



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 22

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

This being the commencement of Educational Week, I would like to welcome to the galleries today thirty-five Grade VI students from the Eugene Vaters Academy here in St. John's with their principal, Mr. C. Rice, and Mr. R. Stringer. I note we have two Federal M.P.s in the gallery at the back, the member for Gander-Twillingate, Mr. Lundrigan, and the member for St. John's West, Mr. Carter. I would like to welcome these two gentlemen and indeed each and every one to the galleries today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of the gravest urgency since it concerns a breach of the privileges and indeed, Sir, the honour of this honourable House. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, today, the gentleman to whom I am going to refer, the Minister of Finance, is not in his seat in this honourable House, Sir, but as I have just completed my research into this matter, Sir, I understand that according to the rules of the House that I have to bring the matter before the House at the earliest possible opportunity and this is the earliest possible chance that I have had to do so, Sir. I have no idea when the Minister of Finance is going to return to his seat.

Now, Sir, members of the honourable House will remember that on February 8, during the question period, I put the following question to the Minister of Finance, Sir, and I refer members to Hansard, page two.

"Mr. Neary: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the honourable 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 Bavarian 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?"

Well, Sir, the minister's answer can be found on pages three, four and five of Hansard, the verbatim report of this honourable House. "Mr. 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 to answer it."

"The position," Mr. Crosbie goes on, "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) \$410,000.00, 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."

Then there was an interruption from an honourable 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 the whole matter, it turned out that there was no agreement between the government and Bison Brewing Company Limited that had any binding effect whatsoever that Bison Brewery would repay the amount of \$410,000 approximately.

"Although we tried to pursue the matter and have the revenue bonds forwarded to us, that was never resolved. Out legal advice when Labatts said that 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."

Now, Sir, I do not need to read Hansard any further but I would like to draw honourable members' attention - the very next day the same minister, outside this honourable House, Sir, Mr. Crosbie, in the "Evening Telegram" dated February 9, 1974, claimed that Mr. Smallwood lied. "Crosbie claims Smallwood lied." "In the House Friday Mr. Crosbie said there is no chance of collecting the \$410,000 from either Bison -

HON. W.W.MARSHALL (Minister without Portfolio): Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have sat and listened to the honourable Member for Bell Island for quite a period of time now trying to determine the nature of the point that he is trying to bring out, whether it is a point of personal privilege, a point of privileges of the House or what have you. He seems in the first place to be bringing up a matter that had occurred sometime ago, almost a month ago. Standing Order (15) quite clearly says: "Matters of privilege," if this is what the honourable member is attempting to bring up, "whenever a matter of privileges arise it shall be taken into consideration immediately. "

Also, he is referring to Hansard, he is referring to statements of facts made by members, and the Standing Orders and notes to the Standing Orders which are substantiated by Beauchesne

indicate that disputes between two members as to allegations of facts cannot be classed as breach of privilege. Also, the honourable member is quoting from an newspaper and alleging that statements that are quoted in the newspaper relate to statements made by a members of the House namely, the Minister of Finance without any substantiation that the minister said it.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I do not know the point which the honourable member is attempting to make. If he is trying to make a point of privilege he should state the nature of his point of privilege briefly so that the House can determine whether or not in fact it is a breach.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the point of order. Whether or not the honourable Member for Bell Island is technically out of order or not on the question of reading from a newspaper, that is an irrelevant questions I would suggest or not the main point at all.

The main point before the House is to whether the honourable member is doing the right thing at the present time under the rules, with regard to the nature of a point of privilege or a breach of the privileges of this House. I would submit that Your Honour really, respectfully, Sir, has no choice but to listen to the honourable Member for Bell Island in order to see the nature of the case that he is going to make.

He has read a statement made by the Minister of Finance in this honourable House respecting his statement as a Minister of the Government. As I understand it, Sir, it is the case of my honourable friend the Member for Bell Island that the honourable Minister of Finance misled the House or lied to the House. He is attempting to establish that, by putting forward the statement that the minister made and as I further understand it he has documentary evidence to support his allegations, the Member for Bell Island's allegation, that the Minister lied to the House or seriously

misled the House. It is a very grave charge which the Member for Bell Island will be making against the Minister of Finance. I submit respectfully, Sir, that Your Honour has little choice in this grave matter but to hear the Member for Bell Island out and then determine whether in Your Honour's discretion there is a prima-facie breach of privilege of this honourable House.

MR. MARSHALL: The point is, Mr. Speaker, nobody is going to take away from the right of any member to raise a breach of privilege, but we have been listening for about ten minutes now to a regurgitation of something, of the verbatim reports, not Hansard because we do not have the edited Hansard but the verbatim reports, together with allusions to what was said in a newspaper. Nobody is going to attempt to prevent any member of this House from raising a breach of privilege but certainly the nature

of the alleged breach should certainly be brought up first so that this House can determine whether in fact it is one because alone the statements that the honourable the member for White Bay South is making - I mean, these are very grave, not unusual for the opposition to be making by the way, this type of allocation. Certainly if the honourable member wishes to pursue and make statements about a member of this House lying, he will have it on his head.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think we should, as you will, hear out the member from Bell Island and what he has to say. He has up to the point, from the time the point of order was raised, has not made too much of a clearing on what this point of privilege was and he really should have done that at the beginning.

MR. NEARY: I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I apologize to the House for taking so long. I just wanted in the preamble to remind members of what transpired before I had started to do the research in this very serious matter. Mr. Speaker, indirect contradiction to his statements both inside and outside of the honourable House, that no such agreement existed to repay an amount of \$407,000 from Bison Petroleum and Minerals Limited - I have here in my hand, Sir, and I am prepared to table these documents, Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand, Sir, a photocopy of an Order-in-Council dated December 14, 1970. Mr. Speaker, I know it may sound boring to the House but I have to read the Order-in-Council. This is December 14, 1970, "Ordered that consequent upon the sale of Atlantic Brewery Limited, Stephenville to Bison Petroleum and Minerals Limited and with respect to the amount of \$407,000 owed by the former company to the Government of Newfoundland, the undertaking of Bison Petroleum and Minerals Limited to repay the said amount by the issue to the government of interest-free revenue bonds redeemable in equal payments over a period of ten years be and it is hereby approved." That is signed, "Chief of the Executive Council, J.G. Channing."

Now, Mr. Speaker, secondly, I have here a letter, Sir, dated March 8, 1972, written almost a month and a half after the new administration took over, signed, Mr. Speaker, by one John C. Crosbie, Minister of Finance, who at the time, Sir, presumably was in full possession of his faculties and knowing what he was signing. I am not going to read the whole letter, Mr. Speaker, but I want to read the first paragraph from this letter, dated March 8, 1972, addressed to Bison Petroleum and Minerals Limited, care of Bison Brewing Company Limited, P.O. Box 160, Stephenville, Newfoundland. "Dear Sirs, on December 14, 1970 a Minute of Executive Council indicated that your company consequent upon the sale of Atlantic Brewery Limited would undertake to pay to the Newfoundland Liquor Commission the sum of approximately \$407,000 by the issue of the government of interest free revenue bonds redeemable in equal annual installments over a period of ten years." I will not read the rest of it but I will table it, Mr. Speaker. It says, "Yours Very Truly, John C. Crosbie, Minister of Finance."

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I have a reply to the minister's letter, dated March 13, 1972, signed by Mr. L.B. Martin, III, on behalf of Bison Brewery Limited, confirming that his company had undertaken to pay the Newfoundland Liquor Commission an amount of \$407,000. Again, Sir, I am only going to read a part of the letter. I will read the first paragraph.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Read it all.

MR. NEARY: Read it all? I will table it, Mr. Speaker. The letter is addressed to Mr. John C. Crosbie, Minister of Finance, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, Department of Finance.

"Dear Mr. Crosbie, we hereby confirm that Bison Brewing Company has undertaken to pay the Newfoundland Liquor Commission an amount of \$407,000 by the issue to the government of interest free revenue bonds redeemable in equal annual installments over a period of ten years."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Not out of the province to the company?

MR. NEARY: Not out of the province to the company, Sir.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. Will the schoolboy debater please permit my colleague to continue?

Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman may call me names if he wishes but the rules of the House are still the rules of the House. If the gentleman does not wish to observe them, then surely he should be called to order. He is deliberately trying to harass the gentleman from Bell Island who is making a point of privilege.

MR. BARRY: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker: The only reason I called the honourable gentleman a name and I have to use the word "gentleman" - I think Disraeli defined a gentleman as somebody who is never unintentionally rude and I think that would apply to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: If I could just finish my point, Mr. Speaker. The only reason I called the Hon. Leader of the Opposition a name was because when he got up on a point of order, he did what he continuously does. He threw an insult across to this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, Hansard will confirm that this is a device which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition uses continually. It does nothing but throw the rules of this House into disrepute. I would submit that the next time the Hon. Leader of the Opposition does it, Mr. Speaker, you should cut him off immediately.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure that honourable members are aware that when one is speaking one does have the right to be heard in silence. Again, as I mentioned last week, the comments exchanged between the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy are really unwarranted and they are not really points of order at all.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if I may: We have listened for ten or fifteen minutes and we still have not gotten to the point of order. If the honourable member is rising to a point of privilege, the rules are quite clear that matters of points of privilege are dealt with by notice of motion asking for some type of relief that the rules provide for a breach of privilege. Now what the Hon. Member for Bell Island is doing is raising his point of privilege and is debating it here in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance, in the absence of the member against whom the allegation is made. Of course, it has to be raised at the earliest opportunity. It has not been raised at the earliest opportunity. Your Honour, I submit, that the

proper way to deal with a situation like this is to bring in a notice of motion. If the honourable member wishes to bring in a notice of motion, then we will deal with it on its merits then as to whether or not it has been brought in time or as to whether or not it is relevant or not. He ought not to be permitted to get up in this House and hurl accusations at a member in this House, without giving notice of motion. That is the reason for the rule, Mr. Speaker. It is to give the member who is affected or the group in the House who are affected notice of what is to be brought up so that they will have adequate time to be able to answer with respect to the charges that are laid. This House should not be used for the purpose of somebody getting up and making charges without complying with this rule which is there for a very good purpose.

MR. ROBERTS: If I may to the point of order, Sir. It seems that the longer the Government House Leader is in the House, the less he understands. First of all, Sir, the precedents in this House are quite clear. One of the most recent ones is when the Minister of Finance himself stood in this House for twenty or twenty-five minutes, Sir and made a vicious attack on a newspaper editor and then sat down without making any motion at all. I submit that what my colleague is doing, Sir, is stating his point of privilege, and explaining it is taking a while to do it but there is no repetition; there is no needless nor irrelevant material in it. He is making his point of order as concisely as he can. If Your Honour rules that there is a prima facie breach of privilege, he is then prepared to move the substantive motion or to give notice of the substantive motion.

Mr. Speaker, the procedure which the Hon. Member for Bell Island is following is the procedure which is sanctioned and hallowed by Beauchesne, by our own practice and by all the rules one could cite in all of the authorities and in all of the books. Your Honour's normal

practice has been that after a point is stated to reserve Your Honour's decision on it, presumably to consult with the clerks and to check with the authorities. Your Honour then rules whether or not there is a prima facie case of privilege. If there is, Sir, my colleague is quite prepared (he has the necessary motion at hand) to move it. I submit, Sir, that he should be allowed to get on with it. Our precedents are further clear. As I said, the Minister of Finance stood for twenty minutes or twenty-five minutes the other day and did not even raise a point of privilege, he merely read a newspaper editorial and then used the House for fifteen or twenty minutes to make a vicious and cowardly attack on that newspaper editor. He did not even, at the end of it, make any motion at all. No member of the House raised objection to that, Sir. What we see now is a deliberate attempt by the Government House Leader to block this point of privilege before it has even been put on its merits. I do not think it should be allowed, Sir.

MR. MARSHALL: To that point of order

I ignore, as I think most people in Newfoundland today ignore the Leader of the Opposition. The point that I am attempting to make is this: That if there is a breach of privilege in this House or in any House it is certainly competent for a person to get up on his feet and to state the grounds for the prima facie case. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable the Member for Bell Island has gone much beyond that, in that instead of stating the prima facie case so that we can see if a prima facie case for a breach of privilege has occurred and in which case he can bring in his notice of motion, he is instead going into great detail and a great number of facts.

