

6234 incorrect
6254 ← New inserts in place



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 46

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, MAY 6, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

HON. L. BARRY, Minister of Mines and Energy: Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to your attention two serious breaches of the privilege of this honourable House. When this honourable House had adjourned yesterday, Monday, May 5, and the Speaker had left the Chair, the honourable Member for St. George's assaulted the honourable Leader of the Opposition within the precincts of this honourable House.

The assault occurred after the Leader of the Opposition continued the line of remarks which he was making prior to the House closing and specifically referred to the honourable Member for St. George's as a drunken sot, thereby insulting and libelling the honourable Member for St. George's and his conduct as a member of this honourable House. This occurred in my presence and that of other honourable members. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I move that the honourable Member for St. George's and the honourable Leader of the Opposition be suspended from this honourable House, each for two sitting days.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy has raised what the Chair considers to be a very serious matter, one of which no honourable member of this Legislature can feel proud. First of all the Chair certainly feels that the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy has established a prima facie case. However, since two honourable members are involved, for the convenience of the Chair, each motion, if one wants to call it that, for the Chair's convenience will be dealt with separately. And first of all the motion to suspend the honourable Member for St. George's is debatable.

The honourable Member for St. George's.

MR. A. DUNPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I wish at this time to express to the House my deep regret over what happened yesterday afternoon. I have,

as a member of this House, I have tried to conduct myself in a proper and dignified manner. And I understand as well as any member the standards which are required of those who are privileged to serve as elected representatives of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I do not attempt to excuse my action. I apologize for it and stand ready to accept any punishment which the House may decide upon. I must however explain to the House what happened yesterday. The records will show that over a period of some weeks, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition has consistently referred to me in insulting and derogatory terms.

These actions culminated yesterday when he referred to me as a drunken sot and asked questions such as, is the honourable gentleman inebriated today. Though I realize that assault cannot be justified, I say to the House that the words of the honourable the Leader of the Opposition were false, malicious, demeaning to this House and damaging to me as a member and as a citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I have never attended this House while under the influence of alcohol, nor would I do so. It is not necessary for me to deal here with these matters of my personal life which are long past. Any references such as were made about me yesterday are inexcusable. I therefore ask this House for protection against the kind of libellous attack which brought about this sad and regrettable incident. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! In view of the statement just made by the honourable Member for St. George's, in essence admitting that he had breached a privilege of this honourable House, the Chair has no other choice than to name the honourable Member for St. George's, Mr. Dunphy, and leave it to the House to decide what form of punishment if any will be meted out.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I move that the -

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker, to a point of order, Sir, I would like to say a word on that motion, It is a motion, I would like to say a word on it, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair has seen fit to name the honourable Member for St. George's and ask him to withdraw. Any motion as to how the House deals with a member after being named by the Chair is not a debatable motion.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand. Your Honour said when Your Honour divided the motion into two that the motion was debatable. I do not wish to debate it but I do wish to say a few words on it and I would ask for that privilege. Your Honour heard the gentleman from St. George's, The gentleman from St. George's sat down, Your Honour did not allow anybody else, I was trying to catch Your Honour's eye. I would like to say a few words if it is in order. I just do not understand. This is a debatable motion, as I understand the procedure, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair has divided the one motion put really by the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy into two parts for the Chair's convenience, because there were two honourable members involved. The Hon. Member for St. George's has in essence agreed that he breached the privilege of this honourable House. The Chair as a result of that has seen fit to name the honourable member. And in Beauchesne, page 118, Standing Order 134-1 explains the procedure and says quite clearly that a motion when a member is named is not debatable. And the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on the second part of the motion will be given the opportunity to make his comments.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, I accept Your Honour's ruling. That is no problem. What I do not understand is Your Honour - first of all we cannot have two motions before the House at any one time. That is a very basic rule. Secondly, Your Honour said when the gentleman for Placentia West first moved the matter that the motion was debatable. I - unless my ears misheard -

MR. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I mean all I - I wish to say a word. I would like to say a word on that motion, and then if there is a second motion to come up, then the second motion will come up and be dealt with in the normal way.

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

MR. BARRY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is correct. Both the motion that I put, or both motions if they are divided are debatable. And if the Speaker had not named the honourable member that would have been the case. But as I understand it also once the Hon. Speaker names a member of this honourable House then there is no debate. The procedure is then that - it is necessary then for the House either to appeal the Speaker's ruling or to support the Speaker's decision by setting out a penalty without debate.

Now the honourable Member for St. George's got up and admitted to the breach of privilege, and Mr. Speaker saw it fit to name him at

that point. So I would submit that there is no debate. And it is clearly set out in Beauchesne that there is no debate on the - once an honourable member is named all that is left for this House to do is to set the remedy following the Speaker taking the form of discipline that he has decided is necessary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we are on common ground when we agree that once a member has been named and withdraws from the Chamber then the matter, you know, the matter is dealt with by a motion which is non-debatable. But I would submit Your Honour was somewhat perhaps over hasty in naming the honourable gentleman. I attempted to catch Your Honour's eye - perhaps I should have made a noise or said, Mr. Speaker, or some such thing, but I did not, because Your Honour was rising I assumed to make a ruling on a point of order. Your Honour, I would ask that I be allowed to say a word or two on the motion, otherwise I am being denied the chance to debate. Your Honour, I think, is a little over hasty.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair is reasonably confident that once a member is named by the Chair then any subsequent motion is not debatable.

MR. ROBERTS: We are on common ground.

MR. SPEAKER: But the Chair is willing to be a little more sure of what the ruling is. It is willing to recess for two or three minutes to consult with people.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour there is no quarrel with the fact - if you want to recess, I mean, that is fair enough - there is no quarrel with the fact that once the member has been named and all of that, you know, the subsequent motion is non-debatable. That is fine. All I am asking is for a chance to say a word with respect to the same problem, the same matter referred to by the honourable gentleman from St. George's. That is all I ask. And I submit that it would have been in order. Your Honour was - I do not say this critically - Your Honour was a little over hasty in standing. Accordingly I sat down and made no effort to rise. Then Your Honour - I, much to my surprise, felt that Your Honour was going to either make a procedural comment or make

a ruling of some sort. Your Honour then proceeded to name the gentleman from St. George's. After all I am just as involved, Sir, in that motion as in the next one. And I, you know, in justice I think I am entitled to at least a word of explanation.

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

MR. BARRY: I confess I do not understand the - the honourable Member for St. - the motion that is before this House has to do with a breach of the privileges of this House by the Member for St. George's, freely admitted by the Hon. the Member for St. George's. The Speaker has named that honourable member, and that there is no debate. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has points to make arising from the same incident, there is another motion that is proceeding, and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition presumably has every leeway to make those statements.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: But this, once Mr. Speaker has decided that a form of discipline is required and names an honourable member then there is no debate on that motion. The procedure then is, and as I think we are in agreement, that the remedy for the breach of the privilege of the House be set out by this House, not by the Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: And I have so moved.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: And, Mr. Speaker, - no I think honourable members may - that is right, there are two different procedures involved because of events that transpired in the House since the initial motions were moved. Both motions are debatable. But once the honourable Member for St. George's got up and admitted to a breach of the privileges of the House, and the Speaker took the course that he did in naming him, that is not debatable. And the proper procedure is for the remedy to be put before the House and for this House to decide what the penalty for the admitted breach of the House is.

MR. NEARY: You got the cart before the horse.

MR. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Ego.

MR. NEARY: You got the cart before the horse.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, in speaking on this breach, and the admittance of the Hon. Member for St. George's that he had broken the breaches of the House, he also went into explain what brought it about. Now surely after that matter was settled, and Your Honour, maybe, as the Leader of the Opposition says, might have jumped to the conclusions a little too fast. Surely the Leader of the Opposition who brought about the events of yesterday afternoon, in part, surely should have a word - maybe, I am not anticipating what the Hon. Leader may say, but surely he should have the opportunity to explain his side of the story as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair is not trying to deprive the Hon. Leader of the Opposition from having an opportunity to make some explanation and some comments to the House for what happened yesterday. There was one motion made by the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy to the Chair. The Chair for convenience, because there were two honourable gentlemen involved, said it would deal with one matter at a time. The Hon. Member for St. George's admitted having breached the privileges of this House. The Chair saw no further need for a debate because the honourable member had admitted doing something wrongly in this House, and proceeded to name him. And once the Speaker names somebody there is certainly no further room for debate. If honourable members disagree with the Chair's ruling then they can appeal the Chair's ruling.

The Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I have already moved, there is a motion before this honourable House that the Hon. Member for St. George's be suspended from this honourable House for two sitting days.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion "Aye". Those against "Nay". The motion is carried. The Chair will recognize the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I assume I am now referring to the motion to suspend me from the House for two days. Let me, and what I am about to say, Mr. Speaker, let me make clear I had intended to say as a point of privilege, although the honourable gentleman quite properly raised the matter before I did or before I could, and

I had intended to say if I had been allowed to speak with reference to the gentleman from St. George's and what he had to say.

I used some words in the House yesterday of which I am anything but proud, and I apologize without reservation. I called the gentleman from St. George's a drunken sot. It was after the House recessed, the Speaker had left the Chair, a number of honourable gentlemen were in the Chamber. I should not have used the words. I can make no excuse, and I do apologize. I have no hesitation in saying that. Sir, those words were spoken in the heat of debate and they were spoken, and the Hansard will reveal this, after the honourable gentleman from St. George's called me a pig, after he had called me a rotten scum, and after he had called me a bastard. And I have checked the transcripts, Sir, they are not all, the pig reference was after the Speaker had left the Chair he called me a pig. And then I said that he was a drunken sot, or some such thing, words which are most inelegant and inaccurate and most inappropriate. The rotten

scum remark, Your Honour, will be found in the Hansard. The bastard remark is not found in the Hansard, but I think my colleagues who were here made protest at the time.

Now, Sir, the words I spoke, the drunken sot words, were spoken in heat. They were not the heat of debate. The debate had ended. I had gathered up the books and papers I had here. I had turned my back to walk out of this chamber when the honourable gentleman from St. George's called me a pig or he said, Roberts, you are a pig or words to that effect. I said he was a drunken sot, and he then took off his coat and came across the way and hit me. Well, that is fine. I mean, what happened happened, and I apologize without any hesitation or any reservation. The words were improper and inappropriate and should not have been said.

Mr. Speaker, let me also apologize to the honourable gentleman for references querying whether or not he was drunk. These I did say in the House and these are in the Hansard. I asked was he inebriated and so forth. I learned subsequently from some of my colleagues that the honourable gentleman opposite was not inebriated and that he has not consumed alcoholic beverages for some point of time. I have been labouring under a misapprehension for some time. The honourable gentleman, in my view, from time to time gave the appearance to me and to numbers of others to whom I spoke of having, particularly in the Chair, been under the influence of alcoholic beverages. Obviously I am wrong and I apologize.

Sir, I have a very tender regard for the need for the fairness of the Chair. I have paid a price for it on occasion, and I may have to pay further prices. I shall do so gladly. The honourable gentleman from St. George's I understand may have a problem which requires medication. I have talked to some medical advisors and they tell me that if the form of medication which is being received is what they expect it may be, which would be normal in the circumstances then the symptoms would be not unlike those caused by consumption of alcohol to excess, slurring of the speech, thickening of the speech and so forth.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not put that forward as a defence. I put it forward as an explanation. I apologize to the honourable gentleman for the incorrect and inaccurate references. Now, Sir, all yesterday afternoon I was harassed by honourable gentlemen opposite. The Hansard will reveal them deliberately and concertedly and consistently having harassed me, interrupted me, heckled, whatever you want. The precise words which I used in the chamber - objection was taken to them by honourable gentlemen opposite and the Speaker, Sir, did not rule me out of order. He did not ask me to withdraw anything. He did not tell me not to use certain words. Therefore I submit I have the right to expect that those words were in order. I do so.

The words I used outside the chamber were drunken sot and for those I apologize, and as I say those were used only after I had been provoked and perhaps I should not have been provoked. Perhaps I should not have lost my cool to the extent of calling the honourable gentleman a drunken sot, which I did and I cannot deny that, but it was only after I was called in turn a bastard, rotten scum and a pig. Then the honourable gentleman launched himself across the House. To that I would add, Mr. Speaker, that on Tuesday past, April 29, the honourable gentleman from Twillingate and myself, the Honourable the Premier and the gentleman from St. George's were walking together or walking at the same time down the front steps of this building. The honourable gentleman from St. George's there and then threatened - he said he would hit me, he would bash me in. I said to the Premier, you know, suggested that he take him aside and sort of keep the two of us apart because words might have led to blows even then. I mentioned it to my colleague, the Member for Twillingate, who happened to be with me and as far as I know heard everything that passed between us. The honourable gentleman later said the same thing, the gentleman from St. George's to the Daily News.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say just one other thing. I think it is obviously determined I am to be put out of this House. The honourable gentlemen opposite I suspect have caucused and made up their mind. They will try to silence me this way. Mr. Speaker, we have had one

other incident in my time of one honourable gentleman being struck by another honourable gentleman. I was in the House the evening the gentleman from St. John's East was speaking and he made some references which the then Member for Green Bay, Mr. Smallwood, Mr. William Smallwood, took as being an inference upon the character of Mr. Smallwood's mother. The gentleman from Green Bay thereupon crossed the floor of the House and struck the gentleman from St. John's East. The then government moved the suspension of the gentleman from Green Bay, the then House Leader, for five sitting days. No action was taken against the gentleman from St. John's East nor should any action have been taken against the gentleman from St. John's East.

I submit, Sir, that no action should be taken against me. I have apologized for the words which I used. I have done so without any reservation. The words which I used in the House I again repeat, Mr. Speaker, and objection was drawn. The points of order were raised with the Speaker. Your Honour was not occupying the Chair. Another honourable gentleman, the Member for Port au Port, was. But, the Hansard is quite clear and the gentleman from Port au Port did not rule me out of order. Indeed, Sir, while he obviously did not approve of the remarks I was making or did not particularly like them, he at several points said, carry on. Indeed he said - this is Tape 2053 - "Mr. Speaker - I request the honourable Leader of the Opposition to speak for approximately at which time the six o'clock curfew, the six o'clock time limit will take over and maybe we can retire to a pleasant evening and come back tomorrow in better humor."

There were further points of order raised. But, at no point, Sir, did the honourable gentleman from Port au Port who was then in the Chair as the Speaker -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He reserved decision.

