Bay de Verde, he lives in Carbonear, I guess has all his life, was not present. He was I believe, but I do not know because I was here, at home and ill.

Indeed, Sir, that morning when we met to be sworn in, his name was called, I stood as Leader and said; "Your Honour," I think Your Honour had been elected at that point or Mr. Clerk if Mr. Clerk was conducting the ceremony; "The gentleman from Bay de Verde is ill and will not be able to be present today. I have seen him yesterday and he will be sworn in in due course," and so forth and so on, and then that was it and the next man's name on the role was called.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I said Mr. Clerk, I did not mean George Clarke, no no, I meant Mr. Clerk and Mr. Law Clerk and Mr. Speaker. Mr. George Clarke was not returned. He was still the Speaker until our present Speaker was elected but he was not present. Two or three of Her Majesty's Judges were present to administer the Oath. But anyway we were all here, or most of us were here, a lot of us were here, I do not know, twenty or twenty-five, however many were elected in October 1971 and were still in the House. A number of my brethren paid the price a month or two afterwards. The people of Newfoundland are still paying it too.

Mr. Saunders later resigned to the House. So I had always thought. The facts as I had them were relatively simple. I have good

reason to believe that the Premier had twice, before the day in question, before March 1, sought a dissolution from His Honour the Governor and had been refused. Twice sought, twice refused and I submit, and I think all authorities would agree, that His Honour the Governor who acted throughout this entire situation with the utmost discretion and candor and tact and propriety, His Honour the Governor was perfectly justified in refusing the Premier's request for a dissolution.

MR. MORGAN: Do you believe or do you know?

MR. ROBERTS: I said I had reason to believe.

MR. MORGAN: That is different, is it not?

MR. ROBERTS: It certainly is different. That is why I did not say I know. I said I have reason to believe.

MR. MORGAN: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I make no charges, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Bonavista South does not want to treat the matter seriously and hear me out then I can only say I am deeply sorry, because I think that he should hear me out, because what I say I believe is of importance to the people of this province.

MR. MORGAN: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to reason with the unreasonable. I would ask him please to be quiet. If he wants to comment later on what I said, let him. He has the same rights as does any honourable gentleman. He has the same obligations as does any honourable gentleman.

In any event, whether or not the Premier had sought or been refused dissolution on the evening of Wednesday, March 1, the House opened at three o'clock, His Honour read the Speech from the Throne, the motion that the committee to appoint the Address in Reply was put and was adopted, all members present voting for it, there were twenty men on this side, Sir, nineteen on the other side, Your Honour in the Chair, forty of the forty-one men eligible to sit in the House were present that day.

Subsequently the gentleman from St. John's East who was the House Leader, put the normal motion that the House of Assembly do adjourn until the following Monday, put, carried.

At some point thereafter, and I obviously do not know the time, at some point between then and very early the next morning, the Premier waited upon His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and advised dissolution.

Now, Sir, the constitutional authorities are quite clear with the House at twenty-one, twenty, the Premier was not entitled to a dissolution. We had the right on this side, if asked, to try to form an administration. I wrote His Honour to that effect, I forget the date of the letter, early in February, citing the authority. I did not want particularly to be asked and I was not asked.

But, Sir, the House at twenty to twenty, the Premier was fully entitled to ask for a dissolution and the Governor did the only thing he could have done and granted it. The result of course is history. That is fine. I have no quarrel with the result. The result is history. But, Sir, in this light the resignation of Mr. Saunders becomes quite important because it was the resignation of Mr. Saunders as a member of the House of Assembly that opened the way to a dissolution. There is no doubt about that. Everybody would agree on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: We all know it.

MR. ROBERTS: Right. We all know that. But it is very essential to my argument to underline the point because it is crucial. So the question then becomes, Sir, when did Mr. Saunders resign? I assume he resigned after the House met on Wednesday? We agree on that. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, somebody has committed a vile, constitutional fraud, because, Sir, if the Governor sat in that Chair and read the Speech from the Throne and knew, or if any man knew that a man had resigned from the House of Assembly and it was twenty-twenty, he knew the House was to be dissolved. I do not for one moment believe in the least that His Honour the Governor had any indication when he sat in that Chair

on Wednesday, March 1, 1972 and read the Speech from the Throne. I do not think he had the slightest inkling that Mr. Saunders had tendered his resignation as the member for Bay de Verde. I do not think that for a minute. It never crossed my mind that he had even an inkling, even a hint that anything had happened other than simply the gentleman from Bay de Verde was not in his seat, he had not been sworn in, he was ill. I do not know whether anybody else had any idea. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if any person had any knowledge that a grave constitutional fraud was perpetrated on His Honour, the Governor, on the Crown, on this House of Assembly and on the people of Newfoundland - I am not even referring to the half million dollars that this session cost the people of Newfoundland.

Let us consider the circumstances in which the session was met. The government assumed office on, I believe, January 18th and they were sworn, I believe, on that day. We resigned as a ministry. Mr. Smallwood tendered his resignation as Premier and with it ours as the ministry. Two or three days before that, within twenty-four hours of the Supreme Court handing down a decision that the gentleman from St. Barbe South, as he now is, was in fact entitled to be the member for St. Barbe South, and therefore it became twenty-one - twenty and that was it, we resigned, no question about it. The new ministry was sworn in and everything was fine. They then delayed meeting the House, Sir. I have good cause to believe - I do not know - I have good cause to believe that they met the House because they were ordered to, because His Honour the Governor, acting on the constitutional authorities, said in response to those two requests for dissolution, "No, you must meet the House. If the House sustains you, you may carry on and at a certain point you may dissolve." Exactly the situation as happened in Ottawa during the same minority situation, exactly the same situation except this was not even a minority. It was a precarious majority but it was a majority.