I think we have spent twenty minutes on this. If the honourable member wish to bring in a motion, let him bring in a motion, then we can decide or let him state, he has not yet stated, briefly and succinctly the nature of the alleged breach of privilege so that the House can deal with as to whether or not it is one. Instead of that he is going into argument.

MR. J. A. CARTER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the whole thing is intolerable. Let the honourable the Member for Bell Island if he has - it is like a tapeworm, let him table his ragbag of delusions. It is just pathetic. We have wasted over twenty-five minutes now. Let him table it. Let the Clerk sort it out at his leisure and then we can come back to it.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, a further word, not with respect to the gentleman for St. John's North: I think the Government House Leader is now coming to the point. The point is: What is my colleague doing? My colleague is doing exactly what is in order. He is stating his case. Before he can make the bald statement that the Minister of Finance has misled this House, as it appears he has, my colleague has to read the evidence which supports this case. He is quite prepared to do so, Sir, and he is doing and I shall submit should be allowed to do it, Your Honour within the normal way.

MR. SPEAKER: I am exempting the time of course which has been taken up by honourable members raising points of order and so on. I feel that the honourable Member for Bell Island has taken more time perhaps than -

I do not know if it be necessary or not because only he perhaps knows that. I suggest that he get on and state directly as it is his point of privilege, table the information that he wishes to table. I will take it under advisement and rule on it later. I do not think it should be very much longer in doing that.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour, I am leaving out a lot of the evidence that I have, Sir, I am tabling all these documents, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on June 4, Mr. D. Peper, Comptroller and Deputy Minister of Finance, wrote John C. Doyle concerning this outstanding debt. I will not read that letter, Sir, I will just skip over it in compliance with Your Honour's request. Here is the clincher. On July 5, 1973, a letter was written, again by the Minister of Finance, John C. Crosbie whom I presume was in complete control of his facilities at the time, Sir. I am only going to read the first paragraph, It is quite a long letter, Mr. Speaker. I will read the first paragraph of the letter.

Mr. John C. Doyle, Canadian Javelin Limited.

"Dear Mr. Doyle:

We have now had a long correspondence originating in March 1972

with respect to the commitment of Bison Brewing Limited to issue to the Government of Newfoundland, free of charge, non-interest bearing revenue bonds in the amount of \$407,000 to be redeemed in equal annual installments over a period of ten years. The agreement; the minister told us there is no agreement; Sir, back on February 8, the agreement between Bison Brewing Company Limited and the government was ratified by the Executive Council by a Minute passed on December 14, 1970.

The second last paragraph of this letter says; "I therefore now advise you that unless this matter is settled to our satisfaction within one month or by August 9, 1973, the government will proceed to take action against the company. Yours truly, John C. Crosbie."

Now, Mr. Speaker, on August 20 a communication from Mr. Peper was forwarded to Bison's lawyer enclosing a copy of the Order-in-Council 977-1970. No more was heard of the matter, Sir, no more was heard on this matter after the August letter went out, so one can only assume, Mr. Speaker, that it was because Labatts had now entered the picture and were negotiating the purchase of the Stephenville Brewery.

On January 18, 1974, Sir, an Order-in-Council was passed and on the advice of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice the government reversed its intention of taking action against Bison in order to clear the way for completion for the sale of the assets of Bison to Labatts to be effective March 31, 1974. I am quoting directly from the Order-in-Council, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, what we have before us is ample evidence that the Minister of Finance not only deliberately misled this House but committed, Sir, a very grave conflict of interest in that the minister acted as both the chief officer of the government in negotiating a cancellation of debt to the province, while at the same time, Mr. Speaker, was associated in at least two ways with the

purchasing corporation which had most to gain by such cancellation of debt.

Mr. Speaker, in his conflict of interest statement, filed with the Auditor General in January of this year, the Minister of Finance, Sir, listed among companies in which he had financial interests, Gaden's Limited and Gaden's West Limited. This company, Sir, I submit to honourable members of this House, is a subsidiary of Labatts and not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the minister is a former secretary of the Board of Directors of Bavarian Brewing which is now owned by Labatts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to add further to the conflict of interest situation, the law firm of Alyward, Crosbie and Collins handled the legal work for Labatts in this whole transaction, Sir, and if you remember, Mr. Speaker, when the member for Placentia East disclosed his interests, he said that he was a partner in the law firm of Aylward, Crosbie and Collins.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: What did he say? He said all kinds of other things, but I am only interested in this particular item at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance also declared that he was associated with the firm of Aylward, Crosbie and Collins, so to add to the conflict of interest situation, Sir, we have the sitting member for Placentia East, who is a law partner with the Minister of Finance, handling the legal work for Labatts in this whole situation.

Mr. Speaker, this is barefaced deceit.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we are going a little bit beyond the rules of this House and the manner in which these matters are supposed to be dealt with. We have rules in this House with respect to matters of breach of privilege whereby notice of motion is given if there is a breach of privilege which allows the individual against whom charges are

made to be able to come and answer them.

Now instead of that, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for Bell Island has been allowed to go on and on and on, culminating in a base attack against the honourable Minister of Finance, without the Minister of Finance being here, and also now he is involving the honourable member for Placentia East and he is not here, in his seat and this, Mr. Speaker, is the very reason why the rules are drafted this way, to give notice of motion of this type of thing so the person can be here.

It is not unusual for the honourable Member for Bell Island to get along in this manner. I do not think that the House should be used in this manner by the honourable Member for Bell Island to hurl this particular type of vile innuendo and direct accusation unless the man charged is here so that he can answer it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that if the honourable Member for Bell Island wishes to continue any further that he bring in whatever notice of motion he wishes and he can answer it at the time when the Honourable Minister of Finance is here rather than take on and start to debate this and hurl this type of charge. This is the type of charge that is going to ruin this House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: "Sit down!" They say. "Sit down!" Listen to the Dale Carnegies on the other side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the -

MR. MARSHALL: Great ego council -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: With respect -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Old happiness pills is at it. Now, Sir, -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: With respect to the point of order made -

AN HON. MEMBER: Thoroughly despicable.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I agree the minister is thoroughly despicable.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the point made so calmly by the Gentleman from St. John's East, I see the Gentleman from Placentia East is now in his seat, it is surely no responsibility of anybody here on this side that he was not in his seat when the House was called at three o'clock. I assume that he had matters that took him elsewhere. As to the Minister of Finance, Sir, he has been

absent from his seat on Thursday, on Friday and again today and we understand again tomorrow, if he comes here on Wednesday. We surely cannot be responsible for the Minister of Finance.

The Gentleman from Bell Island is required to raise his point at the earliest possible moment. He has told us in his opening statement, his opening remarks, that he came into possession of this information this weekend past. Unless somebody is prepared to allege that that statement was not correct, Sir, the honourable gentleman is being timely and is doing the right and proper thing.

He is prepared, as I understand it, to make a motion but before he can do that Your Honour must rule. He cannot do it unless Your Honour rules there is a prima-facie case of breach of privilege. If there is no case then there is no motion. If there is a case, as I understand the precedence, Your Honour will then require the honourable gentleman to make his motion or else the whole matter collapses then. My understanding is again, the honourable Gentleman from Bell Island is prepared to make a motion and it is the appropriate motion in these circumstances. Then the evidence can be gone into. All he has done is cite the evidence he has.

MR. AYLWARD: Would the honourable the Leader of the Opposition permit a question, please? I am sorry I missed the first part of this. What is the motion? Could the honourable member read it to me? What you are talking about? I do not have the motion.

MR. ROBERTS: The Gentleman from Bell Island does have the motion and if it is in order to put it when the appropriate time comes I am sure he will be delighted to put it.

MR. MARSHALL: On that point -

MR. AYLWARD: I want to speak to that.

MR. MARSHALL: On that point of order. It is not whether the Minister of Finance happens to be here or not. The Minister of Finance is on government business but the fact of the matter is

when cahrges of this nature are made they are not to be brought up in this manner in any House of Assembly, House of Commons or where have you, purely and simply because the individual concerned has to have an opportunity to be able to reply.

What has happened, as a result of the statements made by the honourable Member for Bell Island, legitimately this will go throughout the press and the papers and the news media etc. and the reply will be made at such other time when any notice of motion is dealt with. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the manner in which this thing has been conducted has been a total and absolute abuse of the rules of this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Cite your authority.

MR. MARSHALL: My authority, Mr. Speaker, is quite succinctly that a matter of privilege is to be dealt with on a Notice of Motion. When a motion is made the person stands up and states the grounds of making that motion to make out a prima-facie case but he does not go into the full and entire argument with respect to same. It is a basic rule of natural justice -

MR. ROBERTS: If I may say another word, Sir. It is quite in order. The honourable gentleman has not gone into full and complete debate or we would be here for some time. What he is attempting to do, if it were not for the harassment of the Gentleman for St. John's East, who is a fine one to talk about natural justice with his record in this House, disclosing clients matters - sure -

AN HON. MEMBER: Tut tut tut!

MR. ROBERTS: Do not say tut tut tut! He did. But that is fair enough.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: I quite agree with the point of privilege and if it were not for honourable gentlemen opposite we would be at the point of privilege. The point is, Sir, the point of order is that all that my friend the Gentleman from Bell Island is attenpting

to do is to give the notice of motion. Before he can do that Your Honour must be satisfied that there is a prima-facie case. Before Your Honour can be satisfied that there is a prima-facie case a prima-facie case must be established. That is all my colleague is trying to do and if honourable gentlemen opposite would like to debate the matter, then perhaps they would agree to let us put the motion on the Order Paper and then it could

be debated but until Your Honour is prepared to say whether there is a prima facie case, then no motion is in order. The authorities are quite firm on that point.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I regret my absence but from what I have heard so far, it appears to be some insinuation with respect to any wrongful acting on my part.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. AYLWARD: Yes it is a debate. Of course, it is a debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. AYLWARD: It is a point of privilege and I am entitled to stand on it. I will tell you that if the Member for Bell Island or any other member of the opposition have anything to say with respect to my acting on anyone's behalf, I would like for him to say it right here.

MR. NEARY: That is what I am doing. I am saying it.

MR. AYLWARD: I am asking the honourable member -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. AYLWARD: What is the honourable member saying then?

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. AYLWARD: If that honourable member is alleging any conflict of interest, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he does not know what he is talking about. He has no idea at all. All he is doing is what he has continued to do since he became a member of this House and that is try to abuse and embarrass people. I will guarantee you that he will not abuse or embarrass me, and I am sure the Minister of Finance, if he were here.

MR. NEARY: Sit down!

MR. AYLWARD: Sit down? Why would not the honourable member bring it up when we were here?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could we get order in the House?

MR. AYLWARD: Get order? What order? This is what is wrong with this House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down!

MR. AYLWARD: That that honourable member can in the absence of the people he is talking about get up -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. AYLWARD: A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.,

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, if this honourable gentleman can get up and use this House to abuse people -

MR. NEARY: Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: Sit down when the Speaker is calling order.

MR. AYLWARD: I will sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island is taking considerable time and I do feel that he has been debating the point of personal privilege to a great extent. He has made some charges against the present Minister of Finance. I am not prepared to let him continue unless he makes a motion as such or states very precisely and immediately his point of privilege which I will take under advisement and rule on it later. I shall not permit the Hon. Member for Bell Island to continue any further after that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I charge the Minister of Finance, Sir, with deliberately deceiving this honourable House, misleading the people of Newfoundland, Sir, and in view of the seriousness of this matter, I recommend, Mr. Speaker, that appropriate action be taken by this honourable House, that drastic action be taken against the Minister of Finance for abusing a privilege of this honourable House, Sir, for abusing the privilege of his office for his own personal interests and that immediate steps be taken to consider his impeachment.