MR. ROBERTS: That is it. He reserved his decision. At no point did he rule me out of order. If he had ruled me out of order obviously I would have either withdrawn the remarks or taken the penalty. I would have withdrawn the remarks. The honourable gentleman still has not made a ruling on that point. Coming up in the elevator just before the House met, I happened to be on the same elevator as the

honourable gentleman and I asked if he was going to make a ruling and he made no answer of any substantive nature. As Your Honour knows, I asked this morning. I rang Your Honour on the telephone to ask whether there would be a ruling given and if so when.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is it. I apologize without any reservation, and I would have done so, without motions or otherwise, to the gentleman from St. George's. The words I used were spoken in heat. That does not justify them. It may explain them. They were made only after the honourable gentleman used epithets to me which were infinitely worse than any that I used. I do not like being called a bastard. I do not like being called rotten scum, and I do not like being called a pig. The honourable gentleman from St. George's may not like being called a drunken sot. But, I did not cross the Pouse and strike him nor did I do so four or five or six days after I had said publicly both to witnesses and to newspapers that I would strike him. It was a deliberate attack. If there was any provocation, the provocation yesterday, Sir, was the least of the causes of that.

If the honourable gentleman assures us, as he does, that he was not under the influence of alcohol in the House, I accept his explanation without any reservation. But, I do say, Sir, that over the past few months, and I have often said so to my colleagues, that the honourable gentleman when he was in the Chair appeared to be at less than his best form.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is an unhappy incident. I intend to vote against this motion. I would ask my colleagues to do the same. The government, Sir, will do as they feel best. I submit there is no case for putting me out of the House. At the very most, the case is to ask me to withdraw the remarks, and I have done so, and I would be prepared to do so again. The precedent in this House was not a happy one, but the gentleman from St. John's East was not asked to withdraw or put out of the House. The gentleman who struck him paid the price and paid it, Sir, without any hesitation on the government's part who moved the suspension.

Mr. Speaker, again let me just say in closing that at no point yesterday during my remarks did the Speaker rule me out of order, at least this part of the remarks. I submit I am justified in believing that if the Speaker does not rule one out of order when the points of order are raised, then, Sir, it is parliamentary to carry on. The whole incident was unhappy. I am not proud of it, anything but proud of it, anything but happy to have been involved in it. It is a regrettable incident. But, the fact remains, Sir, and a reference to Hansard yesterday will - that I was harassed by honourable gentlemen opposite from the moment I began until six of the clock, the moment at which the House adjourned. The very kindest things I was called by the gentleman from St. George's who has a grudge against me - whether it is justified in his eyes or not is beside the point - I was called a bastard, I was called rotten scum and I was called a pig. None of those is a pleasant word. But, Sir, those are the words that I was called. In retaliation, I eventually lost my cool. For that I can make no justification except to apologize, and then the incident occurred.

But, Sir, I do say that I think it is quite wrong. The government can do as they wish. They have a majority in this House. But, I do not think for a moment that precedent or practice will justify suspending me from the House for the same length of time as the honourable gentleman from St. George's. The motion made by the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy is in my view therefore not justified. I have explained the circumstances, and without any reservation I have apologized to the gentleman from St. George's. He has not, Sir,

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, as yet, I might point out, apologized to me for calling me a bastard, rotten scum, and a pig and some of those words are in Hansard and some of those words were said outside the House. The drunken sot reference, on which the government hang their resolution, was said only in reply to the call from the honourable gentlemen from St. George's, "a pig," and I was in the House as was the gentleman from Placentia West and a number of other gentlemen. In making his motion he neglected to point out the fact that my remark was in reply to extreme provocation.

Well, that is what I have to say, Mr. Speaker. I thank the honourable gentlemen for hearing me out. The words again were spoken in the heat of debate and perhaps, Sir, it is an indication of the fact that this House does not have enough business before it, Sir, and that we should be sent hence and sent back to the electorate so the electorate can resolve this issue.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

HON. F. D. MOORES, PREMIER: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a very regrettable day when such an occurrence as we are witnessing here now takes place. As has been said on a few occasions, but I am afraid not often enough, or certainly not listened to enough, what this Legislature, what this institution means to the Province and to its people. It is supposed to be the one place where people from all over our Province can look with respect and look with some degree of confidence.

That cannot be the case when we witness the type of incident of yesterday, and to a lesser degree in other times of debate during this session and others past. The fact is, Sir, that we have, the Leader of the Opposition has said that certain remarks were made to him and he made certain remarks to the Member from St. George's. Sir, the fact is that both gentlemen were wrong and that is why the motion dealing with both gentlemen is before the House.

No one is saying that the honourable Member for St. George's was right, but equally no one is saying that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition was any more right because he happened to be Leader of

the Opposition. The fact is that he did call the Member from St. George's a drunken sot. The fact is that the Member from St. George's did refer in derogatory terms to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, it is fairly obvious that the innuendo and snide remarks that we have heard for so long in this House are very easily corrected when someone gets up and says, I withdraw those remarks or I apologize, How convenient is it after you have made the remarks! Now we have had a great deal of that in this House, Sir, by members on both sides, but particularly, if I may say, by the Leader of the Opposition.

Sir, the Leader of the Opposition said the remarks made yesterday was in the heat of debate. That I will say may have been the case yesterday but the reference to the Member for St. George's regarding drunkenness, regarding acting inebriated and words to that effect have been said in this House for several weeks before yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, equally the Leader of the Opposition got up today and said the reason he misunderstood this fact was because friends of his, doctors whom he has obviously been in touch with, said this was the problem with the medication that the Member for St. George's was receiving, if I got that right.

MR. ROBERTS: May have been receiving.

MR. MOORES: May have been receiving, The fact is that one is making a judgement on the man's conduct because he may be receiving medication. The fact is, Sir, the Member for St. George's is not receiving medication. To make even that sort of innuendo, in my opinion, is cruel, particularly because it happens to be false.

Mr. Speaker, what brought on this fracas yesterday? What is it really we are talking about? Constant abuse to an unbelievable degree by the Leader of the Opposition to a man who has had, I should say, a problem.

The Member for St. George's, and I will be brutally honest now and I have talked to him about this or I will admit I would not have guts

enough to stand in this House and say it, the Member for St. George's, as many people know, had for some years an alcoholic problem, with all that that entails. There are not many Newfoundlanders who do not understand what that means. In fact there are very few families who have not had intimate knowledge of this problem at some time in their careers in this Province. All of them know how difficult the problem can be and even more, Mr. Speaker, how much more difficult it is to overcome that problem.

The Member for St. George's has made a magnificent, courageous effort, in my opinion, to rehabilitate himself after a difficult time. He has, through yeoman effort, overcome this illness and has in fact not taken a drink, to my knowledge or to anyone else's, for some over thirteen months. He is, through this effort, a credit as far as I am concerned to himself, his family and his Province.

The Leader of the Opposition claims that he was not aware of this problem. The fact was on the argument he referred to on the steps last week, where the Member for St. George's was indeed making very aggressive remarks to the Leader of the Opposition in a very heated debate, he mentioned to the Leader of the Opposition in my presence, not to accuse him of being drunk again, not to accuse him of alcoholism again, and in my opinion, Sir, made it very clear as to the reason why he was so upset and in the condition he was at that time.

MR. ROBERTS: He used no words to indicate he had not been drinking.

MR. MOORES: He used no words to indicate he had not been drinking, Mr. Speaker, for the simple reason he had not. One does not go around after having a drink saying I am drunk and one does not go around without having one saying I have not had one. The fact was he was referring to a specific sensitivity that it was totally normal for a man to have after the battle that that man had gone through for some several years, and had conquered and did not want to be maligned and almost crucified by innuendo on a subject that to him was a very difficult, and understandably difficult situation.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, the attack on that man on that subject had to be one of the most cruel, inhuman, nastiest and vicious attacks in the history of this House of Assembly. And yesterday the character

assassination went on. Most of the insults came after the House as we know, had adjourned or here on the floor of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not all of them.

MR. MOORES: And it is most regrettable, but as the member says not all of them, and the transcripts are there for anyone to read. So as I have said before I feel very badly at this time, I feel very badly for the Leader of the Opposition, because I am sure if he had stopped to realize he would not have made remarks and have brought about this particular result.

I feel very badly for the Member for St. George's, who in effect got up today and apologized, which he must have found difficult, knowing he was wrong, but also a man who has gone through a trying time that, I suppose, most of us will never realize never having experienced the problem itself.

I, Sir, feel very strongly that this House, as soon as possible come back to the world of reality and start acting in the decency for which we were elected to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, before you call the questions, just two or three things I would like to say on the matter. I certainly agree with previous speakers that it is a sad day and it is a regrettable set of events that we have to reflect on this afternoon.

It is my personal opinion, although the motion has already been passed and therefore cannot debate it directly, it is my personal opinion that the House has done the right thing in suspending the Member for St. George's. The business of attacking somebody physically is certainly perhaps one of the more serious, perhaps the most serious thing that can happen in this House, and certainly the House has got to protect itself against members who would do that kind of thing. I did not vote for the motion. I just abstained for other reasons which I hope to get into in a minute.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier in his remarks has zeroed in on the role that the Leader of the Opposition played in this matter. I think in fairness I ought to put the thing in some perspective in a way that perhaps the Leader of the Opposition could not because he would be talking about himself on the matter. From

where I sit, and I sit almost the person farthest removed from the member for St. George's in the House, I feel that the member for St. George's has been on a collision course for a long time on this matter. It is only a question of whether the thing culminated yesterday or today or tomorrow or some day soon. When I have been speaking, Mr. Speaker, I have been called a number of things by that particular member. I do not think I particularly taunted him. I know on one occasion I rose and drew it to Mr. Speaker's attention, not the present occupant of the Chair but the Deputy Speaker,-

MR. BARRY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not see the relevance of any objections the Hon. Member for Hermitage has to remarks made by the member for St. George's or any other honourable member.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: When I finish my point of order.

We are dealing with, Mr. Speaker, a specific motion here. If the honourable member had any breaches of privileges with respect to him or to the House he wished to raise in the past that could have been done. But it is not relevant for the honourable member to start cracking out the history of every taunt or insult that he has received in this House from the member for St. George's or any other honourable member.

MR. SIMMONS: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I quite agree, and I think the member for Placentia West was somewhat anticipating what I was about to say. I believe what we are discussing, if I understand it correctly, is the motion to suspend the Leader of the Opposition, and I was getting into some items, I think, that are pretty pertinent to that subject, and I would submit that I should be allowed to continue.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The rule of relevancy is a rather difficult one

for any Chair, I suppose, to rule on. However, the Chair certainly feels as well that any incidents of provocation or remarks exchanged back and forth between the Hon. Member for Hermitage and the Hon. Member for St. George's with regards to me or any other person occupying this Chair are not relevant to the incident that took place here yesterday between the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the member for St. George's.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think both Mr. Speaker and the member for Placentia West were anticipating me, because what I have to say, I think, is very relevant. I think it brings home the significance of what happened here yesterday. And I would like to continue for a minute with the promise that I relate it to show the relevance of it to the point I am pursuing, the motion before the Chair. I say that the member was on a collision course. At one point in time he referred to me as an S.O.B., although he used the full words. And, Mr. Speaker, I submit -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

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

The Chair has made a ruling in essence that the Hon. Member for Hermitage was being irrelevant in referring to any other examples of things that may have happened to have taken place between he and the Hon. Member for St. George's. And the Chair will certainly not permit any member to be that irrelevant from this particular motion.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I understand also, and I am attempting, Mr. Speaker, I will not assign motives but I am getting a little suspicious as to why everybody is so anxious to get me so relevant all of a sudden. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is very relevant to what has happened yesterday and the motion before the Chair now that it be known,

that it be known, Mr. Speaker, in reference to the Leader of the Opposition and the motion to suspend him that only yesterday in the elevator a gentleman quoted to me privately last evening that the member for St. George's had threatened to get the member for White Bay North.

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

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

MR. BARRY: What is this hearsay that the honourable member is going on with.

MR. SIMMONS: It is not hearsay. Ah, so you are afraid.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The motion presently before the House deals with a matter that occurred within the precincts of this Legislature yesterday. And some reference was made by both the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. the Premier but it certainly was related to events between the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the member for St. George's which led up to something yesterday evening. Now any comments that may have been made on the elevator to the Hon. Member for Hermitage, the Chair again fails to see the relevancy of that particular thing to this motion.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, let me go at it another way. The member for Placentia West is obviously anxious that certain items not come out here so I will cater to him to some degree.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. I am attempting, Mr. Speaker, as the acting to the acting assistant House Leader to keep some control on the proceedings of this House, Mr. Speaker, and it is clearly one rule of this House that honourable members be relevant particularly on a serious matter like this. Another rule, Mr. Speaker, is that there are certain, if not rules of evidence, certain

rules of decency that be applied, and it is not decent or fair for an honourable member to come in here and start quoting uncorroborated remarks made by a third party with respect to any honourable member of this House. And finally, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that it is not relevant nor will it serve any purpose for the Hon. Member for Hermitage or any other honourable member to get up here and start listing the abuse that has gone back and forth in this honourable House that is not relevant to this matter, and it is time that that was set behind us. And I would ask the Hon. Member for Hermitage to come to the point of this motion.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. It seems I am having some difficulty demonstrating to the member for Placentia West that I am relevant. I am not particularly anxious to do it as long as I can demonstrate it to the Chair. I believe we are talking about the advisability or otherwise of suspending the Leader of the Opposition for two days. And I am, in very broken fashion because I get interrupted so often, trying to connect up a line of thought, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, if I were allowed to continue for a moment, I would demonstrate that it is very relevant to the whole question whether the Leader of the Opposition should be suspended or not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY: Is that a point of order?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would point out where this is leading, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMONS: Just let me.

MR. BARRY: - where it might -

MR. SIMMONS: Just let me.