The enormity of this, Sir, would be staggering if anybody knew because the moment Bill Saunders resigned from this House, Sir, the

issue had to be sent back to the electorate. There was no need for any, Sir. So, therefore, Sir, one asks when did he resign? All that I have said so far is either known or is a matter of surmise on my part. That which is surmise I have said is surmise. I believe what I said and I say it after mature consideration.

I had been told, Mr. Speaker, on Monday that one of our members had in suspicious circumstances decided to leave our ranks. I did not know who it was. I was leader of the party. I was quite new at the job and it was difficult times. There had been all sorts of strange circumstances. Mr. Shea and Mr. Burgess had been clipping about. All sorts of unusual things had been happening but I was told that. Now, that came after a caucus on Friday of the then Liberal members. The gentleman from Fogo was there. The gentleman from Bell Island, I believe, was there. The gentleman from Bonavista North was there. The gentleman from White Bay South and the gentleman from Labrador North were all there. It was held at the Laurier Club here in St. John's.

The only elected members of the Liberal Party who were not there at that meeting on Friday, whatever day it was, about twenty-fifth or twenty-sixth of February, Friday, was Mr. Smallwood who was then in Florida and Mr. Chalker, Mr. James R. Chalker, who was out of Newfoundland but was due back for the House. He had been returned as the member for St. Barbe North and was here on opening day.

I went round the table, Sir, to each of the men in that room with me. I can see it now as clearly, Mr. Speaker, as if it were this House at this moment. Mr. Saunders was at the meeting. He most certainly was. I went round the table and I said, "Boys, any one of us can scuttle her. It will only take one with the twenty-one/twenty situation." I went round the table and said if anybody here present has just cause why these two should not be joined in holy matrimony, let him now speak. Among others, I asked Mr. Saunders and I invite those who were present - there were nineteen other men present -

to contradict me. He did say that he had seen the Premier that morning and that he intended to see him again about a constituency problem. He also said (the honourable gentleman from Humber West was the Premier then) there and outside to several honourable members that he was anxious to have the House open because he needed the money. Many of us needed the \$10,000 or whatever portion comes on opening day. He said that, Sir, and I am not breaking any oath of caucus secrecy.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He said that he saw the Premier that morning?

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier being the gentleman from Humber West, the present Premier.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I got this news on Monday from a source that I believed reliable, I immediately brought skill I had to bear to try to figure out whether anybody might in fact be about to jump the ship. I do not mind saying, Sir, that I came to the conclusion that perhaps Mr. Saunders might be in that position. I knew that he had financial problems. He told that. He told me privately as well. I knew also that apparently he had signed some construction orders for Western Construction. I believe it was an improper proceeding during the election. He ordered work to be done, paving to be done in his district. He had signed for it, signed it personally, and I may have the company wrong. He came to me and told me that. He was concerned. The company was pressing him for payment and it was \$70,000 or \$80,000, a lot of money. The company had done the work and wanted the money.

So, when I figured it out, I threw it down and I said; "Now look, Bill Saunders owes me no loyalty. I have known him for years. We served together in the House. We have worked together but he owes me no particular loyalty. He is a friend of mine. I have no reason to suspect him. We get along." So, I picked up the telephone and I called Mr. Smallwood in Florida. Now I think he recounts the story in his book. I have not read that chapter of his book but I think he

said, Sir, and I told him the story. He said; "No fear" he said; "Bill Saunders is loyal to me. Bill Saunders has stood in that House fifty times and said how much he thinks of me and how loyal he is. I will ring him now and tell him that you are the leader and that I am asking in your behalf and I want to know what this is all about." I said; "That would be terrific, Sir." A little while later, Sir, that Monday evening, the phone rang and it was Mr. Samllwood calling from Florida. He had spoken with Mr. Saunders he told me. Obviously in law this is hearsay but I have every reason to believe it in view of what happened the next day. Apparently Mr. Saunders burned up the telephone wires between here and Florida with protestations of his loyalty to whoever the leader might be of the Liberal Party, that he was a Liberal, he had been elected as a Liberal, he fought for election as a Liberal, he had been a Liberal and he was going to go on being a Liberal. I said; "Well, that is terrific, that is really fine, that is grand, I can now rest assured."

I was not quite sure until the next day, Sir, Tuesday, the twenty-ninth day of February, because in that year of our Lord 1972, there was a leap year, there was a February twenty-ninth. I got in a car and I drove to Carbonear and by appointment I saw Mr. Saunders at his home. The two of us were present at the interview. He was a very shaken man in my judgement, not the Bill Saunders I knew quite well. He seemed to have much on his mind, he seemed to be weary and he was weepy and a very tired man. He assured me that he had no intention of resigning from the House, that he had no intention of leaving politics, that he was sick and his doctor had said he should not go the next day to the opening and so forth. I got in the car, my brother drove me over and I came back to town. I reported, I suppose, to some of my colleagues that day or the next. I told the House the same thing. So, Mr. Speaker, you will understand why I was somewhat surprised when the news came out that Wednesday night or Thursday morning that Mr. Saunders had

in fact resigned.