MR. HICKMAN: I have been a member of this honourable House for five years and I have never (I am entitled to speak on this privilege) -

MR. ROBERTS: No! No, Mr. Speaker! To a point of order:

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have the -

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, Sir: We can have a debate on privilege if it is a debate but the honourable gentleman cannot speak on a point of - he has been in the House eight years by the way, not five. Mr. Speaker, my friend I gather should have had a motion there. I do not know if he has one or not. Your Honour must now rule. The Minister of Justice cannot speak on a point of privilege until the point of privilege is before the House. Then if it is a debatable matter, and His Honour rules that it is debatable, then we can all get in on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Did the Hon. Minister of Justice rise on a point of order?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is - to the point of order - that there is not a motion before this House and that there has been a suggestion by the Hon. Member for Bell Island that he is rising and bringing to the attention of the House a point of privilege of this House. I say that the Hon. Member for Bell Island has not come even close to submitting to this House any evidence which shows even an iota of a breach of privilege of this House by the Hon. Minister of Finance. It is the most scurrilous, low-down, vicious, libelous attack that I have ever seen made during the eight years I have been a member of this House.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: I am still speaking. In my support of my submission, this is not a breach of privilege or a point of breach of privilege of the rules of this House that the Hon. Member for Bell Island is attempting to lay before the House. Rather, Mr. Speaker, it is an attempt, a deliberate, malicious attempt to slander the Hon. Minister of Finance, a member of this House and the Hon. Member for Placentia East, based not on facts but on pure supposition and reading from certain documents which are not facts, but an interpretation, in trying to cast

innuendos which cannot stand the light of day. Mr. Speaker, this as I say, is the worse that I have seen in the House. The very idea of reading bits and pieces of presumably confidential documents moving between Her Majesty's government and someone else, reading from these and reading bits and pieces of them and then saying that the honourable the Minister of Finance deliberately misled this House, and there is not one iota of fact in what has been read to indicate that. As for conflict of interest, the honourable the Minister of Finance in his conflict of interest statement says, "I am a member of the law firm of Aylward, Lewis and Crosbie, nonparticipating."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Aylward, Crosbie and Collins.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, whatever the name of the firm is, nonparticipating. To try and stretch that into a conflict of interest situation and then to make an allegation concerning another company, to me is stretching the rules of decency and the rules of this House far beyond where we have ever seen them stretched before.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think this debate has gone on for a considerable amount of time. Honourable members no doubt are very much concerned about it and are tending to get carried away in the heat of debate. I have heard the honourable members speak. I have heard the honourable member for Bell Island. I am not prepared to hear any more debate or discussion on it now. I shall make a ruling and take the whole matter under advisement and rule on it later. We shall continue with the business of the day.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, if I may to a point of personal privilege. This is separate and distinct from the point previously raised. You know from the rules when a question of personal privilege is brought up, it is imperative that it is brought up immediately. I am sorry that I was absent when the matter was introduced by I understand from the suggestions and comments by the honourable the Attorney General and the Minister without Portfolio that this involves our firm acting with respect to the sale of the Bison Brewery.

Now, let me make this abundantly clear and there is no one, no one in this House of Assembly who knows any better than the honourable gentleman if he is referring, which I understood from the previous remarks, to the \$400,000 treasury bonds that were not repaid by Bison Brewery - the reason why that money is owing to the province of Newfoundland is because -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. AYLWARD: Never mind now, Mr. Speaker, this is a point of privilege - is because the cabinet of which that honourable member was at that time a participant and they agreed when the Premier and the former Premier of this province signed a note for the Atlantic Brewery. This is the point of personal privilege now, Mr. Speaker. I think the people of Newfoundland should know what the privilege is. They do not want to hear what the point is. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask you for order until I explain the remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for White Bay South has risen on a point of order.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the member for Placentia East, if he would not mind being seated, is raising no point of privilege and I would ask Your Honour to rule on that point of order as to whether or not the member for Placentia East is raising a point of privilege. I submit, Sir, he is not raising a point a personal privilege or any other kind of privilege, he is merely involving himself in a debate as to what happened several years ago with the former administration.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, if I may to that point of order: This privilege concerns allegations made by the honourable gentleman or the member for Bell Island concerning these revenue bonds and the position of the Minister of Finance in our firm with respect to same. Now, I am sure the honourable House of Assembly wants to know what the position is, or is this man going to be allowed to get up and say what he likes and let the press cover it? Are we going to allow that man an open

day to slander all Newfoundland? Is this honourable House of Assembly now going to let the member for Bell Island say what he likes and do what he likes and the rest of these honourable gentlemen support him?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point of personal privilege is this: What I understand is reference to these \$400,000 revenue bonds, that Bison Brewery, treasury bonds that Bison Brewery gave the Province of Newfoundland to cover sales tax which was due or allegedly due by the Atlantic Brewing Company Limited. So that when the government, the then government of the day, after Atlantic Brewery sold, the assets were sold by the Montreal Trust Company - the Government of Newfoundland concurred in the purchase by Bison Brewery. At that time this question of this \$400,000 which covered sales tax due the province on liquor or beer sold to that brewery, everybody remembers the famous letter that the former Premier signed and no one could remember

what happened or why.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when Labatt Breweries acquired the assets of Bison Brewing Company Limited, it did not concern Labatt's at all what the position was between the province and Bison Brewing Company Limited but on the advice of the law officers of the Department of Justice that the Government of the Province have no claim, because what they received, Mr. Speaker, was just useless treasury bonds. In other words, if Bison Brewery would pay the money -

MR ROWE (W.N) Point of order, Sir:

MR ALYWARD: And the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member who is now standing know that.

MR ROWE (W.N.) Mr. Speaker, do I understand it that the debate on the point of privilege is now on?

The honourable minister, the honourable member for Placentia East is debating?

MR ALYWARD: Certainly Mr. Speaker. This concerns me, Sir.

MR ROWE (W.N): Is the debate now on? If so, I will have something to say myself as well as the members on this side of the House about this whole matter of a breach of privilege.

Is the honourable member now debating the issue or what is he doing? Can I have a ruling on that. Sir? Is the debate now on or not?

MR SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

The debate is not now on, on that point of privilege. I think the honourable member for Placentia East was just speaking, perhaps is attempting to clarify some point which he may have missed in the early part of the day. I did say earlier that I would take the matter under advisement. I do not think honourable members should take this opportunity to debate the thing now. I am sure that others would like to get into the thing and I think, as I said, the whole matter should end - I will make a ruling on it later and if the motion made by the honourable member for Bell Island is in order, then he shall debate it and defend it and other honourable members shall debate it and defend it at that particular time.

MR. ALYWARD: If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on a point of order. The point of privilege that I am speaking to is the privilege concerning myself, not the privilege concerning the Hon. the Minister of Finance, because the rules of this House are distinctly clear that when a matter of someone's character or something like that is at issue and it is a question of privilege you must rise immediately. That is exactly what I am doing. That is a separate and distinct point from the question raised concerning the Minister of Finance.

Now what I want to say is this, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for Bell Island and every honourable gentlemen in the Opposition and every honourable gentlemen in this House of Assembly know full well that the Hon. the Minister of Finance has nothing whatsoever to do -

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the member for St. John's East challenging Your Honour's ruling or is he carry on a debate, Sir?

MR. ALYWARD: No! No!

MR. NEARY: Because all of the documents have been tabled in the honourable House, Sir, placed on the table of the House. The member has access to them. Sir, are we going to debate the issue now because I have a lot of more evidence to present, Sir, if we are going to debate it, or are we closing off the debate while Your Honour makes a ruling -

AN HON. MEMBER: No! No!

MR. NEARY: When I am prepared to move a motion, then the honourable member will have his chance to defend himself.

MR. ALYWARD: Mr. Speaker, -

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

HON. L. R. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for Placentia East is doing what he must do and doing what he is entitled to do. Namely; replying to a slanderous, scurrilous, vehement and slimey attack, by the honourable snow-white Member for Bell Island, on his personal integrity and reputation. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that any

honourable member of this House is entitled to get up when his character or reputation is attacked and reply immediately. I submit that this is completely separate and distinct from the so-called point of privilege or whatever it is raised by the honourable the Member for Bell Island. I submit that the honourable Member for Placentia East is entitled to continue to reply fully to the scandalous, shameful attack by the honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. ROWE, W.N. On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may have a word? I would submit, Sir, that the - when I get Your Honour's ear I will continue. I am in no hurry, Your Honour. I realize it is a very touchy matter and that they may need to confer with people.

On the point of order, Sir, I would submit that as chagrined and as angry as the Member for Placentia East may be about whatever has gone on in this House, he is not entitled to carry on the way he has been carrying on. He says it is a point of personal privilege, Sir, but it comes directly out of the statements made by the Member for Bell Island and the motion which has already been made or will be made by the Member for Bell Island.

He was not in his seat when the statement was made. That, I would submit, Sir, is not our fault but, Sir, what he is saying has nothing to do with personal privilege from another matter, rising -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is your fault that we did not wait.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am sure that the honourable members are aware that when a member is speaking, he does have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. ROWE: Sir, if I may just clue up my point of order. Sir, if the member were rising on something completely extraneous to what had gone on before, what had been raised by the member for Bell Island, then certainly he would be within his rights to raise a point of personal privilege on any such extraneous matter but what he is talking about is based completely and is surrounded completely by what was presented to this House by the member for Bell Island. Sir, I would submit that what he is doing is debating the substance of the point of privilege raised by the member for Bell Island.

Sir, if Your Honour rules that we can now proceed to debate on the matter, then I have nothing at all against the honourable member carrying on with his debate but I ask for myself the same right and the same right for every other member of this honourable House to debate the issue raised by the point of privilege of the member for Bell Island. If Your Honour, as I understand it, has in fact ruled that there is no debate here, that he is going to take the whole matter under advisement, then I would submit, Sir, that the honourable member for Placentia East has no right to rise in this House and to debate the substance of the point raised by my colleague, the member for Bell Island.

MR. F. J. AYWARD: I am not debating the question with respect to the Minister of Finance. What I am debating is the implication of its propriety on my part and that is a separate and distinct point of personal privilege and I am entitled to put that before this House. I am sure the Minister of Finance can look after himself. I have no doubt at all about that and I can handle myself. What I am rising on here is a point of personal privilege on my own

behalf, separate and distinct entirely from the motion there before the House, and that is what I am intending to reply to and surely, Mr. Speaker, the honourable members of this House, you, the press and the public of Newfoundland are entitled to have the other side of it and that is what I am attempting to do and I ask to be -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Is it a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! There seems to be quite a number of members who want to get themselves involved in this debate. Being quite honest, I would like some advice from the Table, whether the honourable member from Placentia East does have a separate point of privilege and I suggest that this House recess for fifteen minutes so I can take it under their advice and rule on it then.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: This House is recessed for fifteen minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! With regard to the matter that is presently being debated, the honourable member for Bell Island rose on a point of privilege in which he made certain accusations and charges against the present Minister of Finance. In his charges he also referred to certain goings on, so to speak, within a law firm of which the honourable member for Placentia East is the senior partner.

I have taken the matter off the point of privilege made by the member from Bell Island under advisement and said I would rule on it later.

I feel that because of the alleged charges made by the honourable member for Bell Island with regard to the law firm of which the honourable member is a member this does entitle him to rise on another point of his personal privilege. No doubt he will have to refer to some of the statements and some of the facts made by the honourable member for Bell Island.

Now I am prepared to hear the honourable member from Placentia East providing he keeps to the point of privilege at hand. After he has made his point, I will not recognize anybody else in this particular debate. I shall accept the speech made by the honourable member and take that under advisement and rule on the whole matter just as soon as we can get transcripts and take time to look at the whole thing. Until I have made a ruling with regard to the whole matter, I request honourable members not to refer to the matter in further debate until that is done.

I shall hear the honourable member for Placentia East on his personal point of privilege and I shall not permit any other debate re this matter and I request the honourable member for Placentia East to stick particularly to the matters on this point of personal privilege.

MR. AYLWARD: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I will continue. First of all let me again say how I think it is despicable, it is beyond

description to think that any honourable member of this House would be as low down and as mean and as miserable and I think the lowest of the low, for that honourable gentleman to feel - is this - Yes, this is, can you not take it or are you justifying it? Do you want to live with it? Do you want it to continue?

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, is the honourable member addressing me or what is he doing?

MR. AYLWARD: I am addressing you when you interrupt.

MR. WM. ROWE: He is looking at me, Sir, and waving around frantically. I am starting to shiver in my boots here. As I understand it, Sir, he is supposed to address Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. AYLWARD: If you would keep quiet, I would give the explanation.

MR. MARSHALL: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour has made a ruling; the honourable member for Placentia East is replying to certain very grave and personal charges that were made and the rule of the House is that the honourable member is entitled to be heard in silence. The honourable member for White Bay South decided that he should not be heard in silence and then he raises on a point of order.

Now this is a very, very serious business affecting the member for Placentia East and he must be allowed to reply to it and I think all members of this House must extend to him the courtesy of keeping quiet and listening to him defend his honour which has been besmirched.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure all honourable members are aware that when a member is speaking he does have the right to be heard in silence, and I sincerely request him to abide by this rule.