MR. BARRY: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not proper for an honourable member under the guise of eventually after some time getting to a relevant point it is not proper in the interim for the honourable member to continue with either irrelevant or improper statements in

this House. Now if the honourable member has a point that is relevant that this is leading up to, I submit, that Your Honour should ask him to make it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair perhaps will be the person who will decide what comments are relevant or not relevant to any particular motion before the House. The Chair has ruled on about three occasions now that certain things being said by the Hon. Member for Hermitage were not relevant to this particular motion. Now the Chair is willing in essence to let the Hon. Member for Hermitage be very precise as to what his relationship is between the events that took place on the elevator, and the motion presently before the House. If not the Chair will have to recognize another member.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am not anxious to read into the record events that took place outside this Chamber. My overall purpose here is to demonstrate that the Leader of the Opposition I believe showed undue, not undue, but surprising restraint in the face of what he had to put up with yesterday afternoon. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that for that reason there is no rationale that says that he ought to be given the same kind of penalty for saying certain things in the heat of debate, for which he has apologized, Mr. Speaker, or else the word goes out that you get the same here, the same penalty for poking a guy as you do for saying some nasty things that you are sorry for saying after. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that that is fair. I do not think it is fair in anyway whatsoever, and I was attempting to lay out some evidence to show that the Leader of the Opposition was being provoked unduly, was being provoked with some premeditation, that the whole thing had been planned before hand. That is my point, Mr. Speaker. You do not have to agree with it. Nobody in this House has to agree with it. I happen to know, and I was using myself as the example rather than quote a third party, that I happen to know that the member for St. George's has a reputation in my mind for being fairly provocative on the matter. And I say that

in the circumstances the Leader of the Opposition, while as he admits said some things in the heat of debate that he would normally not say, even allowing that, Mr. Speaker, admitting to that, recognizing that, I say that he showed restraint yesterday in the face of the situation that confronted him. He showed particular constraint. And I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that the House is being fair. I do not believe that the Government Acting House Leader is being fair in bringing in the same kind of motion to deal with both situations. They are two very different situations. And to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is the same offense is first of all to fly in the face of the tradition of this House where no matter how easily the Premier dismisses it the fact of the matter is that it is known, and I have been involved in it myself and other members have where if you say something that is improper or unparliamentary or nasty or whatever in the heat of debate, then you are given the opportunity to withdraw and then after that if the House or Mr. Speaker feels that a reprimand is in order, well, the rules of the House provide for it. But to suggest,

Mr. Speaker, to suggest that the penalty for saying things in the heat of debate should be equally serious as for physically assaulting someone, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time that the government acting House Leader and the Premier do what the Member for Placentia West just appealed to me to do, to get above politics on this particular one and to recognize that is not a question now of who looks best, publicly when it is all over, in political terms. It is a question of whether we are going to preserve the dignity and the traditions of this House or not. Let us call a spade a spade, Mr. Speaker. Sure there were two unsavory incidents here yesterday. One was that the Leader of the Opposition - there were three, if you like - one was that the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for St. George's called each other some names. I do not think that either gentleman should be particularly proud for same. That is one set of incidents. They ought to be dealt with. I would suggest that they ought to be dealt with in the same manner that the incidents are normally dealt with.

Now, the Premier says that innuendo once unloaded on the House is very easy to withdraw after. I do not think any particular member deliberately indulges in nasty innuendo. I know it does not, it should not sit very well with him. He has still got to live with what he has said himself whether he withdraws it or what. Mr. Speaker, on that particular subject if we had all the words that we have muttered under our breath, not particularly for the Hansard record, that I have said and the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier and the Member for St. George's and the others, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that from where I sit - I have said some nasty things in my time, too, but I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier in many respects would either come in first or a close second with some of the things he has said and for which he is really anxious and he is willing to withdraw after.

So, if we are going to start imposing penalties, Mr. Speaker, for every nasty word that is said in this House we will spend all our time discussing motions like this. But, I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the incident that we are now discussing, the words that were

said in haste by my colleague from White Bay North is a far different set of circumstances altogether than the one we have just dealt with in the previous motion. I would say, Mr. Speaker, to the acting House Leader for the government and to the Premier that it is an insult to this House to suggest that these two separate sets of incidents, far different in their degree of seriousness, it is an insult to this House, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that they ought to be dealt with in the selfsame manner and with the selfsame penalty. I say, Mr. Speaker, that in that context it is evident to me that the government has elected to shirk its responsibility to preserve the dignity of this House and has decided to play politics with this sad affair. I find that despicable, Mr. Speaker, completely despicable. This matter would have been much more easily and in a more gentlemanly way taken care of by all concerned if the government House Leader, acting House Leader, had done what was obviously normal under those circumstances, introduced a motion which would have provided a penalty for the member who had committed a very serious breach of the rules of the House in that he had physically attacked another member, at the same time if they felt a reprimand or some other means of bringing the matter to the Leader of the Opposition's attention were in order, well, of course, do that as well.

But, to come in and suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the two sets of circumstances are equal in their seriousness and therefore equally punishable is not an effort to preserve the dignity of this House, Mr. Speaker. It is an effort to play the worst kind of politics with it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down just allow me to say a word about the matter that the Premier raised. I trust that it will be considered relevant. I have to. It is not playing party games here or anything of that nature. I think my colleague from St. Barbe North will agree with me on this. I learned yesterday - we have discussed this matter, as you can anticipate, Mr. Speaker, we discussed this matter after six. I learned yesterday from my colleague from St. Barbe North who has had some association with the Member for St.

George's, I believe, at a conference in the last few months, I learned from him for the first time, Mr. Speaker, about the matter that the Premier got into some discussion of, the alcoholism problem. I learned it for the first time about quarter after six.

I cannot vouch that the Leader of the Opposition learned it for the first time then, but he was part of the conversation. It was my impression that he learned it for the first time then. Whether he did that is for him to say. He is a man and he can speak for himself. But, I had the impression he did. I know I did for the first time. I will also say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not know what the cause was. It is not for me to stand here and diagnose what the cause was but I can tell you the result, Mr. Speaker. I can tell you what I observed. I can tell you that I have made comments to my colleagues on many occasions that the Member for St. George's for some reason appeared to be somewhat less than rational to me. I wondered as to the reason, as you do on those occasions. Now, as I say, I am not going to go to assign reasons as to what the reasons might have been, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. The honourable Member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: This House may have tolerated this with the honourable Leader of the Opposition when he was speaking to a point of privilege, but I do not think that any member in this House can be allowed to cast reflections on another member. For the honourable Member for Hermitage to get up and say that he did not recognize the problem but the man looked like he had a problem is completely -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: If I may continue, Mr. Speaker - is completely out of order because it casts reflections upon a member. I think that this tack could be well dispensed with by the honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. In case the Member

for St. John's East did not hear me, I said I was not going to diagnose. I did say and it is my observation, and I will say the same thing about the Member for St. John's East if it is pertinent at the time, that I had occasion to observe that the member appeared to be less than rational to me. So much so that I discussed it with my colleagues on occasion. Now, if that is in any way disparaging, Mr. Speaker, well by all means I withdraw it because that is not the purpose I am pursuing here.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

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

The Chair realizes the seriousness and the importance of this particular motion. Even the content of the motion or the referring to the incident that took place yesterday sometimes perhaps from the Chair's viewpoint leaves a very thin line as to what you can rule is relevant and what is not relevant.

However, the honourable Member for Hermitage was very close to casting some serious reflections in his opinion of the honourable Member for St. George's.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In any event, I was about to - I was close to cluing up when I was interrupted by the Member for St. John's East. I was about to say in response to what the Premier had said that I am fully appreciative of the kind of problem that he alluded to and I have not only all kinds of sympathy, sympathy is not enough, I would like to be in a position to facilitate the particular sensitivities of persons who find themselves in the kind of situation that the Premier described. I think, Mr. Speaker, all of us, if we have any degree of compassion in us at all, that situation appeals to us very much. I certainly would not want to be in any way accused, or whether accused or not, I would not want to be in any way contributing to a person's difficulties in a situation like that.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that that kind of circumstance or a recognition of that

kind of circumstance gives that member or any other member any particular license to bully in this House or to physically attack. Mr. Speaker, I submit and I recognize that the Member for St. George's has entered his apologies. Equally, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from White Bay North has entered his apologies. The difference in the two sets of apologies is not in the degree of their sincerity, that is not for me to judge. I submit the difference in the two sets of apologies is that one, the first apologizes for a far more serious set of circumstances than the apology entered by my colleague from White Bay North. For that reason I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is an insult to the House, an insult to the dignity of the House if we continue on this course we are on now of attempting to suspend a member for having said some things in haste which he has since withdrawn and apologized for, and particularly, Mr. Speaker, if we attempt, as this motion obviously does, to equate his remarks said in the heat of debate with the very serious offense committed yesterday afternoon by the Member for St. George's and for which this House has already taken the appropriate steps.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that

the proper thing for the Acting House Leader to do right now is to withdraw this motion, and if he feels that another one ought to be put by way of reprimanding the Leader of the Opposition sobeit. I caution him on that, too, Mr. Speaker, because if he does that he must be prepared equally to submit a similar motion every time I am called a name, or he is called a name, or any other member of this House is called a name. And anybody who sat in these galleries, Mr. Speaker, or in these seats here knows that if this is going to be the case, unless we smarten up around here we are going to have ten or fifteen motions of reprimand every day to take care of the name calling that unfortunately goes on in this Chamber. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Acting House Leader should withdraw this motion and at most should replace it with a motion of reprimand, but rather perhaps no motion at all because, as I say, if he is going to reprimand the Leader of the Opposition for the things he said yesterday, which I do not think he should be particularly proud of, and he said so himself, if he is going to reprimand him for that he better be prepared to introduce a whole string of motions every day this House sits, if what has gone on here this past few months is any indication of what will go on in the future.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bonavista South.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on this motion, and to say it is regrettable that we have to deal with such a motion today in the House of Assembly. But, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the motion to expell the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, for the past four or five sittings of this Assembly I sat here, not taking part too much in the debate, and I saw the worse kind of gutter politics take place in this Assembly, the worse kind of gutter-type politics. When the Hon. Leader of the Opposition fully recognizing, fully realizing, fully knowing what he was doing, he knew what he was doing, Mr. Speaker, and I challenge him to prove otherwise,

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: based on the following evidence.

Mr. Speaker, today we heard the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition state in this Assembly he was not aware of the conditions, of the problems of the honourable gentleman from St. George's. The honourable Member for Hermitage stood in the same debate and said the same thing, he was not aware of the problem, and now he was aware, he had the greatest of sympathy for the honourable gentleman and for his problem.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in that debate in the Assembly, yesterday, this is the recording of Hansard, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and I quote from Hansard, to make it quite clear to all honourable members of this Assembly that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition must be dealt with. He must be dealt with by this Assembly, because he knew what he was doing. He knew what the situation was. He knew what the problem was. And when I sat here and listened to him for the last two or three days baiting, baiting a man with the kind of problem that the honourable Member for St. George's had, Mr. Speaker, that kind of politics is low gutter-type politics. I sat here and watched and listened as the man sat there and cringed in his chair, cringed. Cringed from what, Mr. Speaker? Cringed from the Leader of the Opposition baiting him. Are you drunk honourable member? Are you drunk today? Are you drunk in your seat today? Are you inebriated? Are you? Are you drunk again today? And the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has the nerve to stand in this Assembly today and to say that he was not aware of the honourable gentleman's problems. When yesterday, yesterday, I quote, "Mr. Roberts: I am reading from Hansard, "if I were to believe, Sir, everything that I read about the honourable gentleman he would have been incarcerated, incarcerated at the Waterford Hospital for a number of weeks in 1971 (in 1971 not 1975) in 1971 while he was dealing with Mr. Smallwood. " Mr. Simmons perks in the debate, and he says, "That is not the same fellow." Mr. Roberts, "Yes, that is the same fellow. I am not saying I believe it. I am just saying if I were to believe everything I read about the honourable gentleman from St. George's he was carried, as I recall it, carried

in to town. And there are some interesting recordings around, of tape recordings, of phone conversations in which the honourable gentleman from St. George's figured. He was then making deals wheeling and dealing when he was incarcerated at the Waterford Hospital in 1971." That, Mr. Speaker, is the contents of a statement made yesterday in the House of Assembly by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and today he has the nerve to stand here and to make us believe and the people of this Province to believe he did not know what he was doing. He knew what he was doing the kind of shameful gutter type politics is unbecoming of any honourable gentleman of this House of Assembly, any honourable gentleman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: But to have the Leader of the Opposition doing it.

This House has now dealt with the honourable gentleman for St. George's. Much to my surprise, much to my surprise that the kind of action that we took today was not agreed with, not tolerated by the Opposition, because the House did vote on a motion to expell the honourable Member for St. George's for yesterday's actions for assaulting another honourable gentleman of the House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: The House voted on it. But, Mr. Speaker, I want all honourable gentlemen to make note that the resolution was voted on, the motion was voted on but voted against by the Opposition. And Hansard will prove me correct. The motion today was put to expell the honourable gentleman for assaulting another honourable gentleman in this House of Assembly, but the motion was voted against by all Opposition members.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we can put two and two together. We have expelled one gentleman for assaulting another. But what I saw happening and the kind of action I saw taken during the last few days deserves a greater penalty, a greater penalty because it is not the kind of penalty that we can impose upon that kind of a gentleman who does these things. This House cannot deal with it. None of us can deal with it. How can we? How can we draw conclusions and make decisions on that kind of action, when we saw a politician, knowing

what he was doing, destroying and attempting to destroy, not only the honourable gentleman for St. George's as a politician, but as a man, as a citizen of this Province, castigating him and his family, him and his family in what you were doing, what the honourable gentleman knew he was doing. That, Mr. Speaker, deserves a greater penalty than what this House is going to impose from this present motion before the House of Assembly. It is the kind of action, it is the kind of attitude of a politician, of a potential leader, and in this case, Mr. Speaker, in particular, a man aspiring to become leader of the Province, to do that kind of thing to another honourable gentleman, to do it is unbelievable, is

MR. MORGAN: really unbelievable and I have proven the fact that he knew what he was doing and that, Mr. Speaker, makes an even greater crime, a greater crime.

The honourable gentleman from St. George's has admitted his crime, has admitted his breach of this House of Assembly, the privilege of the House of Assembly. He has admitted that, and he has taken the penalty. Now I call upon the honourable Leader of the Opposition to be a man accordingly and to admit, to admit his most serious breach of the privilege of this Assembly and to accept this penalty accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, in closing my few remarks I sincerely hope in the future that no leader in our Province, no politician, will ever again attempt or try to in any way or form use the human problems of any individual, the human problems of any individual in this Province for political benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely beg of all politicians, of all members in this Assembly in the future, for God's sake to refrain from that kind of low guttersnipe politics. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Is the House read for the question?

MR. ROWE: I would like to speak.

MR. ROBERTS: Let the gentleman speak.

MR. ROWE: Look, this is what I was waiting for, you know (833).

MR. ROBERTS: a government motion.

MR. ROWE: I would yield the floor to Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, like other honourable members on both sides of the House, this is a sad day when we have to consume the time of the House, the people's time and money over this type of an issue and I would request, Sir, that somebody deliver me a copy of the motion so that I can have a look at it.

Sir, I think that one of the first things that we have to straighten out in considering the second part of this motion that has been divided by Your Honour is that whatever was said by the Leader of the Opposition,

and it is for honourable members and the public at large to judge whether or not my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, was hitting or hitting below or above the belt. But, Sir, I think it is very important to point out that Your Honour, or any person who is sitting in the position of the Speaker, during any speeches that my colleague made, the Leader of the Opposition, no Speaker, whether it be the Speaker of the House or the Deputy Speaker or the Assistant Deputy Speaker, brought the Leader of the Opposition to order or asked for an apology because of the words that he uttered during the proceedings of this House.