I was a little more surprised, Mr. Speaker, when a little while later, now this is the man who was in financial difficulties by his own admission. I did not make it up it was what he told us. I did not ask him it was what he told us. It was revealed in the House and I asked the Minister of Finance this on February 22, 1973, it will be found on page 757 of Hansard. I asked him; "May I again ask" (I had asked the year before but this is the most recent reference) "May I again ask whether the gentleman who at one stage represented Bay de Verde, Mr. William Saunders, a resident of Carbonear, has yet received either a pension or did he receive any sessional allowance, indemnity or expense account in respect of that," call it the one day session, we all know the session to which we refer. The Minister of Finance stood and I am quoting him in full, he said; "No he did not." I went on; "He did not receive any monies at all?" The Minister of Finance said; "He should have but he did not." As far as I know, that is true.

So we have the spectacle curious of Mr. Saunders...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker, of this we do not know, that is the point. Mr. Saunders, a gentleman who by his own admission was in financial difficulties, not availing, all it would have taken was to be sworn by any J.P. or anybody authorized to administer oaths in this province. Not being sworn as a member, he was entitled, fully entitled, as much as any man sworn that day in this chamber. If he had taken the oath, the quite simple but quite majestic oath that we take as members of this House, he would have been entitled to his fee of \$10,000, for one day as it turned out. We all did. I think all of us did. So he gave up \$10,000, a very noble gesture.

That session for Mr. Saunders had a special significance, Sir, because those who are familiar with the House of Assembly Pension Act know that if he had been sworn that one day he would have qualified to receive his pension of three or four thousand dollars a

year for his life.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: It is three sessions or ten years. It would have been three sessions.

MR. MURPHY: And ten years if anyone had been elected three times.

AN HON. MEMBER: No. No.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get into an argument with the gentleman from St. John's Center. The fact remains that he gave up his pension. He gave it up, Sir. He gave up two or three thousand dollars a year for life. That is quite a sacrifice, Sir, and I marvel at the way that man has been able to carry on. He sent us a cheque for twenty-five dollars last year for the Liberal Ball but we have not cashed it. I marvel at that. He did. Find out. It is in my - Well, better reorganize in there. A cheque for twenty-five dollars for the Liberal Ball. We did not list his name with the Liberal M.H.A's nor did we cash the cheque.

He has also managed, bless him, to take a couple of holidays in the South.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well deserved.

MR. ROBERTS: Well deserved. His wife was ill and I can understand him wanting to go to Florida for a little sun. Secondly; he managed to buy a second-hand car, a Lincoln-Continental, worth seven or eight thousand dollars. I wonder in wonderment at a man who will tell us on Friday that he is worried about grocery money and then subsequently is able to do this. Then, Mr. Speaker, over this I sort of puzzled and figured there must be an answer. I did not have the answer because I figured Bill Saunders must have resigned on the Wednesday. Would he have lied to me? To Joe Smallwood? I mean, the Governor surely was not misinformed, was he? Would anybody have misinformed the Governor?

There was one other curious incident at about that time that I think is relevant. On Monday the 28th. day of February, in the morning, in the forenoon, the Premier of this Province, the honourable

gentleman who now sits for Humber East, called a press conference to announce that the House would not meet until the member had been returned for Fortune Bay. The seat was empty, Mr. Oldford having resigned previously. The writs had been issued for the by-election, I forget the date. Polling day was the twenty-first or the twenty-second of March and the Premier said that we will not meet the House until we settle the composition because this one man could be so important.

The newspapers, the television and radio stations were there, what I say is accurate. That afternoon, Sir, the Premier called the press together again and made a very surprising announcement that the House would not wait until the end of March to meet, would not wait until the member for Fortune Bay whomever it was had been returned but that the House would meet the day after next, the quickest possible time it could. In fact we did so meet on Wednesday, March 1, thirty-six hours, forty-two hours after the Premier made his second statement.

All of that together is a most interesting series of facts and may lead many in this province to inferences. But, Sir, maybe I am naive, maybe I was not willing to accept what the inferences seemed irresistibly to be. I suggest, for example, to the gentleman from St. John's South, who has practiced in the courts of this province and done extremely at criminal law that if I presented the facts to him and sought his opinion he would say that there is an irresistible inference to be drawn on these facts. There may be arguments against, there may be facts we do not have, and I would suggest that the gentleman from Placentia East, a gentleman skilled in advocacy, would agree that there is an irresistible inference to be drawn from those facts.

I made no charges, I made no statements. Then about a year ago I decided; "Why do we not try to get hold of the - see whether there was a letter of resignation?" I recall wandering in to call upon Your Honour one morning and Your Honour said no, you had not received any letter of resignation and there was none in the

files, and that was a correct statement. Subsequently I was in touch with John Mahoney, the president of the Liberal Association in this province, and I asked him if he would write to Your Honour, as Speaker, to the Premier, as head of the administration, and to the Governor to ask if there was a letter of resignation and if so, could we have a copy of it. Mr. Mahoney did write. He wrote, I believe, on the fourteenth day of February 1973, almost a year ago. He did not get an answer from Your Honour. Your Honour may have sent an answer but he did not get an answer

from Your Honour. Indeed as of this morning he was in touch with Your Honour's Secretary to ask Your Honour's Secretary to check again and I do not know, one may have been sent but no such answer was received. He received no answer of any sort from the Premier. Mr. Mahoney did receive an answer from the private secretary to His Honour the Governor, Mr. Roderick Guzzwell. Copies of this letter are available for the press and for the honourable gentlemen if they wish.