MR. AYLWARD: Now Mr. Speaker, perhaps we will all learn a lesson from this and the House itself because I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that any member of this House of Assembly should be allowed to get up here and slander and malign and do what this member purports to do, particularly when he knows the person whom he talks about is not present in the chamber.

Now it is all very well for any honourable members to say they are not responsible for the absence of someone else, but surely we have been here a month and likely as not we will be here for a few more months, so for anyone to feel that they must be compelled, as this honourable gentleman felt he was, when neither one of us were here, to get up and get on with this, the lowest of the low.

Mr. Speaker, really I suppose it is the first time in my life ever I have, particularly in this House, become personal myself, but to listen to the like of that propounded in this House and on television and everywhere else, talking about how people should behave; but anyway, Mr. Speaker, back to the point of personal privilege. That honourable gentleman knows as I am sure do all honourable members of this honourable House of Assembly, that I am not, as I said, debating the position of the Minister of Finance because there is a motion before you and we will in due course get time to debate that.

But this again shows, Mr. Speaker, that cowardly type, that cowardly type who will try to do that in the absence of the gentleman concerned, and again of course in my absence tried, apparently, by inference to implicate me.

The matter which apparently is under discussion was the acquisition by Labatts of Bison Brewery. And if there was any money lost to the Province of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, because of monies due by the former company, Atlantic Brewing and Bison Brewing, it was because, entirely, of the way the question of the sales tax was handled by the former administration. They know and the honourable member from Bell Island knows why the money that was due the province was not collected, because the people know, as the honourable

Minister of Finance told the House of Assembly, that the Premier lied to the House. It is right there. If the former Premier thinks that there is a cause of action, let him take the Minister of Finance. He never got in the House of Assembly and said it. It is in the papers, not in here, hiding behind immunity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the money that was due, that Labatt's Brewery - the question of sales tax, this \$400,000, the government did not collect that because they could not collect it. That was no concern of ours. That was the concern of Bison Brewery and the government. The honourable gentleman opposite knows that. What the province was given was treasury bonds which meant that when Bison Brewery made money from revenue, they would pay the province's sales tax. They never made a cent so they never owed a cent. It is just like I, Mr. Speaker, telling you that I will give you \$1 million after I make \$10 million. It is just as ridiculous.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as the acting is concerned. Our firm has acted on occasions for Labatt's for years and years and years and years and continues to act and will continue to act Mr. Speaker. On this particular transaction, Mr. Speaker, oddly enough we were retained by a Montreal firm of Messrs. Goodman and Goodman, who had been first consulted by Labatt's at the mainland office. They asked us who acted for Labatt's locally, and for us to act on their behalf. Mr. Speaker, our firm had nothing whatsoever, nothing whatsoever to do with this. The honourable gentleman knows that, Mr. Speaker. He also knows that the Minister of Finance has no interest whatsoever in that firm other than his name is on the door and he has an office down there. He knows that and his statement discloses that. For that man to get up and try to impute a conflict of interest is the lowest of the low.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as acting for that company is concerned, our firm makes no apologies. We acted quite properly. There

was no conflict of interest and I respectfully submit that this honourable House or any one concerned can look at any aspect of the transaction and they will find that under no circumstances was myself, the Minister of Finance, the firm or any one acting in any way other than a proper and an ethical manner. I sincerely trust, Mr. Speaker, that if this debate does nothing else, at its discretion - it will, Sir, you will ascertain this, that the next time any honourable gentleman in this House of Assembly gets up and tries to impute the integrity of another honourable gentleman I suggest that he be brought to order immediately and at least wait until the person is present.

Mr. Speaker, let me wind up by saying that there was no conflict of interest. We were, in that particular instance, retained by a Montreal or by a Toronto firm of Goodman and Goodman to act on their behalf with respect to this transaction. As far as any money that was lost to the province was concerned, it was lost solely and entirely because of the way the matter was handled by the previous administration of which the honourable gentleman was a minister in the cabinet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of sadness that the people of Newfoundland learned today of the sudden passing of the Most Reverend J. M. O'Neill, Bishop of Grand Falls and Harbour Grace. The late Bishop O'Neill was one of Newfoundland's outstanding church leaders. He was a native Newfoundlander who served his entire life in his church within the Province of Newfoundland. He leaves to mourn thousands of bereaved parishioners who were fortunate enough to be in his parish during the years that he served first as a parish priest and then as Bishop of Harbour Grace and subsequently as Bishop of Grand Falls, the Diocese of Grand Falls - Harbour Grace. Newfoundland has lost a very prominent and devoted son.

On behalf of the honourable members of this House, I extend to the Most Reverend Bishop Penney of the Diocese of Harbour Grace-Grand Falls and the people of the diocese the sincerest sympathy in their most sudden bereavement.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House, may I say that we share the feelings so eloquently expressed by the Minister of Justice on the occasion of the passing of Bishop O'Neill.

Bishop O'Neill was a very great figure in our history, Mr. Speaker. He came from a long line of very prominent and very leading citizens on the Northern Shore of Conception Bay. He entered into the priesthood and became a bishop as a very young man, Mr. Speaker. He was only seventy or seventy-one years of age at his death. He became a bishop, Sir, thirty-three years ago, so he became a bishop by the time he was thirty-eight or thirty-nine or forty. That, I think, Sir, shows the esteem in which the late Bishop O'Neill was held by the Holy Father in Rome and by his fellow bishops, a man singled out for promotion to an episcopal office at such a young age is most unique. He left his stamp, Sir, on the diocese, The Diocese of Harbour Grace is a very old diocese. It is the oldest diocese we have. The archdiocese is the older but the Diocese of Harbour Grace is very old, very historic. It includes all of the Northeast Coast, Sir, right down to and including Cape Bauld.

Mr. Speaker, Bishop O'Neill was a vigorous bishop and an active bishop. He took an active and interested role in public life. He was not silent on the great issue of Confederation. He made his position known forcefully and very vigorously. Then he expanded the see, Sir, and the changing nature of the diocese was reflected in the fact that the Diocese of Harbour Grace became the Diocese of Harbour Grace and Grand Falls and latterly, six or seven

years ago, it became the Diocese of Grand Falls. A great new cathedral was built at Grand Falls and the seat of the bishop, the see itself, was moved to what is now the Diocese of Grand Falls.

Newfoundland, Sir, has lost an able son, an able public servant. The Roman Catholic Church has lost an able priest, an able bishop, an able pastor. The people he served as a parish priest and the people he served as a bishop, have lost a friend, Sir, and a counsellor and a very wise and good man. All

Newfoundland, Sir, I know will join with this House in expressing our sympathy to his successor Bishop Penney and to all of the people who loved and revered Bishop O'Neill who was a unique man and one who will be sorely missed by the people of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member for Harbour Grace.

MR. H. D. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to rise to support the two previous speakers in their tribute to Bishop O'Neill. Bishop O'Neill was held in high esteem in the Town of Harbour Grace and also since the Seat of the Sea has been moved to Grand Falls. I knew the Bishop personally, Sir, and I am sure that the people in Harbour Grace in particularly mourn his loss.

I, too, would like to join with the other two speakers in offering my sympathy also, Sir, to Morsignor O'Brien and the parishioners of Harbour Grace.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Address in Reply - I think the honourable Member for Hermitage adjourned the debate on Friday.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

MR. SPEAKER: The Table tells me you have thirty minutes left.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in opening my remarks on Friday afternoon I did mention my particular pleasure at representing among other things parts of rural Newfoundland - my pleasure in representing to some measure the education profession. Perhaps if it is appropriate that I have to repeat that part of my remark today - being the beginning of Education Week which you have already noted.

I mention also my pleasure at being here as a Liberal together with my other eight colleagues in the official Opposition. I want to say I am delighted to have as a colleague the Member for St. Barbe North, a former colleague from the teaching profession, and certainly the Member for Bonavista North whose background in rural Newfoundland is substantial as is the background of the Member for Twillingate and Member for Labrador.

I say also, my joy in being involved with the Member for White Bay South and the Member for Bell Island and the Leader of the Opposition,

the Member for White Bay North, together with these gentlemen I hope to play an effective role in providing the kind of opposition that this province needs and deserves as part of the role of parliamentary government.

Mr. Speaker, towards the end of the afternoon on Friday I made considerable reference to the Rural Development Programme. I pointed out at that time that we on this side of the House and I personally take no exception at all to the concept of the programme. It is quite an admirable concept, the kind of programme that is needed in rural Newfoundland, the kind of concept which made me rather encouraged when I heard the announcement of the programme.

I believe I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, to you, in referring to the legislation and my findings, on the other hand, as to what have gone on in terms of the expenditures under the programme, that the programme is disastrously off the tracks and that something ought to be done immediately to rectify the thing before it gets completely out of control.

I repeat my earlier call that a full and independent enquiry be set up by government to rectify what is wrong, to determine what is wrong with the Rural Development Authority and to take the appropriate steps to see that it gets back on track as soon as possible.

I repeat also my strong plea that the Rural Development Authority be taken out of the jurisdiction of the Department of Rural Development and be established separately perhaps as a crown corporation, that certainly somebody independent of political pressures. I do not especially indict the Minister of Rural Development or the Minister of Fisheries or the other minister who is on the authority, I have just forgotten which one now, nor do I indict the three other members of the authority. I did point out Friday that at least four of them, the three ministers and the gentleman who is the P.C. candidate in the District of Hermitage, four of these certainly have reason to act politically. If I recall them to do so or in consequent comments I shall certainly be quite glad to produce evidence that all four of these

have not only been inclined to act politically but have done so on many, many occasions.

I regret that the Minister of Rural Development is not in the House right now because I do not particularly want to get into the kind of situation we were in previously. I thought for a minute actually, Mr. Speaker, we were going to have the House hours changed to conform to the Member for Placentia East schedule. There at one point, I was getting a little worried. We cannot be completely responsible on this side of the House for who is in the House when, except for our own being here. Despite the absence for the Minister of Rural Development, I think it is fair that having made the implication that he could act politically that I at least give some evidence that he has indeed done so in the past.

I have other items of evidence, just one small one for the record, small in terms of some of the other things he has done of which we have evidence. I was appalled to find that the minister was using his office as minister to influence a decision of the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities for a matter which was completely outside of his jurisdiction as minister and indeed only in his purview insofar as he was a bus operator in the Trinity South Area.

I refer to a letter which he wrote on the 13th. of January to Mr. Saunders at the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities in which he made his case with reference to an application for permits submitted by another individual to operate a bus service in an area of Trinity South. Having made his case, Mr. Speaker, he not only signs his name but does so in his capacity as minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Exactly.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Is it on a government letterhead, Sir?

MR. SIMMONS: No but he signs it James G. Reid, Minister.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, here is yet another example of the kind of abuse that we have been talking about, the kind of unwarranted abuse where men, this man in particular is using his office as a minister to gain personal advantage. I think the time has come when this kind of thing should stop. I can give you other examples and I am sure that as time goes on I shall have occasion to do so.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment on Friday I said that the operative word, the key word was the word "adequate." It occurs three times in the amendment and it is the adequacy or rather the inadequacy of the government's efforts in terms of public service, in terms of taking measures to improve the unemployment situation, in terms of taking measures to restrain the rapidly rising cost of living, the inadequacy of the government's measures that leave us appalled and concerned.

I made some references to matters affecting the cost of living and the unemployment rate. I should like to come now for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, to the matter of public services in the province. Once again, as I said, with the Rural Development Authority I find that I have to come, not happily, because I said Friday that it is not at all a happy thing to indict fellow Newfoundlanders but I have to indict and I have to say that the prime motivation in the improvement of these services, it is pretty obvious is not their improvement for the good of the people at all but the political mileage that can be gained.

Let me give you some examples, Mr. Speaker. During the Hermitage by-election three of the communities there, Pass Island, McCallum and Francois, each of which have Local Roads Boards and each of which had already received Local Roads Boards grants, usually amounting to three hundred dollars as their amount for that particular year, the 1973 - 1974, fiscal year, they had already received that particular amount. They needed more, indeed, like other Local Roads Boards around the province, made representation

for more. Indeed a community in White Bay South, Pollard's Point, a community of seventy families or so, needed more as well; their grant, being a larger community than either of the ones I mentioned, for the year was eight hundred and fifty dollars.

MR. W.N. ROWE: One hundred and ten voters.