Sir, today we have a motion here, without this being so, we have a motion asking for the suspension of the Leader of the Opposition, the same penalty imposed on the Leader of the Opposition, exactly the same penalty as has been imposed on the Member for St. George's, Sir, and it just does not jive.

The honourable the Member for St. George's left his seat and physically attacked the Leader of the Opposition and the rules of Parliament are quite clear on that particular issue. However, the same penalty is being imposed upon the, being asked of the House anyway, in the second part of this motion, the same penalty is being imposed upon the Leader of the Opposition for words that he uttered for which he was not asked to apologize for by the Chair.

AN HON. MEMBER: Irrelevant, Sir.

MR. ROWE: Sir, I think that is very significant. It is only one of two things that we can assume here, one that the words uttered by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition were not that serious or, Sir, with all due respect the Chair was at fault in not bringing the honourable the Leader of the Opposition to order during these so called innuendoes and snide remarks, Sir, because honourable members opposite have addressed themselves not to the words of this motion, Sir, which came after the Speaker had left his Chair, but Sir, honourable members opposite have addressed themselves to words uttered by the Leader of the Opposition over the past few days, weeks and months. I think that is very important, Sir.

My colleague, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition has apologized, when he was finally able to, for uttering the words that he had uttered after the Speaker had left the Chair. But, Sir, he has been subjected to a vicious political attack so far by the honourable the Premier and so far by the honourable the Member for Bonavista South, has been subjected to a political attack for words that he used for which he was not brought to order. And Sir, there is a world of difference. There is a world of difference.

Sir, it is unprecedented that a member of this House should be dealt the same penalty, for the want of a better expression, provocation on the part of my colleague in the heat of debate. He has been dealt the same penalty as was dealt to a member who physically assaulted my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition. Sir, it just does not jive. It does not make sense. One thing that we have got to realize, Sir, in this honourable House, is that politics is a pretty tough game. Politicians are accused of everything under the sun by the general public and debate becomes pretty heavy and hot in this Assembly, Sir, and in the heat of debate certain things are said.

And, Sir, about the only thing that I can say with respect to the Member for St. George's, Sir, is if he cannot stand the heat he should just get out of the kitchen. It is as simple as that. This is a very demanding, Sir, a very demanding job.

MR. BARRY: Is that the sort of debate...(Inaudible).

MR. ROWE: Yes, Sir, the honourable minister will have his opportunity to speak after I sit down if he wishes to do so. But the fact of the matter is that we are elected to office, we are subjected to some very strenuous pressures within this Assembly because of our constituents and because of the problems that we face in this Province today, whether you are in Opposition or in government. And, Sir, if you cannot stand the pressure, no matter what the reason, you have no - you should not be involved at all. It is as simple as that. If you cannot field, or you cannot handle the financial pressure, you do as the honourable Member for Labrador South did. If you cannot stand the psychological pressures, Sir, you do the same thing as my honourable, my colleague from Labrador

South did although he did it for financial reasons. But you are elected to a position of responsibility and it involves pressure. And if you cannot stand it, as the quote I used, if you cannot stand the heat you simply have to get out of the kitchen. It is as simple as that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Now my colleague has apologized, sincerely apologized for what he said after the Speaker had left the Chair. Now that is one thing, that is one thing, Now let us get back to what my colleague is alleged to have said during the last few days, few weeks and as indicated by some honourable members, for the past few months.

Sir, I take issue with both the honourable the Premier and the Member for Bonavista South. They have both accused the Leader of the Opposition of innuendo and snide remarks. Now, Sir, that may or may not be so. Personally I do not believe that the Leader of the Opposition is any more guilty of innuendo or snide remarks than some other honourable members in this House under the heat of debate. But, Sir, the cruelest thing of all was to hear the Member for Bonavista South stand in his place and use such expressions as the following: The Leader of the Opposition is using gutter politics and has used gutter politics knowing full well what he was doing. He was destroying the member for -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: I will come back to that.

He is or was destroying the Member for St. George's knowing full well what he was doing, castigating him and his family, direct quotes. Cruel - the Leader of the Opposition was being cruel. The Leader of the Opposition was using innuendo and snide remarks and the poor Member for St. George's was cringing in his seat over every remark from the Leader of the Opposition.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: These, Sir, these quotes the honourable Member for Bonavista South attributes to a potential leader of this Province, using human problems of individuals with these human problems.

Now, Sir, the proof is in the pudding. Two things should be pointed out. To my knowledge the Leader of the Opposition had no knowledge whatsoever of the circumstance of the Member for St. George's. Now, what do I mean by that? I have to explain this. I think the record speaks for itself. I hate to bring it up but the government has seen fit to play this strategy whereby we debate the issue with reference to my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition. But we did not debate the part of the motion with reference to the Member for St. George's. Sir, the Member of the Opposition has been accused of making these statements knowing full well what he was doing. Sir, that is completely and utterly false.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: It is completely and utterly false. Sir, the record speaks for itself. I sympathize with the Member for St. George's. The honourable member, as do many members and many people in this Province and in this country, has or had an alcoholic problem as indicated by the honourable the Premier. Sir, the events of 1971 were written into the records of the daily newspapers of this Province.

MR. SIMMONS: By whom?

MR. F. ROWE: Not by the Leader of the Opposition. Not by any politician. By staff writers and in one particular instance, Sir, by the honourable the member himself.

MR. SIMMONS: What member? What member?

MR. F. ROWE: The honourable Member for St. George's in an interview with The Telegram. I can remember it very clearly. It was a pathetic thing, Sir, and I felt sorry for the honourable member at that time. But, Sir, it is his problem.

My colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, was completely and totally unaware of the fact that my dear friend, my friend from St. George's has been agonizing over the past thirteen months trying to kick the habit and I give him full credit for that.

MR. MORGAN: That is fine too. He has kicked it.

MR. F. ROWE: Okay, he has kicked it. Now, he has kicked it. Congratulations. I can imagine the pain and the agony that the honourable member went through over that. Sir, I congratulate the honourable member if he has kicked it. I congratulate him and all of my honourable colleagues congratulate him and give him great credit for what he has done. But, let the record stand, Sir, it was not any member on this side who brought this particular issue up to day. It was the honourable the Premier who brought this out into the public, what the situation was.

Now, Sir, let us go one step further. We have had situations in this House were honourable members opposite in my opinion and probably some honourable members on this side in honourable members' opinion on the other side of the House were acting somewhat peculiarly. Whether they were not thinking straight or whether they were overtired or they were on tranquilizers or whether they had too much to drink

is irrelevant. The fact of the matter is there have been examples in this House where honourable members have acted as if they were not themselves, their normal selves.

Such was the case, Sir, that brought about the situation that we had yesterday. Such was the case. In the opinion of my colleague the honourable Member for St. George's was behaving in a fashion not becoming of a member of this House of Assembly. In my opinion he was. Now, my colleague advanced the reason why he thought this was so. And since all of a sudden honourable members opposite have explained the reason and my colleague has learned of the situation, my colleague has apologized. However, Sir, it should also be pointed out that the honourable Member for St. George's was given a position of heavy and high responsibility in this honourable House. He presides over the Committee and he is Assistant Deputy Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: Deputy Chairman.

MR. F. ROWE: Chairman of Committees -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, but Deputy Chairman.

MR. F. ROWE: Deputy Chairman of Committees and assistant Deputy Speaker, a position, Sir, that is as unnerving a position as I can think of in this House when you look at us going at each other from time to time.

Sir, if the honourable Member for St. George's was wrestling with a personal problem one asks this question: Why did the honourable the Premier appoint him to that particular position that requires nerves of iron and, secondly, why did not some honourable members who all of a sudden today and yesterday are concerned over the cruelty the so called or alleged cruelty of my colleague from White Bay North, if they were so concerned over the innuendo and so called snide remarks uttered by my colleague from White Bay North over the past few weeks, why did not some honourable member opposite have the decency and the courage to come over and in the privacy of an office indicate to the honourable the Leader of the Opposition what damage he was doing, if indeed he was doing any damage?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He knew what he was doing.

MR. F. ROWE: The honourable member did not know. And now I know -

MR. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Okay. I know exactly what the honourable minister is going to say -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, gentlemen!

MR. F. ROWE: I am not finished, gentlemen.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The precedent has been set where honourable members are left to their own devices, they occasionally will degenerate into other than vocal activity. I will be interrupting all honourable members at the first opportunity this afternoon. I suggest that the honourable member has the right to be heard in silence. If honourable members have a point of order, they may rise on that, but not to interfere with the honourable member's right to speak.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am in a most peculiar situation for two reasons. I had the honour of spending ten days, I believe it was, in Toronto last Summer with Your Honour and the Member for St. George's and several other honourable members opposite at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference. And I can state quite categorically here and now that the Member for St. George's, and believe me there was enough of it around, did not take to my knowledge a single sip of alcoholic beverages. What he did before then and what he has done since I have no knowledge. Now if honourable members opposite are going to stand up and use private conversations such as informing me, coming over here in the middle of a debate and saying, you know, that Roberts there, boy, this is digging pretty, you know, pretty low. You know what the story is on Alex, you know, and this sort of a thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: You know, and mumblings here - as if I am suppose to be the carrier pigeon between the government and the Leader of the Opposition. Look, I say, Mr. Speaker, if the problem was as serious as they suggest surely it is incumbent upon the honourable members opposite to inform formally and privately the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition, of what damage he is allegedly doing. But, Sir, I think, this is the cruelest day of all when we see honourable members opposite using the very personal physiological and psychological problems of one of their own members, one of their own colleagues, one of their own kind to try and discredit the Leader of the Opposition -

MR. BARRY: On a point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: - because, Sir, this is exactly what is happening.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member opposite is directly questioning the motives of honourable members on this side of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are damn right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not question -

MR. BARRY: He is - somehow it is unbelievable to me, but he is turning around - the submission is that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition

has used this problem, this alcoholic problem of the Member for St. George's. And now he has turned around -

MR. PECKFORD: Oh, Mr. Speaker -

MR. F. ROWE: There you go.

MR. BARRY: - but now he has turned around, Mr. Speaker,

MR. F. ROWE: What is the point of order? He is making accusations.

MR. BARRY: to members of this side of the House attempting to protect the honourable member, a member of this House, and the privileges of this House, he is turning that around and alleging that honourable members opposite are doing this merely to launch a political attack on the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, that is out of order as impugning the motives of honourable members on this side of the House.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order this is precisely what honourable members have been accusing the Leader of the Opposition of doing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on this motion. If I am not allowed, Mr. Speaker, to accuse in reverse -

MR. SIMMONS: Speak your opinion.

MR. F. ROWE: - there are obviously two different rules for each side of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: It is as simple as that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh!

MR. F. ROWE: And I am saying, Mr. Speaker, to that point of order -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Are you speaking to this point of order?

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, I am speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I am saying based on the quotations particularly of the Member for Bonavista South, when he uses these, such phrases, cruel, castigating him and his family, and then saying these are the actions of a potential political leader in this Province, linking that up with what we can expect of a political leader in this Province. What

is one suppose to assume from that if it is not motivations, an attack upon a potential leader of this Province? So I submit, Sir, that I am doing precisely the same, but they cannot stand it. As honourable members opposite have seen fit, I am now attacking, if you will, the statements, not the members, the statements of two honourable members opposite, namely, the Premier and the Member for Bonavista South as they have seen fit to attack statements and the Leader of the Opposition. You cannot have it both ways.

MR. BARRY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, just briefly to -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG) Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - that point of order, if I might -

MR. F. ROWE: You cannot have it one way.

MR. SIMMONS: You cannot use quotes 'Leo'.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The Chair is not going to entertain continuous debate on the point of order, so that the point of order in fact becomes the debate. I have heard sufficient on this point. And I believe it is a difference of opinion between two honourable members. The question of motives or whatever is again a question of interpretation and one honourable member may interpret it a different way from another. The Member for St. Barbe North may be irrelevant, although I have listened very carefully to him and I see the thread of relevancy throughout his debate and I have not chosen to interrupt him. And I believe that he is counteracting arguments, or attempting to counteract arguments that were offered by honourable members to my left and I see nothing wrong with that.

MR. BARRY: To a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. A matter of privilege arising from the honourable member's remarks, and maybe it was because it was brought up on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that it is not clear. The point is, is that, -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: To a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): While we are - it is a moot point perhaps, but we are debating a matter of privilege at the present time, and

while the Chair does not really want to anticipate the honourable gentleman's tactics, I suggest to the honourable gentleman to my left the Chair has just ruled on a point of order raised by the honourable gentleman. The method of challenging the Speaker's ruling is known. And if a point of privilege was the point at issue it should have been raised in the first instance, not as a point of order. And we do have a matter of privilege before the House at the present time. I suppose one matter of privilege could supercede another. I am in a bit of a quandary. But I will hear the honourable gentleman then I will decide whether he has got a point of privilege, order, or what.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to belabour it. Mr. Speaker, I only rise because I see a serious problem arising here. The point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is that if the honourable member has any - and he said this is the method of approach he intends to take - if he has or had any challenges to any statements made by the Member for Bonavista North, the Premier or anybody else then was the time to make them. He also said that because there is a motion here, there is a motion here dealing with the motives of the Leader of the Opposition, that is what it deals with indirectly, that therefore he is entitled in turn to challenge, question the motives of members of this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, just briefly I would submit that the proper procedure, is the procedure that is used here that the honourable member cannot question the motives of anyone in this honourable House unless he is prepared to put forth a motion and set out a remedy, and this I can refer you to, to paragraph 1, 13 I believe it is, Mr. Speaker, in Beausheue.

MR. F. ROWE: To that point of privilege - it is the same thing as he brought up in his point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: (STAGG): Order, please! If I may dispose of this before it blossoms into something else. I see nothing further - I see nothing in the honourable gentleman's remarks that would change my opinion of the previous ruling. And I thank him for the information derived from it. However, I think, we can now proceed to the original debate.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you very much for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Sir, the point that I was making, and I am deadly and I am as sincere as I can be about this, is that, in my opinion, because of the fact that we have now been forced into a long debate on the motion with respect to the Leader of the Opposition, and because two honourable members have already spoken, and they have seen fit to attack, politically attack the Leader of the Opposition, I am saying, as honourable members have used the word opposite, if there is any cruelty in this whatsoever it is what we have witnessed from the Hon. the Premier. I am not assigning motives. I am saying quite clearly that if there is any cruelty

has been shown, it has been demonstrated by the Hon. Premier and the member for Bonavista South when they have taken this very sad circumstance, and they have unveiled the personal problems of one of their own colleagues to become involved in a debate in order to try and discredit the Leader of the Opposition in the eyes of this Chamber and in the eyes of this Province. Sir, I think that that is the cruelest thing that I have witnessed in this House to this date, not anything that my honourable colleague, the Leader of the Opposition has said. Because I state for the record once again, and I will repeat it 101 times if necessary until it gets across, that my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition did not know the circumstances surrounding the events of the last thirteen months of the Hon. Member for St. George's life. He simply did not know.