"Government House,
St. John's, Newfoundland,
February 15, 1972.

"Mr. John W. Mahoney,
President of The Liberal Party
of Newfoundland and Labrador,
P. O. Box 5034,
St. John's, Newfoundland.

"Dear Mr. Mahoney:

Your letter of February 14, is hereby acknowledged. Attached hereto is a photostatic copy of the letter of resignation" (I delete a phrase of which I will come back to) "tendered by Mr. William Saunders when he resigned his seat as a member of the House of Assembly for the District of Bay de Verde.

Yours sincerely,

Roderick Guzzwell,
Private Secretary."

A very nice letter from a gentleman. The letter was enclosed.

House of Assembly
Newfoundland and Labrador

February 28, 1972
Monday.

Sir, 1972 was a Leap Year. The 28th. was Monday, the 29th. was Tuesday, Wednesday 1, March was the date the House met. The letter is dated Monday. "His Honour E. John A. Harman, Esq., Lieutenant Government" misspelled, "the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador." That misspelling is significant, Sir, because the same misspelling occurs in a letter send to the Clerk on the same date, no "r" in Governor - "Govenor" as opposed to "Governor".

"Your Honour:

I hereby tender my resignation as the member of the House of Assembly for the Electoral District of Bay de Verde effective immediately.

I have advised the Clerk of the House by way of a similar communication as of this date.

Yours obediently,"

(and a typed signature)

William P. Saunders,"

It is a signature which purports to be that of William P. Saunders and it has certainly been accepted by His Honour and by all concerned as being that of Mr. Saunders in fact.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that letter was dated February 28. That in itself is not proof that it was written on February 28. It could have been written at any time. It could have been written last week for that matter.

I had inquiries made of Mr. Guzzwell this day as to whether there was any evidence as to when His Honour had received it. His Honour - I understand, this information comes from Mr. Guzzwell to Mr. Mahoney who has conveyed it to me in a written memorandum. There is no dating system. I did not ask His Honour I asked his private secretary. There is no dating system at Government House. At the time in question Mr. Guswell was not his private secretary, Mr. Ambrose Shea held that post. He has subsequently retired because of ill health and I believe he is drawing a pension now.

So we do not know when that letter was received at Government House. I believe it was brought there after the House met that afternoon on the 1st. of March. I must believe that, Sir, because if not the Governor sat in that Chair and read a Speech from the Throne knowing that this House was dissolved. That it was dead. Dead! I do not think for one minute that the present Governor or any other man who has ever held that office or who ever will would be party to that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there lies, as the night follows the day, questions which must be answered. Some questions which

arise from the letter of resignation to begin with: (1) the letter is dated February 28, 1972, if any honourable gentleman would like a copy I shall be delighted to send it to him. It is addressed to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. When was this letter written? (2) Where was it written? (3) How was it delivered by mail or by hand? I understand a copy of the letter was delivered by hand. I have no idea how it got to Government House. If it was delivered by hand then by whom? Somebody had to bring it in. Who was it? To whom was the letter sent in the first instance? To His Honour The Governor? Or was it given to somebody, if not directly given to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor although addressed to him, was it given to someone for onward transmission? If so, who was that somebody? When was that somebody given the letter and to whom did that somebody communicate the contents of that letter? If anybody? How did the letter come to His Honour through the mail? Did he find it slipped under the door when he went home that Wednesday night? Did the Premier bring it with him when the Premier for a third time asked and for the first time was successful in getting a dissolution?

When did his Honour receive the letter? Or when was he made aware of its contents? By whom was he made aware of its contents. Remember, Sir, always this letter, this resignation was the springboard of a general election. Was His Honour made aware of the letter or of Mr. Saunder's resignation from the House before 3:00 P.M. on the afternoon of March 1, 1972? The question must be asked but it is obvious that His Honour could not have been made aware of Mr. Saunder's resignation until after he had delivered the Speech from the Throne. Why is it obvious? Because this is not obvious, if it is not true. If His Honour had knowledge of that, I do not think for one minute he could have. God I do not think he could have! He would have been party to a gross fraud upon the Crown that he served so loyally. He would no more be part of that than he would dishonour his own name.

Mr. Saunder's in his letter says that he sent a "similar communication" to the Clerk. Did the Clerk receive such a letter? If so, when? By whom?

or by what means did the letter come to him? Whom did the Clerk of the House notify? I could supply the answers to those questions, those latter ones I think and let me say that my understanding is that the Clerk did not receive the letter until after the House had met that afternoon. It was delivered by hand to his home not to him personally. Was the Clerk of the House aware at the time the House met that Mr. Saunder's had tendered his resignation? Did the Clerk inform the Speaker? If so, when?

When was the Premier the man who asked for and was granted the dissolution made aware of the fact that Mr. Saunder's had resigned? Was the Premier aware of this fact when he had advised the Governor to call the House together on Wednesday, March 1? You will recall that Mr. Moores announced the meeting of the House late on the afternoon of Monday, February 28th. The day the letter was dated, the date on the letter anyway, earlier that day he had announced that the House would not meet until late in March.

Did Mr. Saunder's decision to resign from the House apparently taken no later than Monday, February 28 and I might add twice denied after that to his own party - did that decision have any bearing on the Premier's decision to meet the House? What other ministers or other persons, if any, were aware of Mr. Saunder's resignation prior to 3:00 P.M. on Wednesday, March 1?