MR. SIMMONS: Pardon?

MR. W.N. ROWE: One hundred and ten voters.

MR. SIMMONS: One hundred and eighty I am told.

MR. W.N. ROWE: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: You are talking about the number you got in the community I believe. One hundred and eighty.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did not vote Liberal.

MR. SIMMONS: The few people who did not vote for the honourable member the last time but they are going to have good reason to do so the next time, Mr. Speaker.

Eight hundred and fifty dollars was the grant for Pollard's Point. They wanted an additional grant, they applied for it and they were turned down. Indeed they were turned down, Mr. Speaker, within a week or so of the time that the three other communities who did not apply got more money.

MR. W.N. ROWE: They got it without even applying?

MR. SIMMONS: They got it without even applying, Mr. Speaker. Three communities who had received amounts ranging from three hundred to four hundred and fifty dollars without applying for more got a bit more. They had populations and they have populations somewhat less than Pollard's Point and I am not at all making the case that they did not need the money. They needed not only what they got but a lot more. I am talking about the equitable distribution, the fair distribution of scarce resources.

Mr. Speaker, Pass Island, McCallum and Francois are the three communities that I am talking about. They already had three hundred or four hundred and fifty dollars. Pollard's Point, of course, had eight hundred and fifty dollars and was told that that was enough. At the same time, within a week three communities which

did not bother to apply got a bit of extra money. They had three hundred dollars or four hundred and fifty depending on the community. They got a few extra. They got enough to bring them up to the eight hundred and fifty dollars, Mr. Speaker, but it did not stop there. They got a few extra dollars. Would you believe, Mr. Speaker, that in November, hardly the time to build roads in any community in Newfoundland. to begin building them, in November these three communities each got an additional seventy-five hundred dollars -

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. SIMMONS: An additional seventy-five hundred dollars within a week or so of the other community being turned down.

MR. ROBERTS: They got that after the election, of course?

MR. SIMMONS: Oh no! As it happened, Mr. Speaker, they got it about two weeks before polling day.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: No, he was busy, pretty busy with posters at the time. Being a friend of mine over the years he wanted to carry my poster. I could have given him some posters, Mr. Speaker, but he paid for them instead.

MR. PECKFORD: Do you want to make a point?

MR. ROBERTS: He made the point.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. W.N. ROWE: So do you when seen on television.

MR. PECKFORD: Cannot do it. Cannot do it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh he is tactful.

MR. SPEAKER (Dunphy): Order please!

MR. W.N. ROWE: Who did you get the franchise from?

MR. SPEAKER (Dunphy): The honourable gentleman who is standing is speaking and there is banter going back and forth from both sides of the House. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman in silence from both sides.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In terms of proof, of course,

the best proof I have is my memory which serves me extremely well on this occasion. I was in the motel room when the honourable Member for Green Bay delivered the posters to the honourable Member for St. Barbe North. I have other people who were in the room at the same time, Mr. Speaker, but I clearly remember the occasion because I clearly remember the look on his face when he saw me there.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the need to improve roads, particularly in the small communities, but I do not advocate that it be done by the manner in which the Minister of Transportation and his colleagues did it in McCallum and Francois and Pass Island two weeks before the Hermitage Election.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned also with the matter of road maintenance and if you want to know what I mean you should drive over the road between Seal Cove and Sandyville in Hermitage District or you should drive over the Bay D'Espoir Highway almost at any time. One would think there is an extreme shortage of sand or an extreme shortage of people to spread it. It is a completely despicable situation, Mr. Speaker, and one that ought to be taken in hand. A number of thousands of people in the District of Hermitage and the badly represented District of Fortune Bay travel regularly over that road

The evidence, Mr. Speaker, is in this House. The evidence was here last week. We have seen a number of members, I tried to keep count, I think five or six or seven members on the government side of the House find that the road situations in their communities and their districts are so completely intolerable,

they have got to come in here and approach the government with petitions. This, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of evidence including, Mr. Speaker, a petition from your own district on the subject.

I could mention, Mr. Speaker, in talking about the inadequacy of public services, the matter of water and sewer. I could tell you again about the government's efforts to get water for the people of McCallum. I have waited with bated breath as the Minister of Municipal Affairs spoke because I thought he was going to tell you about his concern for McCallum because I have a letter, unfortunately not with me today but I can certainly produce it for him - he has a copy of it because he wrote the letter, Mr. Speaker - in which he informed a person in McCallum, about three or four weeks before the election mind you, that his government was determined to give the people of McCallum a viable - I think that was the word - and adequate water system before the winter sets in. That was written in November, 1973, so you can only presume he meant the winter of 1973-1974, before the winter sets in.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who wrote that letter? The member for Hermitage?

MR. SIMMONS: The Minister of Municipal Affairs and the member for Fortune Bay. He was determined, determined that the people of McCallum, no ifs, ands or buts, not if it is economic, not if we can find the water but we are going to do it, period, before this winter sets in. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what they did. About eight or ten days before the election, the polling day itself, a rig was brought into McCallum, a drill rig of sorts. The company concerned will tell you that it was not proper for the job. The company concerned will tell you that it advised the government that it was not proper to do the job. The government took the rig in there against the stated advice of at least two engineers in the minister's department and went through motions, Mr. Speaker, of drilling holes. Despite the fact that private engineers and government engineers

had advised against its sensibility as an undertaking, the equipment much too small for the job was taken in there eight or ten days before, on a Friday eight or ten days before the election and of course was pulled out within two or three days after the election was over without any explanations, without any answers. They drilled, Mr. Speaker, a total of two holes, one fifty feet deep the other fifty-four feet deep. That is what came of the minister's determination, Mr. Speaker, to see that McCallum had an adequate water system before winter.

Mr. Speaker, I only wish that the part-time Minister of Rural Development, the time he does spend in the House he would spend it quietly so that I could get on with my speech, instead of mumbling over there. On the subject, Mr. Speaker, of water and sewer and municipal affairs generally, I was amused beyond words with the way that the Minister of Municipal Affairs was taken up with the letter that my colleague the member for White Bay South had written to municipalities throughout the province. The minister gave his version as to what he thought the letter represented. My feeling and the feeling of my colleagues here is that the member for White Bay South did the people of Newfoundland and the municipal governments in Newfoundland a much needed service because before he had written the letter we were all convinced and the people of Newfoundland were all convinced that with the abolition of the special areas that this money would indeed equally apply.

Government on that point, as time has shown, was lying through its teeth on the subject, that the many references to the abolition of special areas was meant to cloud another issue. So, the member for White Bay South, Mr. Speaker, in writing the letter, accomplished something that I think was worth accomplishing. He called the government's bluff on the subject and the government was forced to tell the full truth.

It was true that part of the truth was that the special areas had been abolished. The rest of the truth was not stated by government

until my colleague, the member for White Bay South, called the government's bluff on the matter. That is what his letter accomplished. It accomplished something else too of course. It allowed the government once more to become up to date in its awareness of the needs of the municipalities throughout the province. I am told that the number of letters that they are getting from the municipalities is quite a stack, and it should be after the misleading tones which came through those speaking for government when the new general development agreement was signed with the federal government. The implication was that somehow it would be a free-for-all.

When we had the fine print explained to us by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, in his subsequent statement in the House, the word was out, the word that they did not want to get out, Mr. Speaker. The word was that the special areas had been replaced for another kind of special areas - a rose by another name.

MR. SPEAKER: I hate to interrupt the honourable member but he has five minutes left to speak. I am sorry, I was given the wrong information. It is not five minutes, it is until five o'clock. I am sorry!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, due to the shortage of time, I shall leave some of my comments on the subject of water and sewerage until my address later on the main motion. I wanted to make some comments about health, particularly the dismal dental services which apply in the district of Hermitage and many other parts of the province. I wanted to make some comments about social assistance but I would rather, in keeping with the state of concern this afternoon, to have the minister concerned, the humble Minister for Social Services, here when I say what I have to say about the subject including a rather precious clipping from a newspaper which tends to belie other things which he has been telling us here in the House, Mr. Speaker.

It being Education week I would like, Mr. Speaker, to come to

a number of things affecting education. In so doing, I will try not to steal the thunder of my colleague, the member for St. Barbe North, he being the spokesman for this side on education. He has a number of rather telling comments to make in that respect as well.

So, at best it is appropriate to note that in this education week in Canada we find ourselves despite all the flowery comments from government, we find ourselves in a most dismal situation in terms of the rate at which we are catching up with the rest of Canada. Despite all the Minister of Education has said about pupil, teacher ratio which I will have something to say about in a moment, about operating grants and about a number of other things, about the Utopia which he tries to project, the fact is that after two years of this enlightened administration we find ourselves with

the lowest per pupil expenditure on education of any province in Canada. We find ourselves in 1973 spending fewer dollars than any other jurisdiction in Canada while we see the Yukon spending \$1,400.00 per student, while we see Ontario spending \$993.00 per student or Alberta spending \$1,028.00 per student. What is this enlightened administration in Newfoundland spending? Certainly not \$1,000.00 as in Alberta or \$993.00 as in Ontario or even \$891.00 as in British Columbia or \$902.00 in Quebec, not even \$680.00 as in Nova Scotia. No, Mr. Speaker, this government spends \$545.00, a little more than half the Canadian figure, the Canadian figure being \$910.00 per student. That is where we have come in education in the past couple of years.

Indeed, if you take your figures for 1973 and the figures for 1971, you will find that the gap is widening.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What?

MR. R. SIMMONS: The gap is widening. We are farther away from the Canadian average now than we were two years ago when this administration took office.

Mr. Speaker, we could talk about capital funds, the pressing need there, the need for not \$10 million or \$8 million or \$12 million but \$20 or \$25 million. Mr. Speaker, the issue, be it operating costs or capital funds or pupil-teacher ratio or bus transportation, these are only symptoms of the real disease. The real problem is the complete lack of leadership of this administration on the subject of education, the complete failure of the Minister of Education to give the kind of leadership that is required at this time. Education lacks a voice, lacks a leader at the provincial level and the minister has failed to provide that kind of leadership. All the poppycock about pupil-teacher ratio, he is going to need, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education is going to need more than charts, which he used in abundance on Saturday night to convince the high school teachers, every high school in this Province that he did not really mean what he said a week or so ago. He will have an awful job convincing the seven teachers in Herdman Collegiate in Corner Brook who are over and above the ratio now. their quota.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: By seven in Corner Brook, seven fewer teachers or in Milltown my friend and colleague, the former P.C. candidate in Hermitage, will be happy to know that where he has nine teachers he is only allowed seven next year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is any man who needs a big staff to do the job it is that man. He had the Premier and fourteen cabinet ministers in November to help him as a staff and he did not do much of a job with that and I suggest to you that if he is running the school and doing an adequate job, I understand, with nine, he is going to need nine next year to continue to do an adequate job. I could give you other examples. I could tell you that every high school, every high school is either standing pat or losing teachers.

The minister is going to need more than charts, Mr. Speaker, to get across his cockeyed and his shocking misrepresentation of what is really in that report that was presented to the members of the House a week or so ago, because the emphasis in that report, Mr. Speaker, is not the emphasis that the minister has been portraying at all. The key issue in that report is that the teacher allocation be assigned on a school basis. The minister, Mr. Speaker, has neglected to say that. Indeed, he is projecting the opposite impression that it is based on district figures and that just is not the case. That is not the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, on the subject of pupil-teacher ratio it does effect an awful lot of high school programmes and therefore an awful lot of high school students and I do not make any brief here to the effect that we ought to do less for the elementary. I think the report is admirable, it is great. It is adequate in terms of what it is doing for the elementary, it is cruel, disastrous, it is shocking in terms of the knife in the back that it is giving to the high school programmes around this country. God knows, we do not have, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, having taught in a high school yourself, we do not have programmes that are too adequate, that

are overdone in any high school in this Province, and the least we need is the numbers of teachers we have now. We do not need seven fewer teachers in Herdman Collegiate or two fewer in Milltown or two fewer in Harbour Breton or two fewer in Springdale or one fewer in La Scie or one fewer in Roberts Arm or one fewer in Triton or one fewer in Hermitage town itself. We do not need that kind of thing. That is what this report does.