And further, certain rulings were made and certain utterances were made by not only the Hon. Member for St. George's that one would question the fitness, for the want of a better expression, of a person in this House, and the question was asked, you know, you could ask, Mr. Speaker, if an honourable member opposite said something very strange one might logically ask the question, have you blown your top? Have you gone berserk? Have you got a nervous breakdown? Are you drunk? Are you on pot? Are you on LSD or what? How come you are acting like that? It is as simple as that.

But, Sir, the member for Bonavista South gets up and quotes from Hansard:

"Mr. Roberts: If I were to believe, Sir, everything I read about the honourable gentleman, he would have been incarcerated to the Waterford Hospital for a number of weeks in 1971 while he was dealing with Mr. Smallwood."

Sir, this is not something dreamed up by the Hon. Member for White Bay North. This is not something dreamed up. This is in the printed record of this Province. It is in the printed record. It is not a falsehood, it is not a lie, it is not imagination, it is not fantasy, because the Hon. Member for White Bay North stated that, "if I could believe

everything that I have read," everything that I have read.' Sir, these Chambers, if you do not mind my saying so, they are a little public than the newspapers of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: The member was not using it. My colleague from White Bay North was being provoked at that very time by the member for St. George's. This is something that honourable members opposite forget. It was not as if my colleague from White Bay North got up and launched into a vicious attack on the member for St. George's. My colleague in fact was trying to point out some of the problems of his district. And he was being provoked, and he was being interrupted very rudely by the member for St. George's. Let us not forget that minor little detail that members opposite see convenient to forget. So let us not have any more of this foolishness about innuendo, cruelty, castigating his family. Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of meeting the wife of the Hon. Member for St. George's. We spent some time together during this conference. A good wife, Sir, and a good husband as far as I can see. He has licked a problem. It would have been much better, Sir, if honourable members opposite had to just come across to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition if they felt that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was injuring the health or damaging the health or jeopardizing the state of health of the member for St. George's. Surely God, Sir, with a medical doctor sitting in their own ranks, out of a cabinet, the leaders of this country, somebody would have had the good sense to simply come across the floor and explain the situation to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, but no, Sir, that was not to be the case. They let it continue, Sir, and let it continue, and let it continue and let it continue. And they now say that my colleague has driven the Hon. Member for St. George's to the actions that he took yesterday, and for that he was cruel indeed. Sir, I submit, that this was the cruelest blow of all when they sacrificed and jeopardized the condition and health

of one of their own members to lash out at the Leader of the Opposition. That is the only thing I have seen to this point, Sir, the only thing that I have seen from honourable members opposite, and I am here now to the best of my ability, not a lawyer, not an experienced politician, since my honourable colleague, the Leader of the Opposition has spoken to the motion, attempting to rebut the curious and peculiar and partisan and politically motivated arguments of the two honourable members who have spoken to this date.

Sir, it is too bad that this part of the motion was not dealt with in the same way that the first part of the motion was with one notable exception, Sir, one notable exception. The actions of one, the Hon. Member for St. George's is clear in the books. It is a breach of the privilege of the House to walk across, as my friend from St. John's East well knows, he was the victim of a physical attack at one stage of the game and the appropriate action was taken against the then member for Green Bay. But, Sir, my colleague stands accused of using words that have been unparliamentary. He stands accused of allegedly jeopardizing the condition of the member for St. George's and for that he is being given the same sentence as the member for St. George's who physically assaulted and could have done bodily harm.

Honourable members opposite, Sir, one might argue this, that bodily harm is no worse than psychological harm. Again the bodily harm aspect was a split action manoeuvre, a moment of passion. The member jumped out of his seat. It is pretty hard to catch two members in flight, Sir. But members opposite had weeks and they had months, and these are the members, Sir, who we are talking about the damage that is being done to this man's family and this man's personality and reputation and his whole psychological make-up. Members opposite are the ones who are accusing the Leader of the Opposition, of doing damage in that respect. This supposedly, Sir, has been going on for weeks and months, so we hear. So, Sir, I return once again. I know I

May 6, 1975

Tape no. 2064

Page 4 - mw

am repeating myself. I ask the question: Should not have one of these responsible members, who are leading this country, come across and advised the Leader of the Opposition and/or the caucus in private?

And this whole thing would have been over and done with. Now, Sir, I intend to vote against this motion because I think it is quite unfair. It is quite unfair to the Leader of the Opposition for a number of reasons. It is the same sentence for a less serious so-called breach of the privileges of the House. Secondly, my colleague did not know the circumstances and - he did not know the circumstances and honourable members opposite can stand up and talk until they go blue in the face. My colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, and I challenge any members opposite to get up, to get up and say that they have brought this matter to the attention of the Leader of the Opposition. I -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Did you read the papers -

MR. ROWE: That is not the point. That is not the point. Listen, the honourable Member for St. Georges said that he has not been drunk in this House. I take him for his word, nor should he be drunk in this House. Any guy who comes into this House drunk, any honourable member who comes in this House drunk should stand accused of being a drunken sot. He does not have any business to be carrying out the duties of this country and making the law of this Province by being in a drunken state. It is as simple as that.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: Well, that is a matter of opinion between two different members.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: Now, I will state once again that the honourable gentlemen opposite have made an accusation and it is incumbent upon them to supply the proof. They have accused my colleague of willingly and knowingly doing what he supposedly had done, whatever that is. If such is the case, I challenge honourable members opposite to supply the proof. Are we supposed to hear every rumor that is on the go? Is the honourable Leader of the Opposition supposed to be following the thirty-three

honourable members opposite around in the dead of night to see what they are drinking, they are smoking and their sexual habits are so they will not be offended in the House? Is that what the job of the Leader of the Opposition is, to keep a personal prospectus, is it?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes.

MR. ROWE: - On members opposite so that they will not be offended, so that their families will not be hurt.

MR. BARRY: He should not be using that sort of thing -

MR. SIMMONS: He was not using it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: He was not using it, Mr. Speaker. The only time my colleague from White Bay North used any of the language that has been attributed to him has been as a result of provocation from the honourable Member for St. Georges.

MR. SIMMONS: Right.

MR. ROWE: It is as simple as that.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right.

MR. ROWE: And I defy honourable members opposite to research Hansard and bring up one single example of where my colleague cast an aspersion or an innuendo or a snide remark on any member opposite without having being provoked, because, Sir, I am telling you one thing now - the member can point at that all he wants to - during this whole discussion the member was continually being provoked and I might also add, Mr. Speaker, this is Hansard or a transcript of what is picked up on this machine here. Now, I might also point out that these machines are on for a speaker who was speaking and there has been one heck of a lot of provocation and words thrown across this House by honourable members opposite and on this side that have not been picked up by that machine because it has not been on when the honourable members saw fit to throw a certain word across the House. So, let us not use this technique.

Sir, it is a most unfair motion to bring into this House, the same sentence for a less serious alleged breach of privilege. My

colleague has been accused falsely of knowingly and willingly destroying the Member for St. Georges, castigating him and his family, being cruel, having the member cringe in his seat, using the human problems of another human being for his own political advantage and then they add, they tie it all up by saying, is this what we can expect of a potential leader of this Province? What can be more politically motivated, Sir?

MR. SIMMONS: Character assassination.

MR. ROWE: Huh?

MR. SIMMONS: It is character assassination, worse than they have accused -

MR. ROWE: Sir, the honourable Member for St. Georges has been made a martyr by his own colleagues in order to get at the Leader of the Opposition, another type of parliamentary gymnastic that we saw coming from the honourable Member for St. John's East on Private Members' Day, a parliamentary maneuver to try - honourable members opposite knew what had to happen to the honourable Member for St. Georges. He had to be suspended for what he had done. So they got together, they got together and said, now how can we best take care of this situation?

MR. SIMMONS: How can we save face?

MR. ROWE: I know what we will do, some brilliant suggestion. We will nail the Leader of the Opposition with the same sentence. That in itself is bad enough for a lesser crime, no crime. No, not even a lesser crime, no crime.

MR. SIMMONS: If it is, they are all criminals.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: They nailed him with the same sentence for doing something that he did not know what he was doing, and he has admitted that and he has apologized for it. Worse still, they have cruelly used one of their own colleagues to attack the Leader of the Opposition. Sir, I am glad to see the Premier back in his seat because I can sincerely say that I was going along with the Premier up to that point. But when the honourable the Premier accused the Leader of the Opposition of innuendo and snide remarks -

MR. SIMMONS: Himself, the master.

MR. ROWE: You know, Sir, I was really disappointed, this coming from the Premier of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Sir, this may be the cruelest one of all. But the simple fact of the matter is that I am very sorry for and very sympathetic towards, I feel very sorry for the family of the Member for St. Georges. I do not know how many kids he has. I know his wife only. I feel extremely sorry for them as a result of all this. But, Sir, this is not a Sunday school picnic. We have got to have men in here who can take the pressure, the financial pressure -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would just like to remind the honourable member he has some three minutes left in which to speak.

MR. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A member, a people who can take the financial, the psychological and every other, and physical pressure that is required of a politician. As the Member for Labrador South says, it is a demeaning job. It is a demeaning job. We are always accused of certain things. You have to be a politician to know what it is really like and it is not what it appears to be on the outside. But I do feel sorry for "Alec". I know him very well. But, Sir, honourable members opposite have availed of this opportunity to carry out a political attack on the Leader of the Opposition which I think is completely unwarranted and I think the motion is unwarranted and I think it is unfair and I will be certainly voting against it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to get into this debate until I heard the way in which it was tending because the last few moments have indicated, the last, the Member for Hermitage and the Member for St. Barbe North, as far as I am concerned, have certainly given a very forceful and dramatic instance that the members in the

Opposition do not realize the enormity of their own actions.

Mr. Speaker, I do not chose to get into, as I was, as I might have otherwise have gotten into this debate with respect to the cupability of the honourable the Leader of the Opposition because the honourable the Leader of the Opposition has submitted his apology to this House and I do not chose to go into it to any great degree any further. But there are two matters that I would like to bring up in connection with the statements that have been made because

one can get very emotional about issues such as this that have arisen. So, I shall try to attack it from another end of the event, in order to try to have reason overcome any emotional that one might feel.

First of all, the main reason why they feel, the members of the Opposition feel that this part of the motion, the suspension of the honourable Leader of the Opposition is unfair is, I suppose, that on the one hand the penalty does not fit the crime, as far as they say, or that the action does not equal the action of the honourable Member for St. Georges. Now, there were two items as far as I saw that were quoted in justification of this. One is related to an instance in which I was involved in some time ago in this House, which was not pushed to any great length but I think it requires an answer. The honourable Leader of the Opposition when he got up pointed about an assault that had occurred in which I was involved when I was in Opposition, for which I was a victim, let us put it that way. He said that no action was taken against the Member for St. John's East at the time but the perpetrator of the incident was suspended for five days. He quite clearly and logically said, nor should there have been.

Now, I do not propose to regurgitate that incident and I do not think it is going to do any good to the edification of this House or to the people involved, some of which are out of politics and some of them are half out of politics, to regurgitate it. But I would draw quite forcibly to the attention of this legislature that there is a very real difference between the two incidents, to myself and the Leader of the Opposition at that time, because the Leader of the Opposition has thought it necessary and certainly it was necessary to render his apology for the statements that he made in this House. Now, how he made them is another - made his apology is another line we could take. But at the time I did not, I did not have to and there was absolutely no need or any necessity for anything that I did at the time to render any apology. There, Mr. Speaker, is a direct difference when one is talking about the difference in the penalties involved, to say that because somebody is struck that they get a penalty

and that the victim must get a penalty to match it because of words said. I said nothing at the time. As I said, I do not propose to regurgitate it. I do not think it does the House or history any good. That incident speaks for itself and there is not point in going into it further.

With respect to the other item, and this was referred to again and again by the Member for Hermitage and the Member for St. Barbe North in their statements, for they said that the penalties were unequal, that all the Leader of the Opposition said, all that the Leader of the Opposition said was to say a few words and the other incident involved a physical assault, so the penalties were really unequal. I would say, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable Leader of the Opposition had not tendered his apologies to this House that certainly the penalties may have been unequal because if the honourable Leader of the Opposition had not seen fit, as he did, to tender his apologies to this House in his way, which is not the way of all people but in his own way, I did not read them as unqualified but I hope he intended them to be unqualified, then the penalties should have been much different. Because the penalty, as far as I am concerned, if he had not done it should have been much greater against the Leader of the Opposition.

We can talk about physical attacks on the one hand, and we can talk about other types of attack, but I do not feel when one views the circumstances of the situation of the honourable Member for St. Georges, and here again you do not want to get into that to any great degree, but when one judges his circumstances and all of the facts attendant upon it, the words uttered by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and particularly the words after proceedings closed which are in the main body of the motion there, were as great, as greivous and as cruel an assault as one could make on any person. I think that point really has to be made. That is, I say, the penalties they might say are unequal and I think they would have been unequal but for, certainly, the apology. The arguments that are used are churlish arguments from the Opposition that no one had brought the Leader to order, said the Member for St. Barbe North. He also said that the members had addressed themselves, the members on this side to statements that had been made over the past weeks and months.

Well, Mr. Speaker, from what I have heard and from what has been said to me in conversation with the Member for St. Georges over the past ten days, I think it fair to say that the honourable Member for St. Georges has felt that he has been tormented by the honourable Leader of the Opposition over a particular personal problem which he has. Now, I repeat this to the honourable House, I was not talking to the Leader of the Opposition about it but I am talking about the attitude that the honourable Member for St. Georges had with respect to it. And I had my day although there is no excuse at any time and the honourable Member for St. Georges tenders no excuse to this House for his particular actions. There is no excuse for physical violence or assault or what have you. But I today have a large measure of respect, admiration and feel a great deal of compassion to the Member for St. Georges who got up and made the statements that he made today, and one does not have to be too long lived in this world to realize that a man in public life like him, with the problem he has admitted he had had but has had the courage to lick, with a family or what have you, that it took a great deal of courage and gumption for a man to get up and do what he did today and I think he deserves the congratulations and certainly the understanding of everybody in this House and certainly I know as he will get in his own constituency.