Here is the second category of questions which are quite brief. There are only two. Why did Mr. Saunder's choose to forgo not only his sessional pay and allowances of \$10,000 but his right to receive a pension? (2) Was his decision to do so in any way connected with the fact that he resigned from the House of Assembly in such unusual circumstances?

Now, Mr. Speaker, you put all of those facts together and I think that I am justified in asking the Government of this Province by a royal commission to appoint a suitable person, hopefully a judge, one of Her Majesty's judges from the Supreme Court or one of the District Court judges as see fit to investigate these events. Because there is an irresistible inference - it is an inference but it is an irresistible

inference and I have laid out a chain of events . I may not be an advocate skilled in the Criminal Law or in presenting cases to judge and jury but I think I have an ability to reason and an ability to understand. I have laid out a chain of events which leads to an irresistible inference that that letter was written on Monday, February 28

that ministers were aware of it and that it was written in usual circumstances to say the least. Furthermore, Sir, if that instance be correct, if it be correct and only an enquiry will bring out the facts. Mr. Saunders has, numerous times, declined invitations from the press to discuss the matter. Nobody else has said a word on it. If it be correct, then Sir, any man who had any knowledge of that letter, any man, be he in Carbonear or be he in St. John's or be he anywhere in this world, any man who had any knowledge of that letter and did not tell his Honour the Governor or did not tell Your Honour, who became Your Honour, our Speaker, that morning, is guilty of a gross fraud upon the Crown and upon the people and upon this House.

The honourable thing to have done was to get the desolution right away and let the people decide. Now I ask for that enquiry. I ask for it. Honourable gentlemen opposite may or may not grant it. It is entirely within their gift. If they do not grant it, there will be the completely undeniable statement, inference that they are hiding something, that there is something that they do not want to come out.

There is an enquiry being conducted into the alleged affair of the gentleman from Bell Island on far less evidence than I have presented here because he was man enough to stand and demand that it be put to the test. Mr. Saunders has made no such demand.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Nor do I expect him to.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Let him hang himself.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentlemen opposite have it in their power to grant this request. I can only make the request. If no Royal Commission is appointed, a commission of enquiry is

appointed - let it put it to the test. Let these questions be answered. It would not take very long. It would not be very difficult. Let men be subpoenaed under oath. Let them testify under oath. No oaths of cabinet secrecy bear here, Sir. These are not matters of the cabinet. These are matters that go to the very heart of the democratic process in this Province and if they want to broaden it - some may say that perhaps Mr. Olford and Mr. Shea and Mr. Burgess should also have the searching light of scrutiny cast upon them. I am all for that. All for anything that wants to be investigated, let it be investigated. I say that there is here a chain of evidence, a chain of facts, none of it particularly dramatic, none of it evidence in itself conclusive but put it together, Sir, lay it out, follow it through and there is irresistible evidence that a gross fraud, a gross constitutional fraud has been perpetrated upon the Crown in this Province, upon the people of this Province and we will see if the government and those who support the government have any desire to let the truth come out.

They could only profit from the truth. Surely, any man in public life, any Newfoundland can only profit from the truth. They used to act so eloquent at our alleged desire to cover up the truth when we were in office. They waxed so eloquent. Fine. Let them be equally eloquent now and let them pass the order in council to appoint someone to look into these things. Whatever that is in my possession, I shall gladly give to any such commissioner. Almost all of that which I know I have revealed here today and I believe what I have said here today. I believe it to be fact. Most of what I have said could be corroborated. Most of the meetings I have described were there. There were other people there.

You have a man resigning in unusual circumstances. That in itself is worthy of comment. Then you have an unusual situation constitutionally resolved by that man resigning in unusual

circumstances. Then you have, to top it all off, the knowledge that his resignation was dated two days before the House met, two days before the dissolution. Now, there may be a perfectly honest explanation for everything, Sir. It may well have been that Mr. Saunders took his letter, sealed it, put the stamp on it and walked down to the mailbox, popped it in and in due course the Canada post-office fellow came along, picked it up, carried it along and popped it into the postbag down here at Government House and in due course somebody opened it and said; "My, Your Honour, here is an interesting document. Bill Saunders has resigned." I rather doubted that had happened.

MR. W. ROWE: That would have had to be Wednesday night.

MR. ROBERTS: It would have been Wednesday. Well, you know, when His Honour got home after the opening of the House, back to Government House at four to five o'clock, whenever it was, somebody would have met him at the door and said, "By the way, Sir, while you were away we had the most interesting letter come. Bill Saunders will not be at the House anymore. He resigned."

Now, that is his credulity to believe that. I would like to see the doctors examine. I would like to know why Bill Saunders resigned. I do not know why.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am suggesting - that is the first suggestion that I have heard, Sir, and I think it is unworthy. Further that suggestion of mental instability against Mr. Saunders is beneath contempt. No, Sir, I am not suggesting it. I have said that Mr. Saunders was in ill-health, Mr. Speaker. He himself tells me that. I would like to know whether he saw a doctor that Monday morning. Maybe the doctor advised him to resign. That would be a reasonable and legitimate and an honest thing.