Mr. Speaker, I talked to a building contractor earlier today and he had heard the minister on open line he said. "Look, explain it to me, what is this all about, this pupil-teacher argument, pupil-teacher ratio argument?" I said to him, "Well, perhaps, as a contractor, I could approach you this way". I believe, Mr. Speaker, this probably puts the problem in prospective. The committee set up by the minister himself to advise on this matter recommended the implementation of this programme over a two year period. The minister said we are going to do it over a three year period. So I said to my building contractor friend this morning, I said, "Here is what is really happening. I do not have the money to build all my house this year, so I want to close her in this year and finish her inside next year. I am sure you would say 'That is sensible enough', but some other guy comes along and tells me how to really save money and he says, 'Why do you not do it over three years, build the outside this year except the roof, paint her and plaster her inside next year and put the roof on the third year.'"

Therein, Mr. Speaker, lies the problem in the implementation of the pupil-teacher ratio. They are putting the roof on the third year. Any advantage to be gained from what started out to be an admirable formula is going to be shafted because of the way it is being introduced. My plea to the minister and to the government is that in the interest in preserving what we already have in high school programmes across the country that the least the government can do is freeze the allocation for high school until the new pupil-teacher ratio catches up. Freeze what is in high school and that way the teachers in Corner Brook and the other places I have mentioned will not be surplused.

March 4, 1974.

Tape 576

RH - 4

Mr. Speaker, I cannot overstate the problem. The problem, and I ask honourable members to check with their constituents in this matter, is affecting

high schools in this province and therefore high school teachers and therefore students who attend those particular schools.

It was brought in. The decision to spread over three years was an unfortunate decision and I appeal to the minister and the government to do something about it before the damage gets done.

Mr. Speaker, I made brief reference a few minutes ago to the matter of bus transportation. Here, Mr. Speaker, is another example of the callous way in which the school boards of Newfoundland have been dealt with by this administration. If you were to take the moves that this administration has made in terms of bus transportation subsidies over the past two years and put them altogether in sequence you would laugh your head off, Mr. Speaker, except for one reason, you would not, because of your particular concern with education you would be frightened to death, you would be shocked to see what is really happening, and youngsters and students around this country are the victims.

The bus transportation policy of this administration or the several policies of procedures they have had in the last two or three years, Mr. Speaker, is one of the bigger shames of the more atrocious acts of this administration.

Mr. Speaker, the real problem of course is that this administration is not the kind of thing that gets votes very often. As a result, education through its lack of leadership by the minister and the government and because it does not get votes very readily is getting as complete a shaft as any public service or a bigger shaft than any other public service in this country. The sad part of all that of course is that literally every youngster in the country is affected, 180,000 right in the school system itself.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks I would just like to make a very brief reference, since the Minister of Mines and Energy is here, to the matter of electrical service to the Connaigre Peninsula. It is another example of where the public services

being made available to the people of Newfoundland leave much to be desired.

The people of the Connaigre Peninsula, including Harbour Breton and Gaultois and so on, have suffered more than they can bear this winter in terms of power outages, lasting a day, a day and a-half, twenty-six, twenty seven, thirty hours on one stretch. The island on which Gaultois is located itself, the Community of Gaultois, has had five outages of a day or more this winter and points again to the substandard services being provided by the Power Commission in some more of the rural parts of this province.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I do not take pleasure in supporting the amendment. I find in conscience I have to support the amendment because I feel that the services being provided, the public services, whether they be Health, Social Service, Education, Road Maintenance, are completely inadequate. I find that the unemployment rate and the story behind it and the shallow attempt by the Premier to take credit for what is a disaster at best, I find that to be appalling and I find that obviously the government's concern for the Newfoundland people cannot be very high on their list of priorities. When I look at what is happening to the cost of living and when I hear the pious mutterings of an administration that is doing nothing except to prove what we already know, that much of the responsibility for cost of living restraints belongs to Ottawa, but when I see an administration that is doing nothing whatsoever in its own right to live up to its responsibility in the matter, I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that in conscience I can do no other than support the amendment. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bonavista South.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this amendment which is really a vote of nonconfidence in the government and the reason given by the opposition members are, three main reasons; there is no

action on the part of this government to halt the rising cost of living and there is no action taken in regards to the unemployment which is on the increase during the winter months, and public services.

Now I have listened to a number of speakers in this debate and most of all I listened very attentively to the newest member of this Assembly. I say I listened attentively because I was sincerely hoping that the honourable member would bring some kind of common sense, some kind of constructive criticism, some kind of realistic points of view, but unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we are back in the same boat. He is in the same boat as his colleagues. He has chosen to make personal attacks. He has chosen to bring in unsubstantiated charges in this Assembly, the same thing as his colleagues.

I find it rather regrettable because I was sincerely hoping he would bring some kind of constructive criticism from the opposition. I refer in particular to his statements made not this afternoon but on Friday afternoon past. I have to refer to the article that has been adequately covered, I must admit, very adequately covered by the local paper, "The Evening Telegram." Unfortunately we have not got Hansard to quote from.

"The Evening Telegram," I am quoting, March 2, 1974, "did a very adequate job of covering the House of Assembly and the honourable member's speech." How a new member of this Assembly can stand in here and attempt, deliberately attempt to destroy a good programme to me is unbelievable. He stands in the Assembly and says, "The Liberals are ~~not~~ getting loans from the Rural Development Authority. It is a partisan programme. Only P.C.'s can get loans. There is hanky panky going on. There is wrong doing going on. There must be a full scale investigation."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I request that if the honourable member intends to quote me, he do so correctly, I at no time said nor

inferred that Liberals could not get loans. He has just quoted me, Mr. Speaker, as saying that, I ask him to retract it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The matter referred to by the honourable member for Hermitage I think is really a difference of opinion with regards to facts between two honourable members and not really a point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I refer to a quote and I think he is very adequately quoted properly and correctly. "Mr. Simmons said in view of the disproportionate allocation of loans with regard to P.C. and Liberal Districts throughout the province, there was evidence of political hanky panky." That is one quote.

"The programme has been given the shaft for political reasons. Money is being improperly spent," a very serious charge. Then he comes along with some facts supposedly some facts. Mr. Speaker, the part that is annoying me in speaking in this Assembly is that when a person is speaking if the press is going to quote that member and it goes out to the electronic media and to the press media and if he is given certain facts, if the member is given certain facts through the members of the House of Assembly, the question there is which facts are the correct ones.

Now I would urge every honourable member in this House of Assembly to check the facts by going to the exact source, the Rural Development Authority. I did that today.

Now, I have no hesitation in saying that the trash that the honourable member got on with Friday afternoon was just that. It was trash. It was not facts. It was not correct. It was untrue. It was false. Why the honourable member would choose to do that with a programme that is working quite well in rural Newfoundland, why he would stand in this assembly and try to misrepresent the facts, I fail to understand why he would do that.

For example, he was trying to make a point that the Rural Development Authority, the Rural Development Programme was designed for rural Newfoundland but the larger centers like St. John's and Corner Brook and Grand Falls were getting loans. He pointed out that in St. John's for example the six districts in St. John's, the six electoral districts in St. John's, according to the honourable member who spoke on Friday afternoon, received a total of \$141,581,80, six districts. He tried to use these points as an argument that the funds were not going to rural Newfoundland, were not being used to develop the industries and business establishments in rural Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, these are not the facts because the facts are obtainable I am pretty sure by the press if they wanted to and immediately from the Rural Development Authority, easily. They can just check with the Rural Development Authority or the minister concerned who is doing a fine job in that department. The facts are that in St. John's since the programme was instigated, in St. John's they have had a total of seventeen loans approved. Now, the question mark is, did it go into St. John's Center? Did it go down on Duckworth Street? Did it go on Water Street? Did it go on Le Marchant Road? Where did these loans go? Truly the honourable member for Hermitage is not so naive as to think that there are not rural parts of the districts in St. John's.

St. John's North is a substantial rural area, St. John's East Extern, St. John's South. Why did he choose to misrepresent the facts

by saying that St. John's got the loans? St. John's East Extern got three loans. St. John's North, six. St. John's South, five. These are really rural districts, looking at St. John's South in particular. St. John's East, no loan whatsoever made in St. John's East. St. John's West, two loans. St. John's Center, there was one loan made in St. John's Center totalaing \$3,600.

Now, let me clarify the point. These loans were made and there is not one loan that was made in St. John's, there is not one business place that received a loan from Rural Development Authority that is operating within the boundaries of St. John's, not one loan. Now, these are the facts. These are the facts that can be obtained from the minister of that department and from the Rural Development Authority itself. So, why would the honourable gentlemen choose to misrepresent these facts, to try to kill a programme that is working well for rural Newfoundland? Sure, we all admit that there could be more done. We all admit that. Why stand in this assembly and say that the Progressive Conservative districts are getting all the money, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals districts are getting no money, Mr. Speaker? It is a programme of patronage, political hanky-panky?

Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman would stop and think for a little while, he would realize that maybe during the past six months that the main reason why the people in their districts, in the rural districts represented by Liberals, the main reason why they are not coming to this development authority, Rural Development Authority or coming to the minister in that department to seek loans to establish businesses and expand their present businesses is because of the honourable gentlemen and their attitude. Surely if the honourable gentleman is going to expound in this Assembly and expound through the media that this programme is of patronage, only Progressive Conservatives can get loans from this authority, surely the people in their own respective districts are going to think twice. They are going to stop

and think twice before they come here looking for a political handout, a political payoff. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is not that naive.

That is the reason why I sincerely believe that the Liberal Party and the Liberal Opposition in this assembly are deliberately trying to kill, destroy, to scuttle a programme which is working well for rural Newfoundland. It is embarrassing to the honourable members on the other side of the House of Assembly. It is embarrassing to them because for twenty years, when that same party was in government, they ignored the rural parts of Newfoundland. They forgot them. They ignored them. There was not one kind of a loan made to help business places expand or establish. Because now this government is doing this, because it is working quite well, the honourable members on the opposite side of this assembly are embarrassed by it. They want to stop, scuttle. They want to scuttle the programme. There is no other reason why.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to spend too long on this one point. I am sure the minister himself is going to elaborate quite adequately on the programme when he speaks in the same debate. I am going to say that in Bonavista South, in my district, I am very proud to be able to stand here and say that during the past year, a year and a-half, a total of forty-three loans were made to the people in my district. Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in standing here and saying that it does not matter to me whether the Progressive Conservative, Liberal, Communist, or New Democratic Party - I am sure that some people who have received loans were Liberals. So what? They had a viable business operating, a very feasible application. It was feasible for them to receive the money. Forty-three loans were made, a total amount of \$238,697.

Mr. Speaker, if I had to look at that list now and list off the names, which I know I am not going to do - it is not the appropriate place to do it - but if I had to go down through that list of names

and pick out who is a P.C., who is a Liberal, or who is otherwise I would not be able to do it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the honourable members on the other side of the House of Assembly can pick out who is a P.C., who is not a P.C., and to have the Hon. Leader of the Opposition stand in this Assembly -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: and then to go outside of the House of Assembly and to say, "Mr. Wallace Maynard over on the West Coast got a loan, he is a P.C. Mr. Mike Ryan down in Ferryland got a loan, he is a P.C. and Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick from Bell Island received a loan." He stands in this Assembly and goes to all the media and saying "The Rural Development Programme is nothing but political patronage. It is filled with it." We ask him for the facts and what do we get? We get three names out of 550 loans approved.

Is that the kind of trash that the people of Newfoundland are going to listen to? It is evidence to me that these kind of charges, that the name of the game in the Liberal Party Opposition is to destroy the programme. Well here is one member of the House of Assembly who is not going to see the Opposition do that. The programme is working well for my district. It is also working quite well for my neighbouring member who happens to be a Liberal in Bonavista North. A total of thirty-three loans were made to the honourable member's District of Bonavista North, a total amount of \$192,277.

I am sure that those people who have received loans, they do not like it whatsoever for the Liberal Opposition saying this is a programme of partisan politics, a partisan programme, political payoffs. They do not like that, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition in making these charges and the honourable Member for Hermitage in making these charges are insulting the integrity of these business people who receive these loans.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned when I opened my remarks, I was hoping that the honourable the Member for Hermitage would have been a bit different in this debate, in his maiden speech in this Assembly that he would not choose to destroy something that is already existing but rather he would try and improve on something that we already have. I sincerely hope in the future instead of condemning this Rural Development Programme that we are going to see the members of the opposition in their respective rural districts take the same attitude as right now that I have as a member of the House of Assembly - I am going to get every loan I can possibly get for a viable operation in my district. I have no bones about saying that - every possible loan that I can get for the people who need them to create jobs and expand their existing operations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if we can call this a vote of non-confidence or what it is. The amendment brought in by the honourable Member for Fogo is saying that there have not been adequate programmes to lessen the severe impact on our people with the rapidly rising costs of living. There have not been adequate programmes to reduce the extremely high numbers of our people who are unemployed. There have not been adequate programmes to bring in services.