It is rather unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that he was constrained to have to do this particular situation. I have no desire to stand here in the House and to try to enter into a forty-five minute debate, as members on the opposite side, indicating that I feel that the honourable Member for St. Georges was justified because of with provocation and what have you. I will just say there was provocation. But I think as he has indicated himself that he has made his own position clear. Would that the members of the opposite side had done exactly the same thing. As I have said the other defense put up by the Leader of the Opposition and members of the Opposition, that he did not know, that is the Leader of the Opposition did not know about the problem, but I would suggest,

Your Honour, that certainly the words that were uttered at the last part of the session yesterday in the House, certainly indicates that the honourable Leader of the Opposition, if he did not know about it, certainly knew facts which would result in a reasonable man, if he is a reasonable man, in concluding that a problem did exist. I draw to Your Honour's attention also the fact that yesterday in the House before these, what I consider the most base words that I have ever heard in my life that were spoken to the Member for St. Georges, when you consider the circumstances, before these were emitted after the session ended, at that particular time the Assistant House Leader, the Minister of Justice had gotten up on a point of order and drew what I thought to be very delicately but very forcibly to the attention of the Leader of the Opposition that he was certainly trespassing in an area very personal and in a very cruel manner.

I have no desire, as I say, to get up and castigate the Leader of the Opposition with respect to it. I think his actions speak for themselves and he will bear the fruit of that which he has sown and neither do I have any intention of really going on that much further. As I say, the defenses, the so-called defenses that have been raised, to make the penalty fit the crime, I think that the crime is not the word although I think it was the most vicious attack that I have ever heard in my life and these words used in context against the Member for St. Georges, as I say, if the Leader of the Opposition did not know it, did not know the problem, he certainly, as a reasonable man, as he must be, ought to have known it and there is no excuse whatsoever.

So, an apology has been made. Well, that is fine. So, an apology has been made. But I would submit, Your Honour, that the enormity of that spoken word which constituted just as brutal assault although no more excusable or less excusable or more or less culpable than the physical assault but just equated and just as effective as the physical assault, has to be punished as far as I am concerned regardless of the apology itself because we cannot allow this type of thing to go

May 6, 1975.

Tape 2066

RH - 5

on in the House. It has been going on, certainly it has been going on probably from time in memorial, in the stormy Houses of Assembly of this Province throughout history but I think it has been going on with a good degree of particular frequency and intensity in this session of the thirty-sixth General Assembly. It has got to stop somewhere and I would hope and pray that this would be the place it would stop. The only unfortunate part, it is a sorry lesson for all of us to see.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member for Twillingate.

MR. GILLETT: Mr. Speaker, I shall address myself to the resolution, and very briefly, but I have been listening with interest. I think practically everything has been covered, perhaps too widely covered, but we have a situation here where one member of the House of Assembly assaulted another. Actually he could take legal action against him in the courts of the land, but he chose not to do that.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. GILLETT: He could not? Why not?

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the lawyers -

MR. GILLETT: I would think so. I am not going to argue against a lawyer but I would think so. But the way I look at it, Mr. Speaker, is this and I think we can go back to start at the beginning with the Member for St. George's and he is not the only one. But regardless of who is speaking on this side of the House, if the Member for St. George's does not approve of what he is saying, he will from time to time say, "sit down," or, "shut up" or some such an expression, you see. This naturally causes provocation. And he did it yesterday on several occasions.

I feel that I should get up now and defend the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks concerning the incident of a few nights ago. The honourable the Premier was there, he heard the remarks. Following that, the next day, and I must confess that up until that time I had no knowledge of the fact that the Member for St. George's had not taken a drink of alcohol for thirteen months.

MR. ROBERTS: That is what I had no knowledge of, not his alcoholic problem.

MR. GILLETT: The following day I was told by one of the honourable members on the other side, I had fully intended to mention this to my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, asking him to refrain, to be above that, to get up on the higher - in other words, go up another thousand feet because he was on a collision course, as my colleague from Hermitage has said.

But somehow or other I did not, so I stand guilty, and just as guilty as anybody on the other side, and everyone of you, if you knew, as I was aware the following day, that he had knocked the habit, because I for one would never, knowing his past condition, I for one would never even

hint, a jot or a tittle against him. I have no problem myself, but I can imagine, I have been in the world long enough to know what the problem is with others and I can imagine how hard that fight must be. He has fought a battle. He has fought a war. And he has won. As the Leader of the Opposition says, you know, he is grateful for that and so did, I think, my colleague from St. Barbe North.

But Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that all of this was, shall I use an expression, cooked up in caucus, exactly what was going to happen today and here we have the Leader of the Opposition on trial, so to speak, he is actually on trial, But he is on trial not before an unbiased jury but before a caucus, a political caucus, a political body. He has no chance in the world of winning. We have wasted now, as I see it, we have wasted an awful lot of time this afternoon because we all know the results of the vote.

The Member for Bonavista South was quite perturbed, quite disturbed and shocked because we on this side voted against the motion to have the Member for St. George's flicked out for two days. Of course we voted against it. I voted against it because I knew, following the evening of the incident on the steps, I knew he had licked that problem -
MR. MORGAN: Inaudible.

MR. GILLET: - therefore I thought surely goodness we have compassion enough to forgive him. He acknowledged his faults. He did not ask for forgiveness. He said he would accept whatever the House meted out to him, but the quality of mercy is not strained.

So, I certainly for one, and I voted the way my conscience told me, and I for one was opposed to the motion of suspending him from the House for an hour, much less for two days. For the same reason, I am voting against this part of the motion too. Because yesterday afternoon I was the one I believe, Mr. Speaker, I was the one who told the Leader of the Opposition immediately after my colleague and friend from St. Barbe North did, but I believe I was the one who told him. When he said, well he has been drunk within the last two or three months, and I say no "Ed", I am told he has not had a drink for over a year. And the Leader of the Opposition

said, well I did not know that and you can usually see in a man's face if he is telling the truth or not. And I saw in his face that he was telling the truth. Of that I am convinced. Of that I am convinced.

I told one of the ministers this morning when I was visiting his office on business, of that I am convinced. For that reason and because the Leader of the Opposition did the manly thing, had he not did what he did, mind you, I would not have voted against this motion. Had he not apologized, knowing what he was told yesterday afternoon, had he not apologized, Mr. Speaker, I could have said only that he was a coward. Having apologized I can say that he is a man. I can also say the Member for St. George's is all of a man, because it takes all of a man to make the confession that he made today. It takes all of a man to apologize in the manner and in the sincerity - the honourable Member for St. John's East doubts the sincerity, I do not. I read it in his face yesterday afternoon and just before we came into the House this afternoon.

So I want to explain, Mr. Speaker, why I for one voted against the first part of this motion and why I shall vote against the second part of the motion. It is most unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition has to receive the same penalty as the person who actually assaulted him, most unfortunate. And I think we are stepping on dangerous ground here when we do this because, as it has already been pointed out this afternoon, if we are going to have resolutions brought before the House everytime somebody says something that is not liked by a number of members on the other side of the House or on this side of the House, that we bring in resolutions, it would not be much good for us to bring them in now mind you, but with the great majority on the other side, why then we shall certainly be dealing with them almost daily.

I do not condone, I never have, neither do I now nor shall I ever condone much of the accusations that have gone on across this House. It goes across, I presume, in Houses of Parliament, Houses of Assemblies and House of Commons and all other democratic Houses of Legislature. I do not relish it. Sometimes it makes for entertainment. I think yesterday

May 6, 1975

Tape No. 2067

NM - 4

afternoon, we will all agree, but yesterday afternoon for a long while there was sort of a jovial atmosphere and I believe the Speaker, when he called it six o'clock, mentioned it. It is in the Hansard. But I can understand and I can appreciate why the Member for St. George's welled up within and why he took the action. I do not hold it against him, Mr. Speaker, the actions he took. Because I think that perhaps if I were in his place, if I were in his shoes, I would have done the same thing.

But I will ask the Member for St. George's and any other members on both sides of the House to refrain while somebody is speaking. He will have a turn if he wants to. All he has to do is make a note of the remarks he wants to make. I know it does not sound the same, but I would ask them to refrain. If he had not the Member for St. George's provoked yesterday, we would not have been here discussing this this afternoon. I can assure you that. I think every member on both sides of the House will agree with me there.

We all stand here, Mr. Speaker, today - I think we are all guilty. I feel as guilty almost as anybody could be because I did not tell the Leader of the Opposition the very next day after that incident on the steps. This is why I am asking this House to reconsider that motion, that penalty, and delete the second half of that motion in its entirety, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, this is another sad day in the life of this Assembly. I feel that this Assembly has deteriorated. It has been deteriorating now for the last three years or more. The climax was reached yesterday and again today.

Now, Sir, we all feel sorry and sympathetic towards the honourable Member for St. George's. Sir, if any harm has been done to that honourable gentleman, it was certainly done and brought to the surface by the Premier of this Province this afternoon. Why, Mr. Speaker, should a person's private life, his family life, be brought on the floors of this Assembly and debated? We have debated for nearly two hours the private life of an honourable gentleman of this House of Assembly. Mr. Speaker, if that is not deterioration, then I do not know. It is beyond decay almost.

So, Sir, I am not proposing to speak very long. But, this whole thing should have been cut short yesterday by the Chair when the honourable Leader of the Opposition made certain statements. At that time the Speaker should have brought a halt to the whole thing and asked the Leader of the Opposition to apologize and take the words back. This was not done. So, therefore we find ourselves

today debating a motion which should not be discussed in the form in which it has been this afternoon. The penalty served on the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, is much too severe when you consider the sentence or penalty applied to the honourable Member for St. George's.

Now, Sir, that honourable gentleman, he stood in his place and he apologized. So did the honourable Leader of the Opposition. I think, and I feel as members representing this Province in this House of Assembly if we had any respect at all for rules and for the dignity of this House we would have accepted. Without anticipating what the honourable leader would have said, if he had the opportunity to reply or to make a few comments on that motion, I would suspect that the honourable Leader of the Opposition would have said in apologizing and requested the government to retract the motion and not suspend the Member for St. George's. That is what I would have liked to have seen done, Sir. Then this whole thing would have gone on and we would have had the whole thing cleared up. But, as it is now, Sir, the whole Province now is aware of this honourable gentleman's private life and the problem he is having, or he had. This, Sir, is not an easy problem to master. Credit must be due to any honourable gentleman, any honourable man, especially if he is a member of this House, but to any person who has a problem attributed to the honourable gentleman - I do not know whether he has a problem or not.

I have travelled with the honourable gentleman on one occasion. I had no reason to suspect that the man had a problem. However, the problem has been brought out by his own colleagues. They are the ones who are saying today that he has a problem and he is striving hard, or he did strive hard to correct it. Much credit must be due to the honourable gentleman, Sir.

So, I say, Mr. Speaker, that I will in all fairness - I voted against the motion to have the honourable Member for St. George's removed from the House. I vote against this motion because, Sir, I do not think there is any comparison between the two penalties.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was out of the House for a while so I did not follow all the debate so far, but I have the most of it I think, and I have pretty well the gist of what has been said so far.

Sir, let me start off by saying, Mr. Speaker, that as long as we have the democratic system as we know it today, as long as we have a free society, as long as we have parliaments, as long as we have legislatures, and as long as we have House of Assembly, Sir, there is bound, Mr. Speaker, to be disagreements among members. There is bound to be, Sir. Tempers are bound to get out of control occasionally. Members are apt sometimes to say things that they are later sorry for. But, Mr. Speaker, as long as we have the democratic system as we know it today, these things are bound to happen. No man is perfect, Sir. Let he who is without sin in this honourable House cast the first stone.

I have on numerous occasions in this House, Mr. Speaker, I have stated myself, and I have been guilty of it sometimes, that one of the worse things that a member can do in this House is to lower himself to personal character assassination. That is one - to get involved in personalities, Sir, to get involved in a man's private life, in a man's personal affairs, is dynamite because, Sir, as I say, let he who is without sin cast the first stone. When you start that kind of a game, Mr. Speaker, you never know where it is going to end, and it could lead to bloodshed. In some legislatures, Sir, throughout the world it has led to bloodshed. Feelings sometimes run high in debate.

This particular debate that we are involved in now, Sir, has been a very emotional, a very dramatic debate. Reference has been made to certain members having problems, Sir. I am not going to fall into that line of debating. I understand, Sir, since I came back to the House that we have had a casualty, that the Member for St. George's has resigned because of all this uproar, as assistant Deputy Speaker of the House. For that, Sir, I am truly sorry because, Mr. Speaker, I have gotten to know the honourable gentleman fairly well since he came into this honourable House. I am truly sorry, Sir, that the Member for St. George's has seen fit to resign as assistant Deputy

May 6, 1975

Tape 2068 (afternoon)

IB-4

Speaker of this House, as assistant Chairman of Committees.

The honourable member, Sir, in my opinion is just an ordinary Newfoundlander like myself who has tried to do the best he can as assistant Chairman, as the assistant Deputy Speaker of the House, not trained in jurisprudence. He does not have any legalistic training. He tried to do the best he can as I would do if I was in the job, Sir, and I am sorry that the honourable member has seen fit to resign his position and just

become an ordinary backbencher on the government side of the House. I have crossed swords with the honourable gentleman. I doubt, Sir, if there is an honourable member in this House that I have not tangled with in the last three years. Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, I have gotten down in the mud and rolled around with some of the honourable members. Sometimes I have taken the high ground and risen above it all. And God only knows, Sir, if there is ever a member in this House who can speak from personal experience in this honourable House of being attacked personally, character assassinations both inside and outside the House, it is myself, Sir. And sometimes I have yielded to the temptation and I have fought back, and sometimes, Sir, fought back in a way that I was not exactly proud of myself.

I have had my bad days in the House and I have had my good days. One of my bad days, Sir, in the honourable House was one day recently when I had a flick at the Deputy Speaker, who was occupying the Chair at the time. For that, Sir, I got five days suspension from the House. Five days! And I suppose that one of the biggest penalties that was ever dished out in this honourable House. Five days! So obviously, Sir, would I not ask the question? Is there anybody in this House, Sir, who is in a better position to ask a question? When an honourable member comes across the House and slugs another member, belts him in the side of the head, all he gets is two days. It would make me wonder about the penalties.

But, Sir, getting back to feelings running high and members having their bad days and so forth, I would consider yesterday, Sir, to be one of those days when members seemed to be jittery and jumpy and edgy and irritable, and on two or three occasions before the incident occurred between my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, and the Member for St. George's, there were a number of references made, Sir, that you could interpret, I suppose, as being innuendoes of the lowest kind.

The honourable the Premier, I must admit, Sir, was man enough on one occasion, when a reference was made to a member of my family that I had nothing to do with, I did not bring it on, it

just appeared right out of a clear, blue sky on the other side of the House, the honourable the Premier was man enough to stand in his place and apologize. I accepted the Premier's apology. He was not named, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: He was not named for his personal reference, for his little off-handed flick. The Premier was having a bad day. We all have bad days in the House, Sir. I had one bad day. That was not taken into account but that happened to be my bad day. I paid the penalty, I got five days suspension from the House for that. I had five good days outside the House.