I say, Sir, there are men in Newfoundland who know - Mr. Speaker, am I to be allowed to carry on or not?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Leader of the Opposition has the floor and has the right to be heard in silence. Honourable members

are quite aware of this rule.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir. Normally I do not mind it but I think this is a grave subject. There are men in Newfoundland, Sir, I say now, who if they tell the truth could tell the full story, could explain the hitherto unexplained events. On the facts, as they are, Sir, there are irresistible inferences. I do not think that letter was mailed to His Honour the Governor. I think that letter was given to somebody and was carried from Carbonear to St. John's and that that somebody had it and in due course that letter was given to the Premier. I am not suggesting before the House met, Sir. I do not know. Perhaps when the Premier left the House at five o'clock that afternoon and walked down to his office, that somebody said; "By the way, Sir, there is something interesting here, Bill Saunder's resignation letter."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Two days after he wrote it.

MR. ROBERTS: It might have happened. I know, I have reason to suspect that a copy of the letter was delivered by hand here in St. John's that evening. Let an enquiry be set up. If I am wrong, if my believes are wrong, let them be exposed as incorrect and untrue but let the government set it up. That is the only way we will find the truth. If not, Sir, I say there are men in Newfoundland now - if somebody has said, let us investigate, we say let them investiage anybody they want, Sir, but let them investigate this thing because I say that there are men in Newfoundland today who know the answers to these questions. They may not all know all but some know some and some know others and perhaps some know all and all know some. There are men who can explain why a man dated a resignation on Monday, February 28, told the man by whose side he had fought through general - we all know politics is a band of brothers. We all know that, that men in a cabinet or in a party stand together and fall together if need be. Bill Saunders fought by Joe Smallwood's side in 1962 and in 1966 and in 1971 and was proud to do so on his own words. Maybe he wrote that letter after he spoke to Mr. Smallwood on the Monday night. Maybe that letter was written late Monday night. In that case he stands only of not having told me that.

Maybe I made it up. Maybe he had told me he resigned and I stood here on Wednesday morning and said; "Oh, he did not resign. He is just sick." Maybe he told me that. I think we will find that out.

Sir, I ask the government now, in the House of Assembly, as openly and as publicly as I can, if they do not appoint a suitable person to do a royal commission, with the power of subpoena and the power to question under oath -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I want the truth, Sir. If the honourable gentleman does not support my request, he does not want the truth. "The truth shall make ye free." That is what the Bible says and I believe that. I fear no man saying the truth. It may be unpleasant but I do not fear the truth nor do I think that the gentleman from Fortune Bay - he does not fear the truth nor does the gentleman from St. John's North nor the gentleman from Gander nor the gentleman from St. John's South nor the gentleman from Burin nor other honourable gentleman, all of them. I do not think any honourable gentlemen opposite fears the truth. Why should he? Why should anybody fear the truth who has nothing to hide?

Sir, if there is no commission of enquiry appointed, the people of Newfoundland will agree with me when I say that there has been a cover up, there has been an attempt to hide, an attempt to prevent the truth from coming out. I do not think any crime has been committed. There are those who do but I do not. It is a matter of opinion. Perhaps when the facts are out, there may have been a crime. I do say, Sir, a grave, constitutional fraud has been perpetrated and the truth shut out.

Mr. Speaker, that brings me up to the next part of my remarks. I have copies of these questions if anybody should wish to look at them. They have been distributed, I believe, to the press. Any honourable gentleman who would like them or like a copy of the resignation of Mr. Saunders - these marks by the way say, file JWM, personal file, Mr. Mahoney's personal file at his -

MR. W. ROWE: The point about the misspelling.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, the misspelling. The letter sent to the clerk - Mr. Clerk was good enough to give me a copy of it this day - he has a copy of it. It has a misspelling, "govenor." The letter sent to the governor is, "govenor," the same misspelling. I think one could reasonably conclude that the two letters were written at the same time, by the same person, not necessarily conclusive but reasonably conclusive, Sir, and certainly until and unless rebutted. The letter was sent to the clerk. I asked some questions about the clerk. He said, "I think I know the answer." I do not for a minute think that the gentleman who is clerk had any knowledge of that letter until after the House met that afternoon. I am not saying that anybody did but I think somebody did.

MR. W. ROWE: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: If any honourable gentleman would like a copy of this letter to the governor, Sir, for his personal research, he should feel free to ask for one. I would be delighted to let him have it and the same with the letter from Mr. Guzzwell to Mr. Mahoney. Needless to say, I have Mr. Mahoney's permission to deal with this material - a calendar in case anybody doubts that 1972 did have a February 29.

Mr. Speaker, the next point I would like to deal with in my brief remarks on the Throne Speech by way of opening is the province's position with respect to the Energy Conference at Ottawa.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot said on all sides about the Energy Conference and this province's position thereon. I do not think any subject upon which I have touched in my comments has so deeply and tenderly wounded an obviously exposed nerve. I suspect, Sir, that the administration know that they are wrong in their view, in their policy as they have advocated it. I suspect they know that. I suspect that they are tender of the fact that not one voice has been raised publicly in this province in support of it. The Premier may

have received 100,000 letters for all that I know in support of the province's stand, but not one voice -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, that is what I meant about tender. They have been words to use instead of thoughts and are, they are like robots. Now let them listen, Sir. If they do not want to listen, then let them be quiet. If they cannot be quiet, let them leave. When their turn comes, let them stand and let them speak. Let them give us the benefit of their thoughts. Mine, Sir, may not be very good but really they are

the best I have got and I venture to say they are better than any they have got.