I am going to deal with each of these separately. I am going to deal with unemployment first. Mr. Speaker, now to deal with the rising cost of living, it is so important, I will do that first. The rising cost of living - the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition made some kind of a constructive remarks when he spoke in this debate. He said that maybe there should be an investigation into the rising cost of living and into a possible profiteering of companies.

Well I have no hesitation today in standing in this Assembly and making a speech in this debate saying that I feel there definitely should be an investigation into the food manufacturing companies because that is where the big profits are. I quote from the Canadian Press in January 1974; "Sharply rising food and transport cost were the chief factors in pushing up living costs in most major cities last month." This is in the twelve major cities in Canada.

Now what is happening in my view is that the food manufacturing companies in Canada are using this psychology of inflation or the inflation psychology we have in this country of Canada. They are using that, they are using also the cost of transportation, they are using these two major reasons to hike up the prices of food. The prices of food have been hiked up for one reason, for the increased profits of these companies.

I feel that the federal government, through the Department of Consumer Affairs, and I agree with the honourable Member for Hermitage that we should not put all the blame on the federal government. What can we do here in this province to control these food manufacturing companies? I feel that the federal government should immediately investigate these companies. The reason why I say this is for one major reason; is because the profits of these companies have substantially increased during the past twelve months. The published reports of these food manufacturing companies show a very substantial profit over and above last year and previous years. Surely

the cost of food manufacturing is there, and this justifies the reason to increase the food prices because there would not be such a substantial increase in their profits. Yes, I do believe there is a firm reason to investigate the cost of living but not locally in this province. These food manufacturing companies are taking advantage of the situation we have in Canada today. They are taking advantage of it. I feel that we, as a nation, should not tolerate any further profiteering on the part of food manufacturing companies.

"The Canadian Press" quotes on February 9, 1974:

"Sharply climbing grocery prices in January helped to launch the 1974 inflation at an even faster pace than in the last twenty-two years record rise in living costs. Grocery prices, the chief factor in 1973's inflation, rose another 1.2 per cent last month across the nation." We are talking about January month. It rose 1.2 per cent across the Nation of Canada.

Then to have to stand in this honourable Assembly and listen to speakers on that side of the House of Assembly in the Throne Speech debate - one honourable gentleman stood up and said that the food prices in Botwood are caused by the honourable crowd on the other side of the Assembly. They are trying to blame the increase in the food prices and the cost of living in this Province on this Progressive Conservative Government. How naive does the honourable member think the people of his district are, to try to even attempt to make the people of this province believe that the reason why the price of groceries has increased and the cost of living has increased is because we have had a Progressive Conservative Government for two years in this province?

Mr. Speaker, it is a very urgent problem and I feel that the federal government or the federal level of government have not taken adequate steps to halt the inflation trend in this country. They took the steps initially to try to halt inflation and

what did they find? They found that in taking steps on the one hand to halt inflation, on the other hand, up came the unemployment rate. Which was of the most political benefit to the Liberal Government in Ottawa? "Let us forget the inflation measures or the anti-inflation measures, let employment increase." If we continue with these kind of measures, we are going to find ourselves with an intolerable unemployment rate in this nation.

Mr. Speaker, they decided to take away the anti-inflation measures. Unfortunately, this is the reason why the cost of transportation and the cost of food is driving up the cost of living to an almost intolerable situation, especially for those people who are living on fixed incomes. These people are finding it practically impossible to make ends meet. Yet the unfortunate part is that a few days ago when the Liberal Government in Ottawa brought down the Throne Speech, they did not talk about any measures to control the increase in the food prices, in the cost of living. Their attitude now is, "let us increase the production of food in the Country of Canada; let us increase our food production and hopefully we will drive down the cost." Instead what we can now expect, we can expect in the Throne Speech brought down by the federal government, we can now expect food prices to climb further, further and further for the next six, seven months or maybe even a year. The people on fixed incomes cannot afford it, they just simply cannot afford any further increases in the cost of living.

The provincial government are limited to what they can do to try to slow down this increase. We have taken some action that is of some benefit to some people of the province. I think other speakers on this side of the House of Assembly have already mentioned these facts but I am going to say here again that the removal of the sales tax on fuel oil is of benefit to the people in this province. It is a help. It is a little step in the right

direction. At least the things that this government can do, they are doing. The tax on children's clothes was removed, maybe a small point but it is important. Those pensioners who were receiving such a measly pension, who have been retired for quite some time now - the pensions of 1,135 pensioners in the province received an increase. These may be only minor things to the honourable members of the opposition but I am sure they are important to those people who are receiving a fixed income and who are trying to bear the cost of the increase in the cost of living.

Now maybe there are other things that this government can do. If there are, let us hear some views from the opposition, not for them to just stand in this Assembly and condemn the government in a nonconfidence motion which I am doubtful we can call a nonconfidence motion. They are now condemning the government for not doing enough. Why not do what the Liberal Party did a few days ago in Ontario? It is in opposition in Ontario. The Liberal Party laid down what they thought the government should be doing. It is a big difference. There they are saying to the government; look, we want to see the government do this and do that; we feel it is good for our people. It is not done in this province, Mr. Speaker. We do not hear one word of constructive criticism from the honourable members on the other side of the House of Assembly, not one word. They would not dare bring forward some views - of course, would not dare, because they are not capable of it maybe. I think, Mr. Speaker if they,

if the honourable Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues devoted more time into bringing in constructive views, offering suggestions as to what this Government could do about the cost of living, about the unemployment situation and regards to services to the people of this Province, but no. Like I said when I spoke in the motion to adopt the Throne Speech - all we hear is criticism for the sake of criticism, destructive, condemn for the sake of condemning. That is all we have had since this session opened. It is really regrettable. It proves to me that the people they represent are not getting a fair deal because they too would like to see some kind of suggestions from their honourable members who represent them as to what this government should do.

Maybe the suggestion made by the honourable Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons with regards to food prices in Canada is not a bad one, that there should be a ninety day price control, price and wage control. That is his suggestion but the Federal Government decided not to adopt this suggestion or accept it. They decide it now as for the Throne Speech brought in a few days ago in the House of Commons, they decided to let the food prices increase further and see what happens when we have the production increase in Canada. Pass out some money here and there to the fishermen, that is good news and to the producers of food in our country and let them increase the food products across the nation in the hope that the prices will go down, in the hope that prices will go down, and meantime they keep on climbing.

I feel that the price control should be brought into effect. I feel the Federal Government should do that. We cannot do it here and I also feel that there should be a full-scale investigation, documented full-scale investigations. I do not think there should be a full-scale investigation into the Rural Development Authority as one member who spoke in this debate suggested but I think there should be a full-scale investigation into the food manufacturing companies in this nation. For example, the price of sugar has increased forty per cent in the past few months, forty per cent and I fail to see the reason why. Maybe there should be - the honourable Leader of the Opposition mentioned he would like to see some kind of an investigation locally and I

think the honourable member for Hermitage mentioned it with regards to the pricing set down by the local business people. I would like to know why the price of sugar is nine cents higher here per five pound than what it is in Toronto, I would like to know.

It seems to me the transportation costs should not be that - that alone should not warrant the nine cents more on a five pound package of sugar. One major factor, one major point which warrants my call for an investigation into the food manufacturing companies is that the food price index across the nation has risen by twenty-two per cent, twenty-two per cent since 1973, one year. I do not think the companies can justify their manufacturing costs to warrant such a gigantic increase in the price of food.

So there are things maybe this government can do. As a lowly backbencher I can stand here and say, "Look, I do not know what this government can do to put a halt to the rising cost of living." I sincerely wish I could make solid suggestions but I cannot stand here and condemn my Government for not doing anything unless I say, "Look, will you do this?" I would like to see this Assembly pass a resolution, unanimously pass a resolution to ask the Federal Government to investigate the food manufacturing companies - number one, and number two, to immediately impliment price controls across the nation, at least for ninety days. I would like to see that done here in this Assembly to try to put the pressure on the Federal Government in the hope that they will take some kind of action.

Mr. Speaker, on the second part: Rising cost of living: I limit my debate because I am not too knowledgeable on the subject. I do not mind admitting it, but unemployment - I have here a report that was done by the Federal Department of Finance.

It is very, very interesting. It was done last year in 1973, speaking of unemployment throughout the nation the question mark is; do people want to go to work anymore? I am not too concerned now, I am not too concerned now, this year, when we have an unemployment rate which is not really satisfactory. It is high. We have too many Newfoundlanders unemployed but I am not as concerned now as I would have been back in 1965 or 1966 because we have good social service benefits, we have an unemployment insurance benefit which is really substantial and will keep the family in good, reasonable living conditions while they are unemployed.

This report here leads to the point I am going to make about benefits. This is a report that was done by the federal government where the Federal Department of Finance has set up what they call a; "Help Wanted Index." In 1973, this help wanted index was based on the want advertisements that were placed in all the press media across the Nation of Canada, on weekends only. This report is based on the findings of that help wanted index. Back in 1969 and 1970 and in 1971, what would happen as the help wanted index went up, the employers wanted workers, the unemployment went down. The report indicates that from 1971 on, from 1971, across the nation as the help wanted index went up the unemployment did not go down. The jobs were there. The employers had the jobs, skilled positions and other positions, the help wanted index proved the jobs were vacant but yet, the help wanted index did not go down. The unemployment did not go down, rather. The demand for jobs was there but the unemployment stayed steady.

This, according to their report, is an indication that people are satisfied with the kind of welfare benefits they receive and the unemployment insurance benefits they are receiving, especially during the winter months. I sincerely think, without making any charge to that effect, I sincerely think it is happening in this province. I think a man who is sitting at home drawing one

hundred dollars a week unemployment insurance, he is not too concerned if he is working this winter or not. If he is out going to work and he is working at a carpernter's wage or a plumber's wage he has to pay his transportation back to where he is working, commuting back and forth each day or he has to pay his cost of where he is going to reside while he is working. He has to pay his income tax and other benefits etc. Workmens' Compensation etc. He is not too concerned if he is not working this winter. If we have a fairly high figure of unemployment, which I think we do really, right now and we are going to every winter season because most of our construction work is seasonal, I do not think it is really a burden or really a hardship on the people of this province because of the benefits they are receiving.

Therefore, I do not think it is a big enough issue at this time. If the unemployment rate were the same as it is now by the middle of June or the middle of July I think the opposition would have every reason to bring in a vote of non-confidence on this government and say; "Look we have no confidence, the people have no confidence in this government with this kind of an unemployment rate in this province." We are not going to see that, Mr. Speaker. When seasonal work rolls around, construction work, road construction and the fishing season starts the unemployment rate is going to go down tremendously. I know that and I feel each honourable member on the opposite side knows that.

To bring in a vote of non-confidence because of the unemployment rate in the middle of February does not make sense. As I mentioned earlier, I cannot say that this help wanted index applies across the nation. The main reason for it is because of the high unemployment benefits the federal government are paying out. It may be not but at least the chart itself, Mr. Speaker, indicates like I earlier said, that as the help wanted index increases the unemployment does not decrease and it should, really. It should but it does not, which means that the jobs are there and people are thinking twice before they go to work because of the benefits they

are receiving.

With regard to unemployment a few more words: The programme that the opposition members are trying to scuttle is doing a good job of creating jobs in this province. It is really! Despite what the honourable Member for Hermitage had to say and the honourable Leader of the Opposition and the honourable Member for White Bay South, despite what they had to say about the Rural Development Programme, it is creating jobs.

In Bonavista North, for example, sawmilling, I will not give the names of each individual but ninety-five per cent of them are sawmilling operations. Every loan that was given out enabled the individual who had a small sawmill to hire one or maybe two men on, which he could not do before because he did not have a tractor to get his material out of the woods.

If the programme is developing employment in the district of the honourable Member for Bonavista North as it is doing in mine, I fail to see the reason why he should condemn it. If he condemns it and if he scuttles the programme, if this programme is destroyed, if people are saying; "I am not coming in to get any loans," it is going to increase unemployment in his district. He wants unemployment reduced on one hand and he wants to try to scuttle the programme that is going to overcome unemployment on the other.