But, Sir, the point that I am making is this, Mr. Speaker: that although this afternoon we all seem to be in a sort of a melodramatic sort of mood, everybody seems to be down in the mouth, in the blues, playing up emotional points to try to win the argument and so forth, that I would submit, Mr. Speaker, nobody is going to win this argument. This is the kind of an argument that nobody can win. But there is a great lesson to be drawn from it, Sir. A great lesson; that members on all sides of the House, Sir, might in future, before they utter a word that could be interpreted as character assassination or an innuendo about a man and his family, that they bite the bullet.

Your Honour probably realizes, since Your Honour has been sitting in the Chair, that many a day in this House I have had to bite the bullet. And Your Honour could probably take a little credit for that, for giving me the flick once in awhile, put the bullet in my mouth and I bit it. Because of the reprimands that I have gotten from the Chair, it has made me a better debater, Sir, made me a better debater. And I have tried to get away from this sticking the dart in once in awhile, sticking the knife in and giving her a little twist once in awhile, hitting below the belt. I bet you, Mr. Speaker, that I have logged more time in Hansard in this session.

of the House than all the other members on either side of the House put together. I have logged more time, Sir, and you can go back over the record and see -

AN HON. MEMBER: Neary apologizes.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Carried.

MR. NEARY: - and see how many personal references are made there. Hard debate. Hard debate. My friend from St. John's South and I have crossed swords, we have had some hard debate. The Minister of Fisheries, who is not in his seat, Sir, and I have had some hard debates in this honourable House. We have crossed swords and we fought it out, and when you are into a debate with the Minister of Fisheries, the Government House Leader, you know you have been in a debate. Mr. Speaker, I have often left this House and gone home after debating with the Minister of Fisheries and felt like I was dragged through a wringer.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Because the minister knows how to do his homework, Sir, and he knows how to debate. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, maybe I am being repetitious but honourable members, I am sure, have heard me say in this House before in the last two or three years, that one thing that members have not apparently begun to realize yet is what the House of Assembly is all about. It is a free debating forum, Sir. It is a forum for debating. It is a forum for making political points, if you want, Mr. Speaker. It is a place where you can get things off your chest. It is a place where you can talk about your constituency, as my friend was doing yesterday, or you can talk about anything under the sun. You can talk about sending a man to the moon.

But, Sir, where we have gotten off the tracks in this honourable House in the last few years is with these little personal snide remarks, these innuendoes and insinuations. And we have all been guilty of it, Sir. I hope that nobody today thinks he is wearing a halo and his halo is hurting him because we have all been

guilty of it, and some, Sir, more guilty than others. Some continue it today despite the fact that they should have learned their lesson.

Mr. Speaker, there are enough people today trying to undermine our democratic system without us, Sir, coming into this honourable House and saying that we should be ashamed of our actions, that the House is deteriorating, there is no decorum in the House. If we feel that way, Sir, how do you expect John Q. Public to feel about the House? We have enough people challenging, Sir, the democratic system of government today, the democratic process today without us undermining our own House of Assembly and our own democratic system right here in Newfoundland.

Now, Sir, yesterday was one of those days when everybody seemed to be on edge and tempers were flaring, emotions were running high, and my honourable colleague the Leader of the Opposition was involved in two or three very heavy debates yesterday. The honourable the Leader of the Opposition had made a major speech before he swung into the speech that he was making when all this whole matter flared up. The Leader of the Opposition had spoken, I suppose, for almost ninety minutes, but that is no excuse. I am not leading up to making an excuse for the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition did have a busy day and he was continuously, Sir, continuously heckled, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Harassed.

MR. NEARY: - harassed and interrupted by members on the government side of the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, if it were me. Your Honour knows that I do not mind sparring with members on the government benches, Sir, and Your Honour will let it go on and I will never complain, I will give them the odd few flicks.

Sometimes

Your Honour will say, well, we have to restore peace and quietness in the House. But, Sir, yesterday they were continuously harassing my friend, the Leader of the Opposition. Now the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, is a man I would say who is very quick on the trigger to say the least. The Leader of the Opposition, Sir, can make members who interrupt him, can make them look foolish. The Leader of the Opposition, Sir, when the honourable members in the government benches start to interrupt him can cut them to ribbons and make them look foolish. And I somehow or other, Sir, have come to realize in this honourable House that when this happens, when my friend the Leader of the Opposition gets the upper hand in debate that somehow or other the member who interrupts him resents it, resents the fact that my - my God, sometimes I wonder or I wish that I was as quick on the trigger as the Leader of the Opposition. I have to stand here sometimes, Sir, for minutes before I can pick up an answer to my wonderful friend there, the Junior Member for Harbour Main, before I can think of something witty to say to him, and then probably not so witty. But the Leader of the Opposition, Sir, is a natural, rapid-fire just like a machine gun. When members try to interrupt him and heckle him and harass him he is just like a machine gun. He will fire back and he will flay -

AN HON. MEMBER: Shoot them down.

MR. NEARY: - and shoot them down in flames, and then, Sir, they resent it. And, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to Your Honour that this is where part of the weakness lies, Sir, that these members never seem to learn a lesson. They continuously want to get after my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, knowing full well that the Leader of the Opposition is going to give them a flick, that he is going to win, that he is going to come out on top. And so, Sir, maybe part of the reason for the ill feeling that has developed between certain members and the Leader of the Opposition and members on this side of the House is the fact that members on the government side are

not properly disciplined. They should be told. And, you know, Mr. Speaker, I am led to believe that they have been told. They have been told by their leader, keep quiet. I have seen the Hon. Premier in this House. I saw him no later than yesterday trying to tell the Minister of Tourism to sit down and keep quiet. Ignore it, I heard the Premier, I have heard the Premier use that term 500 times in this House, ignore him, ignore him.

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

The honourable gentleman's comments are interesting but I fear that they are irrelevant, however. And while I would like to listen to him on this vein for quite some time because it is very interesting, I feel constrained to bring it to his attention that he might get back and be more pertinent to the subject.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House was one of those unusual days, Sir. It was one of those days when tempers ran probably a little bit high and maybe got a little bit out of control. And things were said possibly, Sir, that should not have been said. And things were done that ought not have been done. (Thanks to my Anglican friend here that I got that quote straightened out.)

CAPT. WINSOR: United.

MR. NEARY: Oh United.

CAPT. WINSOR: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Sorry.

But, Mr. Speaker, I submit, Your Honour, that the penalties that have been imposed on these two honourable gentlemen are too severe. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for St. George's, Sir, stood in his place in this honourable House this afternoon like a man, and I was sitting here listening and hanging on to every word the member was saying, and I admired him and respected him for the statement that he made in this honourable House this afternoon, Sir. I am getting a little sentimental and melancholy myself. And I looked across at honourable members I thought about myself and I said to myself, but for the grace of God there go I. The honourable member

did not have to do it, Sir. He did not have to do it. But he chose to. It was the honourable member's own decision to take that particular line of reasoning or line of defence, or take that particular line to clarify his position yesterday. The honourable member did not have to do it, but that is the line of reasoning or the line of defence that he took, and he is to be admired for it, Sir. And then the member went on and apologized to the House.

Well now, Sir, in my opinion that took a lot of courage. It took a lot of thought, and I am sure that the member for St. George's, Sir, last night, after he went to bed and was alone by himself, thought that over very carefully and said, is this the course of action I should take? Or should I do it this way? What is the best way to do it? And the member made up his mind. He probably never slept a wink last night thinking about this whole matter. Because it was a very important decision for the honourable member to take, Sir. And then the member went on and apologized to the House and to the Leader of the Opposition, I presume, for his action yesterday afternoon in coming across the House and assaulting the Leader of the Opposition. Now, Sir, that was punishment enough in my opinion. In other jurisdictions that I know of, Sir, members have often gone across the House and punched another member in the mouth while the House was sitting, and they were given the rest of the afternoon off. And then, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition stood in his place, and he explained his position, and then the Leader of the Opposition apologized to the House and to the member for St. George's for some remarks that he had made yesterday in this honourable House.

Well, Sir, the remarks that were made by the Leader of the Opposition in the main, Sir, were made during the time this House was sitting. The Leader of the Opposition made these remarks during the time he was participating in the Throne Speech debate. No member on the government side, Sir, rose on a point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. NEARY: No, they did not. No members rose on a point of order except later on the member for St. George's who stood in his place on a point of order. And on one occasion, I think, Your Honour, ruled that the Leader of the Opposition was in order. And the next time when the member for St. George's pressed the issue, Your Honour, said that he would have to take it under advisement and listen to the tapes and this was at the last minute.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Yes. But, Your Honour, did not uphold the point of order. That is what -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: Then the House closed.

MR. NEARY: Then the House closed. Well, that is what I am saying. That, Your Honour, at the last minute, said that he would take the point of order under advisement, check the tapes and if there were any grounds there for the point of order that Your Honour would allow discussion. -

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Hickman also.

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is right.

- but allow discussion and then make a ruling.

So for all practical purposes, Your Honour, the Leader of the Opposition was allowed to plow on in his debate without being ruled out of order by the Chair. Now, Sir, let us say that some of the phrases used by the Leader of the Opposition were unparliamentary. Let us say that Your Honour came back in the House today and said, yes, some of the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition were unparliamentary. Then what is the punishment, Sir? What is the penalty for that? I ask, Your Honour happens, Mr. Speaker, what happens when a member is told that his statements were unparliamentary, ruled out of order by the Chair? Well, Sir, I would submit the penalty for that, for such action, Sir,

is that a member is asked to withdraw the statement and sometimes apologize, to retract. The member is asked to withdraw. Now, Sir, what happened in this particular case? My colleague the Leader of the Opposition, who has been accused of making some unparliamentary statements is being punished by being expelled from the House for two days, for two

MR. NEARY: days, Sir, for making unparliamentary statements. I would submit, Your Honour, that this is unheard of, that this, Sir, is creating a very dangerous precedent. If we proceed, Sir, and take a vote on this and the Leader of the Opposition is expelled for two days, then I would submit, Your Honour, that in future when a member makes an unparliamentary statement, that he can withdraw later on according to Beauchesne, that any member could be expelled for two days and not be given a chance to withdraw. That is the consequences, Sir, that is the implications of this motion. Personally, as I said a few minutes ago, Sir, I think the penalty imposed on both honourable gentlemen is too severe.

I think the Member for St. George's has been punished enough, in all this public exposure that he is going to get.

MR. ROWE: That is right.

MR. NEARY: As my colleague the Member for Fogo indicated a few moments ago, we talk about not parading out a man's personal life on the floor of this House and then we spend the whole afternoon -

AN HON. MEMBER: You spent -

MR. NEARY: I did not. I have not made any reference to the member's personal life, Sir. I have not. Others member have. But if you follow me closely you will see in my remarks that I am deliberately avoiding any personal reference to the Member for St. George's. Because I do not think it is any place for it in this honourable House.

Members have stood in their place, Sir, to try to justify these two motions and paraded out the member's personal life on the floor. This kind of situation, Sir, in my opinion is not right and if you are going to punish a member, either the Leader of the Opposition or the Member for St. George's, use a sharp scalpel and do it in a hurry. Never mind getting up and parading out the man's personal life. That is not fair to the member. It is not fair to the Member for St. George's -

CAPT. WINSOR: Or his family.

MR. NEARY: Or his family either. It is not fair, Sir, the way this debate

has - the twist that it has taken this afternoon. The member got up and apologized. The member made a very manly statement. And I think that was punishment enough.

What I would like to see happen, Mr. Speaker -

CAPT. WINSOR: It is humiliating.

MR. NEARY: What I would like to see happen, Mr. Speaker, is for the House, the minister, and this is the first duty I think that the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Acting President of the Treasury Board, this is his first official duty as Acting House Leader, that he reconsider this whole matter and I would favour, Mr. Speaker, a reprimand to both honourable gentlemen and let them take their seats in the House.

CAPT. WINSOR: That has been done now.

MR. NEARY: No, it has not been done. No, it has not been done. They are going to be suspended for two days.

CAPT. WINSOR: Oh yes.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is more than a reprimand.

CAPT. WINSOR: If the motion is withdrawn.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is what I am saying. I am asking the -

CAPT. WINSOR: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I am asking the minister, the Government House Leader, to reconsider this matter. In view of the things that have been said by both honourable gentlemen in this House this afternoon who seem and both seem to be truly sorry, neither one has given any excuse for his behaviour in this House yesterday. The Leader of the Opposition said he did not know that the Member for St. George's -

CAPT. WINSOR: Had a problem.

MR. NEARY: - did not know that the Member for - I am trying to figure out a way so it will not be personal.

CAPT. WINSOR: Had a problem.

MR. NEARY: That the Member for St. George's had a problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not so.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Well, that is what the Leader of the Opposition said. Well, Sir,

that is the impression that I got. The Leader of the Opposition said that he did not know that the Member for St. George's had a problem at the present time.

MR. SIMMONS: So he was trying to lick it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, whatever it is, members know what I am driving at. Now, Sir, I do not know what else I could say about this, Mr. Speaker. I do not want, I am not going to debate the personal life of either one of these gentlemen. As I indicated to the Premier yesterday when I walked across the House, this is the sort of thing that can get us nowhere and can only lead to blood shed. And anybody who starts it, Sir, anybody, I do not care who it is in this honourable House, better be prepared to put up with the consequences. As I said when I started, let he who is without sin cast the first stone.

I think, Sir, that we have sufficiently aired this matter. I think it probably has been a very worthwhile debate. The decorum of the House has been something that has been on the carpet now for the past three or four years and I just walked in, got off the elevator when I heard my colleague here make a statement that it is not a Sunday School picnic.

Mr. Speaker, when you come in this honourable House you have to be prepared, Sir, for hard debate. You have to be prepared, Mr. Speaker, to take off your coat, roll up your sleeves, get down to hard work, work like a slave, work for your constituents and for Newfoundland, disagree with the government and the ministers when you have to, disagree violently with them on issues and on their policy, but not on their personal lives, Sir, that is not the business of any honourable member of this House. It is not our business, Sir, the personal life of an honourable member of this House, and should be left out of the House, and left out of the debate, and I hope that if there is any lesson to be learned from this Sir, and I am sure there is, we learn something new every day, that the lesson that we will learn is that from now on members when they are speaking in their places in this honourable House, will stick to the issues.