Now, Sir, as I was saying before the gentleman, I do not mean to pay attention, Sir, but it is awfully hard, they do have strident voices. They are sort of a gas-house gang and they are trying, I do not know, they are trying to curry favour with the ministry. I do not know what they are trying to do. They are certainly not trying to help their constituents or Newfoundland.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman is at liberty to leave any time he wishes. He will have to leave when his constituents get at him.

Now, Sir, as I was saying, no public voice has been raised anywhere in this province or as far as I know outside this province in defence of the position taken by the ministry at the Ottawa Energy Conference, not a voice, not the meanest Tory hack has spoken out publicly, not a voice. All we have heard from the Minister of Energy, after all his hand maiden, he has to defend them, his political career is on the line. Of course he has to defend it. It is his baby. He created it. It is his thought. It is his words, his policy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Not one voice has been raised publicly, Sir, not one that I have seen. There may be thousands I have not seen and for all I know, Sir, the eighth floor tonight is bulging with mail sacks of people in Northeast Crouse, in my constituency, and in Jerry's Nose, in Your Honour's constituency, and all the other communities throughout Newfoundland, bulging from letters from those people who sat down - and I take pen in hand, Mr. Premier, to write to you, to tell you I think you did the right thing." For all I know, Sir, it may be, but if so they have kept them cleverly hidden. They have kept them cleverly hidden. They have kept them nearly as cleverly hidden as the member for Bonavista South keeps hidden his thoughts. The difference is, Sir, that

they do not use as many words.

Now, Sir, I think that is significant. I think the fact that this policy which has been discussed often and perhaps not always in reason and intelligently and calm and without passion, but has been discussed often, there is not one person anywhere in this island who has seen fit to leap to the public defence of the ministry on this matter. They do not lack for defenders on other sorry incidents.

But, Sir, I think every Newfoundlander knows and I think the ministry know that they are wrong, that they have made a terrible mistake, that they have made a great error, that they have not stood up for Newfoundland, and let me say, Sir, that standing up for Newfoundland is the duty of every government in this province no matter what its political stripe. I think we can agree on that.

AN HON. MEMBER: We have been arguing that for twenty-three years.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman has been arguing for twenty-three years, the only problem is the people of Newfoundland never agreed with him. The whole regiment was out of step except him, of all the arrogance.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland expect a government that will go to Ottawa, not with cap in hand but to fight for our rights, to fight for our -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: You see they cannot argue with the policy. They cannot argue the policy so instead I am being accused of advocating a policy of hands and knees, by old kneesy, weezy over there. I am being accused of toadying. I am being accused of carrying Ottawa's begging cup. That is their substitute for positive argument. I have yet to hear a statement from anybody on that side on the merits of the case and that goes from the Minister of Energy on down.

The Minister of Energy favoured us on Saturday last with the better part of two-thirds of a page in "The Evening Telegram," Saturday edition. He is obviously not mouthing his master's words if it is

a yellow dog rag, a piece of yellow journalism as the Premier assured us in a written statement, which he later retracted because he did not have a good day he told us, But a statement by the minister that I read and re-read and then I asked my wife, who is a not unintelligent, lady to read it. She shares my puzzlement and everybody I have talked to cannot understand it, because it makes no sense except as a political diatribe, by which standards it is not bad.

He went on CBC last week and did the same thing. Fine and dandy! I will trust to the good

sense and intelligence of the people of Newfoundland at any time.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am weary of the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South. I am weary of him. He is trying to get in the cabinet or something...

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: He is trying, Mr. Speaker, he is trying to get in the cabinet, he is distracting when I am trying to present a line of argument.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Look I can engage in...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Honourable members seem to have memories that are rather short. A very short time ago I had to stand and ask that honourable members observe the long-standing rule that the speaker, in this case, the honourable Leader of the Opposition has the right to be heard in silence. I ask that that be observed.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I quite enjoy engaging in repartee even with him but there are times when one tries to be serious, Sir, and there are times when a statement should be allowed to be made. We do not interrupt the Premier. On opening day I was proud of my colleagues, I do not think we interrupted him once. Did we? Most of his statement, Sir, unless he is obviously - at times I ask for attack. I think Your Honour will agree there are times when I am not altogether surprised that honourable gentlemen opposite play my game, dance to my tune and react to my statements. That is fine. That is part of the debate process, it is a valid and legitimate part.

There are other times, depending obviously, the gentleman from St. John's South, as far as I recall, spoke for an hour and a-half, eloquently, and I do not think he was interrupted once, or twice. He may have had some questions, he may have invited some flack, in which case, hopefully, people joined with him but people have the right to

be heard. The only ones who are against a man being heard are those who are scared of his ideas. Was it Ben Shawn who said in a famous quotation; "You have not converted a man because you have silenced him." They will not silence me, Sir. My lungs are every bit as good as their ears or better. As long as the rules of this House protect me, Sir, I shall happily speak when I feel I have the obligation to speak.

If my constituents in a general election wish to remove me from the House they will do so, they will not hesitate for a moment. Anytime Her Majesty's Ministry wish to refer the issue to the country, I shall be delighted to go to my constituency and put my political fate in the hands of my constituents. Anytime the gentleman who is now Premier, anytime, he does not need resignations this time, constitutional law is quite clear, at any moment he may wait upon his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, whom I am sure would be delighted to receive him at any proper time and say; "Your Honour, I advise you to dissolve the House and to issue the writs for a general election." His Honour, will say; "Of course, Mr. Premier, I am delighted so to do, I accept your advice, let the matter proceed." That is what Mr. Heath did in Britain a day or two ago.