What do the honourable members of the opposition want? The people of this province are confused and I am sure members of this side of the House are confused as to what they want. Sometimes I think the honourable members on the other side are confused as to what they want.

It may not be strictly relevant to the debate but I would like to mention one thing. For example, the honourable Leader of the Opposition wants a select committee set up in this province to investigate or look at the forestry legislation.

He wants a select committee on one hand and another piece of legislation before the House, a resolution before the House, the honourable Leader of the Opposition wants legislation passed within thirty days.

Here we are with legislation prepared before the House, finalized, a task force with all reports brought in. Legislation finalized, ready to be adopted by this Assembly and the honourable Leader of the Opposition says, "No, no, we do not want that. We want to bring it back to a select committee of the House." That is on one issue. On the other issue he says, "No, with regard to election expenses and disclosure we want it done right now, thirty days." Confusing, it is confusing to me and I am sure to his colleagues as well.

Mr. Speaker, last year this government spent \$43 million on roads throughout the province. I am not talking about services yet. This is just on the unemployment situation. \$43 million on roads and every construction season we have millions of dollars allocated for construction. I think \$43 million was more than any other year, more than any other year, especially by the previous government.

Last year in this province the housing starts were up in the province. Now the honourable member from Hermitage says, "Why should the P.C. Government, strong in the House, especially the honourable Minister of Finance, try to take credit for the housing starts in this province? How dare he do that?" Mr. Speaker, we can, we can sincerely because this government in 1973 raised the ceiling of loans available to people in rural areas of the province to build houses, raised it from \$6,000 to \$9,000, \$3,000 to build a home more than before.

It was because of that increase in the amount of money a person could get from government, or from the Housing Authority to build a home, it was because of that that we saw such an increase in the starts of housing throughout rural parts of the province. So we can sincerely take credit for it. A man before could not build a house

for \$6,000. He could not build it. He could build a shack maybe, build a basement, he could not build a home. So we increased it to \$9,000 and we did see the housing starts up tremendously in the province. In fact, in 1973 it was up by two per cent in comparison to the national average, two per cent more than the national average. A substantial increase in the starts in housing. I can assure you that by looking at the area of Bonavista South, all the new houses being built, the main reason they are being built is because money is being made available

The housing starts, here is a quote from Canadian Press, "The housing starts," if you want the information, "was nine per cent in 1973, up two per cent over 1971 in comparison with the national average in this province." That is a fact.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: If the honourable gentleman wants to make a speech he can stand when the time comes. He can ask a question only.

So we can sincerely take credit for the housing starts in the province and how we can have the honourable member from White Bay North and White Bay South and Hermitage, who have spoken so far on this amendment, condemn the government for not doing anything, when they start to do something they want to tear it down and destroy it and then they want to condemn it again and blame the government for not doing anything.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that by the time June comes around, the first week in July, that the situation with regards to unemployment in the province will be much, much brighter. I sincerely believe that with the programmes this government has planned for this year, that we will have one of the better years of this province, construction wise -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: No, but I will tell the honourable gentleman what I will do, if unemployment is the same rate in July as what it is now, I will stand here and condemn my own government for it, because it is naive

to believe that unemployment is now gone up. When the fishermen left the fishing boats in September or October, most of them in October, and went to draw their unemployment insurance benefits, up goes the unemployment. Naturally, every fishermen left the boats. That is a major factor right there that can influence the unemployment rate.

Now, Public Services - you know the honourable members of the opposition, they stand in this Assembly and I heard the member for Bonavista North and I am quite familiar with Bonavista North, in fact I ran there as a candidate for nominations one time, my honourable colleague beat me out but that is beside the point, I travelled the area long before I got involved in politics with the Rural Development Association and he stands in this House and he condemns the government for not doing anything in his district.

I am going to give him some prime examples of what the government did for me in my district in 1973, which was a real bad year according to the opposition. \$1 million in the Town of Bonavista for water and sewerage, \$1 million alone; \$250,000 in Summerville for upgrading and reconstruction of a new road, or construction of a new road in one section, upgrading in the other; paving of the roads in Port Blandford, the Town of Port Blandford was paved last year; Bunyan's Cove was paved last year; upgrading of the roads in the Community of Sweet Bay, right through the community; extension of the water supply system in Eastport, almost \$100,000; a fishing development programme in Salvage costing \$100,000, approximately -

MR. P. THOMS: You will get nothing this year.

MR. MORGAN: A longliner haulout at Salvage, a longliner haulout at

happy adventure. Forest access roads were constructed in Jamestown and Winter Brook. The first time in the history of the area that they saw some work being done.

Mr. Speaker, these are the examples of the things done in Bonavista South in 1973.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Speaker, that is not true. I got my fair share. This government does not give me all the services and somebody else none. What I am quoting here is an example of what the honourable members on this side of the House of Assembly got for their districts in services. Now, if the honourable colleagues on the other side of the House of Assembly, if they want to condemn the government for not giving the people services, maybe it is because they are not working for their people, maybe it is because they choose to come in here and condemn the government. They do not choose to go down to the officials in the different departments and discuss with them the problems of a certain area.

I know in one case the honourable member for Bonavista North does not do it, not very frequently. He very seldom does that. There is no point in standing in the House and condemning the government for not taking any action. I get more representation, not more, no, because I get tremendous representation from my people. I get more letters, not more. That is a lie. I retract it, Mr. Speaker. Not more. I get almost as many representations from the people in Bonavista North with individual problems as I get from the South. Now, why is that? That is because, Mr. Speaker, the people in Bonavista North are not being adequately represented in this assembly.

The same goes for the honourable member from Bell Island. The same for White Bay South. The opposition members are so obsessed with attacking the government, personal attacks, condemn, condemn,

they are so obsessed with that idea, they forget their districts. When the time rolls around, the budget is brought down and they are in looking for money and at the end of the year they say, "Oh, my district has no money here, no water and sewerage, no roads here, no pavement, no upgrading", I would say that it all reflects the services that the people are receiving in this province, the services reflect directly on what that M.H.A is doing.

My colleague in Trinity North I am sure got just as much or more in his district last year as what I got. The reason why he got it is because he is working for it, for his people. I know he was working for it. How can honourable gentlemen in this assembly stand up and say, "We get no services." We do not go in to - Mr. Speaker, can I be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Dunphy): Order, please! The honourable gentleman has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. MORGAN: If the honourable gentlemen are so concerned about services and worry about the services to their people, I would say last year in 1973 that was the best year ever for Bonavista South. I say it sincerely. I go on to say that if it were not for this government that came in in 1972, the people of Bonavista South today would be in desperate condition. I will tell you the reason why and I am serious, because the Liberal Administration and their Liberal policy was to forget the nineteen communities on the shore of Bonavista South side of the bay. They built a new Cabot Highway down the middle of the highway going towards Trinity Bay. These nineteen communities with their schools and their bad roads, etc. formed a committee and the parish priest today in the area can substantiate what I am saying, can verify what I am saying, they had a committee formed, they came into the government of the day, the Liberal Government, they sat down with different ministers and the Premier and they were told quite bluntly, "Look, boys, we are sorry to tell you, your area out there is a dormant area. There is

nothing there. There is no industry. There is no viability to it. We cannot supply you the services." They were told that bluntly and, "We are going to build a new road down through the middle of the highway."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: The Liberal Government here in this province. The great defenders of rural Newfoundland. The great builders of rural Newfoundland. They told these nineteen communities - the parish priest who came in and that committee are still in my district today. They are still there and can verify what I am saying. The Liberal Government told these people to go back boys and forget it, we cannot give you no services. We are building a big new highway down through the peninsula. You people over here on the South of the bay we cannot give you no services. You can all forget it. We cannot do anything for you, nineteen small but viable communities.

I can recall

the community of Keels, a sending community, volunteer sending community, King's Cove. There is a question mark there because the local parish priest made such a fuss over it, he says, "In no way am I going to resettle the people from my area." So, they finally came back and said, "Okay, we will label King's Cove as a receiving community." That was fine. On up the shore, Summerville, Plate Cove East, Plate Cove West, Charleston - there was a question mark on Charleston because there was an operation of a fish plant going there and they said maybe it could become a growth centre. With the exception of Charleston and King's Cove, the other seventeen communities were told, "Boys, move or not get any services."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Now, that was the attitude of the previous government in 1971. So, I would say that and I repeat I think a quote from my colleague who sits next to me here, "Thank God for the P.C. Government in Bonavista South."

Mr. Speaker, talking about services: The honourable Leader of the Opposition was so enthralled on his view points about the hospital at Bonavista. He goes in the House three or four times questioning the Hon. the Minister of Health about the hospital in Bonavista. That same gentleman who has no excuse, the same gentleman when Minister of Health went down to Bonavista, he went down there, he stood on the platform at the opening of the Bonavista Fair he told people and there were thousands to witness what I am saying. He told them I came down with your member, Mr. Barbour - I went in and saw the accommodations of the hospital. I saw what you have. We gave you a new bathroom. He told them that, we gave you a new bathroom in your outpatient clinic. As far as we are concerned Mr. Morgan's charges at that time, I was then aspiring to be a candidate for Bonavista South. I was raising pure -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hell.

MR. MORGAN: Pure hell if you wish about the hospital in Bonavista.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Raising hell. The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition who was then Minister of Health, who was then in the position to do something

about it stood in front of the people in Bonavista and said; "We cannot improve your hospital, your hospital is adequately providing the services for you people. We gave you a new bathroom that is all we can do."

That was in 1971, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Here he is now expounding on the fact that Bonavista must get a new hospital - must get a new hospital, a new hospital in Clarendville, a new hospital in Port aux Basques. Now he is suddenly concerned - hypocritically suddenly concerned.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the services going into Bonavista South, adequate services because Bonavista will get a new hospital from this government. There is no question mark on that. The seventeen communities that I mentioned earlier along that shore just this year maybe will see for the first time in history an asphalt plant. I cannot say I am not sure, I am saying hopefully that they will see for the first time in their history an asphalt plant that will start laying asphalt on that main road down through the communities.

That is the kind of thing that the individual member of this Assembly can do for his district. Every honourable member of this Assembly if he is sincerely concerned for his people and not just concerned about making headlines in the paper with calling for a full scale investigation of rural development authority, calls only for a full scale investigation of Saunders resignation, personal attacks on the Minister of Finance, personal attacks on the Minister of Rural Development. If they were more concerned with the problems in their districts, they will get more done but no they choose to slander and make personal attacks and destructive criticism continuously in the House of Assembly.

I am not going to elaborate on the things that were said by the minister, I think the Minister of Finance adequately covered what the government did in general in the province. I want to refer to a few things in my district which is a good example, a prime example of the services put out by this government during the past year. There is one point that I would like to mention, it is a very major point that is in the 1973-1974 budget, the budget we are now working under - the total budget

was \$674 million, now that was an increase of \$139 million over the 1971-1972 budget. There is one thing that stands out in that point because despite the fact that 1973-1974 is a normal year, there was no election on, it is still at \$139 million more than what was spent during election year, 1971-1972 by the Liberal Government. That is a very noteworthy comment because if you think about it the budget in 1971-1972 was a record budget by the Liberal Administration. It was a record budget for one simple reason, election year but the year after the government took over power in 1973-1974, this government spent \$674 million - \$139 million more than the Liberal Government's Budget in 1971-1972.

How can the honourable members who sat in that administration, how can they sincerely stand in this House of Assembly and say; "Look the P.C. Government are doing nothing for the people. They are ignoring the services. They are not doing anything to help the well-being of Newfoundlanders!" How can they sincerely say that? They cannot. They cannot sincerely say that. They cannot do that.

The Honourable the Member for Hermitage mentioned - I should not refer to him any more but I guess I will. He was wondering why the members of this side of the House of Assembly were so defensive, always on the defensive. The reason why is because the honourable gentlemen on the other side are so destructive. They want to destroy all of the good things this government are doing. That is why. If we do not stand and defend a programme which is working for Newfoundland and listen to all the criticisms going out over all of the media and attempting to scuttle; to destroy -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: It is working.

AN HON. MEMBER: I am not such a bluff as you are.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Anywry, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

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

MR. MORGAN: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Would the honourable member like to adjourn the debate.

MR. MORGAN: Okay I will move the adjournment of the debate.

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

On motion the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 5, 1974 at 3:00 P.M.