Anytime they want to silence me - the only people who can are the electorate and let them anytime refer to the electorate and I will happily abide by the decision of my fellow Newfoundlanders. Very happily. I have no complaints with the results of the March election. I regret them but I have no complaints. People did as they believed best. They were fooled and misled by a bunch of men but the people will exact a penalty in due course. The people will exact a penalty at the polls, they did it in Hermitage. The first crack they had they did it, (Bingo! Bingo!) and Bert Meade, member of the non-partisan Rural Development Authority and \$80,000 and the whole cabinet, with the notable exception of the Minister of Finance, the Minister without Portfolio and maybe one or two others, the whole crowd of them were not enough to turn the tide.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I know there is great

latitude in the Address in Reply. We have listened with great endurance and boredom to the satire but surely, Mr. Speaker, this is not relevant nor germane to the Address in Reply, the mea culpa of the honourable the Leader of the Opposition and his paranoia thoughts.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): I think the point of the honourable the House Leader is well taken. The honourable the Leader of the Opposition may have strayed from the

general tenor of the Throne Speech debate. However, it is a free-wheeling debate and certainly, if the honourable Leader of the Opposition would be called to order. He should have been called to order a bit earlier and accordingly while I encourage the honourable Leader of the Opposition to return to the Throne Speech debate itself, he nevertheless, is protected by the fact that there is a wide range of debate on matters of this type.

MR ROBERTS: Sir, do I have the right to proceed or does this gentleman who so obviously does not know the rules insist upon proving it every day. I am sorry if I were lead somewhat astray, Sir, but I fear I was lead astray. I am afraid I was lead astray.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER (Inaudible)

MR ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me go on then with what I was trying to say about the Energy Conference, trying to approach it seriously with the consideration that I believe it deserves. No I will not allow a question from the likes of the honourable gentlemen - If the honourable gentleman has something to contribute I would be happy to have a question at any time.

Now, Sir, I submit that there were two issues laid before the Energy Conference at Ottawa and I submit that each one the position taken by the government exponents is not only wrong, it amounted to a complete sell-out, a complete reversal of every principle for which any government of Newfoundland should stand and fight. I think it was cynical. I think it was done for who knows what motive. I think it was done callously and for all the fine words that are in this unimpressive collection of lengthy documents, I think it was done without any true regard for the genuine needs of the people and the interest of the people of this province.

Sir, the two issues before the Ottawa conference, we all saw them or we all could see them. I understand CBC were flooded with calls protesting the decision to run the conference instead of,

Cornation Street or Edge of Night or whatever normally comes on in the afternoons.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Bugs Bunny.

MR. ROBERTS: But we all - Bugs Bunny - I do not know. Does Bugs Bunny come on? Can the honourable gentleman tell me? What comes on in the afternoon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: But we had the opportunity, Sir, to be present and I was ashamed as a Newfoundlander and as a Canadian and as a man who -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, maybe he is wrong. No man has the right to question my motives. But I was ashamed, I was ashamed by the position advocated by the spokesman of this Province. I think they should be ashamed of themselves. I think it was sell-out. It was a sell-out.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir. I do wish they would heed Your Honour. They just do not know any better. They are little ignoramuses, you know. They just do not know any better. They are ignoring. They are ignorant. I am quite willing to let them speak, if they dare, in peace. I am quite willing, Sir.

I have lost my line of talk because of those terrible nasty fellows interrupting me. I was talking, Sir, about the two issues before the conference. In my view, the Province is wrong on each issue. They are wrong on the energy issue and they are wrong on the constitutional issue. Then to add insult to injury, they tried to confuse the matter by dragging in what I have called an oily herring. It is not a red herring, it is an oily herring. The issue of off-shore ownership, the issue of the rights, of ownership of such oil as there may be off shore, well, Mr. Speaker, there was no question before the Ottawa Conference of ownership. The question placed before that conference and the questions raised at that conference did not deal in

any way with who owned resources. I realize there is a difference of opinion between the administration here and the Government of Canada for the ownership of our off-shore oil rights resources and I happen to think our government are right. When we were in the government we thought the same way and we adopted the same policy. They

have carried it on and they have developed it and more power to them.

The Minister of Justice will recall discussion, will recall commissioning lawyers when he was the Minister of Justice in the previous reincarnation, to examine our position, because we felt then as we feel now, that Newfoundland's position is strong and it is right as against the federal position.

MR. HICKMAN: It is not very defensible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am lost -

MR. HICKMAN: The honourable gentleman will recall when the Government of Canada made the first offer of sharing in the hope for revenue. I remember because I got into great difficulty by saying it was totally unacceptable and then I heard my Premier say that he thought it was a good offer, remember that?

MR. ROBERTS: I think I remember the incident. That was the so-called base-sharing lines or some such thing.

MR. HICKMAN: It was a dreadful offer.

MR. ROBERTS: In any event, that never became the government's position

Mr. Speaker, being nearly six, I shall move that the debate do now adjourn and I assume the House Leader would wish to make the normal motions or perhaps if he wishes I will make them, I mean it is -

MR. MARSHALL: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: All right, let the honourable gentleman do that. He has done nothing else all day, Sir, of any help to this country.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition shall get the opportunity to speak the next day.

MR. MARSHALL: I move that the House at its rising, Mr. Speaker, do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that this House do not adjourn until tomorrow Monday at 3:00 P.M.