God, Mr. Speaker, there are so many things - look I come into this honourable House, I can pick an issue every day of my life, and I do pick issues. The government, Sir, has been so negligent and so weak and has such foolish policies that any day you want to, Mr. Speaker, you can pick an issue and debate it. That does not mean an attack on an individual, a personal attack. There are some members who think that when you criticize the government or criticize a department of government, they take it as a personal thing, that is wrong. They are going to have to rise above that, set their sights a little higher. As I said some time ago, when we have another debate in this honourable House, Sir, about a similar situation that members come into this House green, without any training. They do not know the least little thing about parliamentary procedure. We should run a seminar. It would be worth our while, Sir, for the honourable the Premier to think about it, running a seminar to teach members on both sides of the House what this House is all about. It is a debating forum, Sir, we are here to score political points, not to roast a member or take the hide off of him on a personal basis.

That is what the House is all about, Sir. That is what happens when you get a crowd of rookies, Mr. Speaker, and I am not only referring to members on the government benches, when you get rookies, Sir, who have never taken the time to sit down and think about what the House is really all about, then Mr. Speaker, you run into trouble, because everything that is said and done in this honourable House is taken personally, taken as a personal affront and it should not be. And we have had probably a little bit too much of it in the last three or four years, Sir.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much, even after our debate this afternoon, Sir, if we are going to cure it. Human nature is a funny thing. I forecast, Sir, that in the Thirty-seventh Session of the House of Assembly that emotions will run high. Members will fall out with one another. They will almost get on the brink of challenging one another outside the House. It has gone on, Sir, ever since we have had our

May 6, 1975

Tape NO. 2071

NM - 5

democratic system and I would submit that it is going to go on. Long after, Sir, you and I are dead and gone it will go on.

But, Sir, when I hear statements like the decorum of the House, the House is deteriorating, the House is a shambles, it makes me shiver in my shoes, Sir, because honourable members should realize when they make these statements--and I do not make them, Sir. I might talk about no business on the floor of the House, I might talk about the foolish legislation we had before the House, but I never go outside and make a statement that the decorum of the House is deteriorating and that the House is in a shambles - and do you know why I do not do it, Mr. Speaker? Because there are enough people attacking our democratic system without us undermining it ourselves. We will have a difficult job as it is in the future trying to keep our democratic system intact without going out and undermining the system ourselves, Sir, and I would suggest that we be very careful in making that sort of statement in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It now being six o'clock, I leave the Chair until eight o'clock tonight.

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before we adjourned at 6:00 I was suggesting to the minister and to the House that the maximum penalty that should have been imposed on the Member for St. George's is that there should have been a reprimand. And that is all, Sir. The Member for St. George's should have been rapped on the knuckles for what he did. And that would have been it, Sir. He should have been allowed to continue to sit in his seat. And my colleague the Leader of the Opposition, Sir, for -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - making statements that may or may not have been unparliamentary, and that has not yet been proven, Sir. Your Honour has not proven whether - Your Honour has not stated whether the statements that were made by the Leader of the Opposition were unparliamentary. But let us say they were unparliamentary, Sir. Let us look at the worse kind of situation, and that the Leader of the Opposition did make unparliamentary remarks about the Member for St. George's. Then the Leader of the Opposition, Sir, should have been asked by Your Honour to retract, and if necessary, apologize to the honourable member. And the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was prepared to do that, Sir. That should have been the maximum penalty imposed on the Leader of the Opposition. Sir, this happens day in and day out in this honourable House when a member makes unparliamentary statements, uses language that is considered to be out of order by Your Honour, unparliamentary, the member is asked to retract. The Speaker will stand in his place and he will say the Member for Bell Island, the Member for St. John's South, the Member for St. John's North have made what is considered to be unparliamentary statements and I ask the member to retract. That is what should have happened in the case of the Leader of the Opposition, Sir. That should be the only punishment. And the Leader of the Opposition as a matter of fact has already done that, both inside and outside of this honourable House.

And I would suggest, Sir, that the government, the Acting Leader of the government in the House is over reacting to this situation, and making the situation look like what it is not.

The Member for St. George's should be permitted to return to his seat, Sir, in my opinion, with a severe reprimand. And the Leader of the Opposition should retract any unparliamentary statements that he made because my colleague has already stated publicly, both inside and outside of this House, that he is sorry if he said anything concerning the Hon. Member for St. George's that would be unparliamentary. The member has already said that. And, Sir, it does not make any difference about the feelings of the members on the government benches, Sir. Justice not only has to be done in this case, but it has to appear, as my legal friends have said, it has to appear to be done. And in this case, Sir, justice is not being done. The penalty is too severe.

Mr. Speaker, that is a fact. They may like to take the Leader of the Opposition out, Sir, and string him up from the nearest tree, or put him in front of a firing squad, but they cannot let their feelings run away with them, Sir. And that is what is happening in this case. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the government and the members on the government benches are allowing their feelings to run away with them. And in so doing, Sir, are creating a very dangerous precedent, because if my colleague, Sir, broke the rules of this House, the only thing he did was use unparliamentary language, and for that you do not get suspended for two days. In no way, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NEARY: Since when do you get suspended from the House -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Since when, Sir, do you get suspended for using unparliamentary language, if you are prepared to retract and apologize? Why even the Member for St. John's South knows the difference of that. My colleague admitted that he may have used unparliamentary language.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: This is what I said going down over the steps if I said anything, and I do not recall seeing the honourable member going down -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: - over any steps.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, that is all my colleague did, if he did that. And that has not yet been proven, Sir. All we have is a motion, a government motion using brute force to get my colleague out of the House because they are allowing their feelings to run away with them.

I know, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition said some very unkind things about the Member for St. George's. And the Leader of the Opposition said publicly that he is not proud of that. And I think he is quite sincere. But, Sir, it does not make any difference. The Leader of the Opposition has come into this House in man fashion and said look I am truly sorry, if I said anything unparliamentary about the member I retract and I apologize to the House. That is the penalty, Mr. Speaker. I cannot help but repeating that. That is so.

Sir, when the Member for St. John's East got a dart in the chops from another member in this honourable House, Sir, for provoking that member the government House Leader moved -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Sir, on a point of order. I have already dealt with the honourable member was not here when I dealt with it in debate. That reference is entirely false, completely untrue, and the facts point it out. And I would suggest that the honourable member -

AN HON. MEMBER: Retract.

MR. MARSHALL: - desist from that scope or that line of attack or we will open, you know, an area that I do not think, as I said today, that the people who were involved in that thing who, some of them half in and half out of politics, would not favour the Opposition bringing it up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MARSHALL: Because the honourable member full well knows that the reason for that particular situation was motivated by matters that occurred outside of this Chamber, that I was not brought at any time to apologize for anything that was said, that I never said. And he

is entirely out of order when he casts an innuendo that I provoked anything at that particular time.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour knows full well that is not a point of order, Sir, that is just an opinion between two members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Hon. Member for St. John's East when he was speaking in this debate this afternoon did feel it was a matter that took place some years ago, long before the present Speaker was ever a member of this Legislature. And he did make the remarks that he did not provoke him. Whether he did provoke or did not provoke, perhaps at this point, this Speaker, it might be a matter of opinion from a procedural viewpoint.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour. But the point, Sir, is this that the member who went across and hit the Member for St. John's East was suspended from the House for three sitting days.

AN HON. MEMBER: Five.

MR. NEARY: Five sitting days, five sitting days of the House, Sir. No disciplinary action was taken against the Member for St. John's East. Whether or not he provoked him, Sir, is a matter of opinion. That is a matter of opinion, Sir. And it is a matter of opinion in this case, Sir. Whether my colleague provoked the Member for St. George's or not, the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to give the member the benefit of the doubt, and has retracted and has apologized, and yet, Sir, he is being flicked out of the House for two days. For what, Mr. Speaker? For what? Because he said something unparliamentary. Sir, they are over reacting, and I beseech and I beg the government House Leader to reconsider the punishment and the penalties that are being imposed. Why, Sir, if you go out in the street tonight and you punch somebody in the mouth and you are hauled in to court for common assault, and it is your first offence, the judge would put you on a suspended sentence, would he not? He would not send you down to the penitentiary for two days, would he especially if he had a good lawyer like the Member for St. John's South?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, - would he, Sir? No, he would not. He

would say, suspended sentence.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: And this is the first offence for the Member for St. George's, Sir. I am coming to his defence, rallying to his support, rallying to his side, and saying that he should be reprimanded and returned to his seat, Sir, take his seat in this House. And my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, if he broke the rules of the House by saying something unparliamentary has already retracted, but in case the message did not come through, I am sure my colleague would again stand in his place, retract any unparliamentary statements he made, apologize to the House, and that is punishment enough, Sir. That in itself clears the Leader of the Opposition, gives him a free bill of health in the House. And unless he persists in using unparliamentary language, Sir, is allowed to sit in his seat, to maintain his seat, and not be put out of the House.

So, Sir, I cannot figure out why the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Acting House Leader has made a motion to suspend the Leader of the Opposition for two days. I do not understand it, Sir. It does not make any sense at all. Not in keeping with parliamentary practices. It is not the traditional procedure in, not only in this honourable House, but in any House, in any Legislature, Sir, and in the House of Assembly where you have the democratic process. And I would urge now, Sir, the Acting House Leader to reconsider both motions, to reconsider the penalties that have been imposed on these two honourable gentlemen. And that the Member for St. George's -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - Sir, be invited to come back to his seat -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - with a reprimand from Your Honour,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time for the Hon. the Member for Bell Island is up.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir. - with a reprimand from Your Honour and

May 6, 1975

Tape 2072 (night)

PK-6

the Leader of the Opposition retract and apologize for any
unparliamentary language he used and be allowed to continue to sit
in his seat in the House.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. John's South.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I had thought earlier this afternoon that probably the least said on this matter, the better. But, I have heard one or two astonishing statements in the course of the debate this afternoon that I think must be touched upon. Now, it is important for us quite dispassionately to examine this thing to see what happened.

What happened was this, that members, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable Member for St. George's, both did things which are absolutely contrary to the privileges of this House. You see, Mr. Speaker, I think it is more than just one member calling another something. That is bad. That should not be allowed and there are rules for dealing with it. But, when somebody does something that goes right to the root of the dignity and standing of this House of Assembly it is an affront to the House itself. It is just not a matter of my calling the honourable Member for Twillingate or the honourable Member for Bell Island something and he calling me something. It is not just that. Some things go to the root of the institution itself. Some things are an affront to the institution itself, an affront to the people who put us here. That is what, I think, we have to remember.

Now, on the face of it to strike another member is obviously something that cannot be countenanced. The honourable Member for St. George's realized that. When he made his speech he said so and he placed himself at the mercy of the House and, as he said, he would accept whatever punishment the House meted out to him. That disposes of his case. He also made remarks which were unparliamentary and unfitting. He did not mention these specifically but they have come out in the debate. For these things, too, I think although not specifically mentioned in the motion because the striking of another member over-rides that, but for these things also he deserved to be disciplined. He knows that and he admits that.

But, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and he is a man with a long, by the standards of this House, with a long parliamentary

background he has been a member of this House for some years. He is an educated man, a man trained in a profession and a man who by very virtue of the position he holds should be entitled to the respect both of this country and this House. In a sense it makes it all the more sad that he would allow himself to use the remarks which he used in the House yesterday and which are not in dispute. So that it is not just the affront and the insult to the Member to St. George's. That is perhaps secondary. But the insult and the affront is to all of us, to the House itself and most of all to the electors of Newfoundland who put us here. That is what I think is disturbing and that is what hurts me as a member of this House and I think hurts every member of this House and the members of the public.

We are not just a little Island alone onto ourselves now. We are a Province of Canada and we have a pride in being Britian's oldest colony, as we were, and Canada's newest Province. We have a right to hold our heads up and a right to stand for something. When this sort of thing happens, there is not question about it, it demeans everybody. That was the affront, that was the unfortunate thing.

Now, I heard it said this afternoon, if you cannot stand the heat get out of the kitchen. That, Mr. Speaker, does not apply to this. With the greatest respect I do not think it applies here. That implies that if I say to another honourable member, you are this, you are that, you are a crook, you are a thief, you are anything, you are a drunk, that implies that he has got to sit and take that because if he cannot stand it, well resign, get out, go somewhere else.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WELLS: That is what was said this afternoon, and I was here and I listened and it was quite clearly said, if you cannot stand the heat, get out.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WELLS: Well, that is the - I only heard the words. I am sorry if the context was meant to be different, but these were the words I heard and particularly, I choose, from the Member for St. Barbe North

who I heard say that.

Now, I think this is wrong. Either we are a civilized people with a civilized House of Assembly, with a civilized standard of behaviour or we are a bunch of rowdies and we might as well come in here and punch each other or throw things or say what we like. Either it matters or it does not matter. My honourable friend from Bell Island I thought made a very good speech, as many of his speeches are, and I enjoyed listening to him. He touched on the function of this House. There is no question he is quite right when he says that one of the functions of this House is as a debating forum, a forum where we put forth ideas, where we test ideas, where we attack ideas, where we have a bit of banter, sometimes a bit of fun at the expense of another member. All that is part of the canons of parliamentary behaviour. All that is part of the game. All that is accepted.

But if I say to a member, you are a drunk or you are something else or your morals are this or that or something else or you are a crook or you are a thief or you are a liar, that is more fundamental. That goes to the root of the very institution. That, Mr. Speaker, is what went wrong yesterday. The striking was wrong. The remarks which led to it are equally wrong. As I understand - now the honourable Member for Bell Island in closing his spirited defense of the Leader of the Opposition said, oh, it is all right. It is just a breach of parliamentary language. The language is not right. There are many words which are unparliamentary and which sometimes members use in the heat of debate and the excess of debate, if you like.

But, no this is a bit different. As I understand the rules of parliamentary privilege and matters of privilege - I do not claim to be an expert - but as I understand it, certain things go right to the root of the whole institution. When breaches like that are made even though they may be in the nicest words, but if the wrong sort of things are imputed, if things are imputed which are improper and completely outside the pale of parliament, then though the language may be sweet as pie, then it is not only unparliamentary but a breach of privilege.

Now, no man, Mr. Speaker, in his right mind could say that to call another a drunken sot, to ask the rhetorical question is the member inebriated today, if this is to be allowed, if this is a mere breach of parliamentary language, if I use such language and Your Honour says to me, oh, tut, tut, you must withdraw that. I say, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that. If some other member does it and if I do it tomorrow and on and on it goes, what is going to happen to this House? This House is going to be put down a long way lower, Mr. Speaker, than it is now, and God knows there are many times when all of us in here and I am afraid a great many people outside this House think it is pretty low now.

I mean, let us get it out and call a spade a spade. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, what a lot of people in this country are saying about politics today? They are saying that because of some of the antics in the House of Assembly that politics is not a fit thing to be connected with, that to be a politician is to be a fool, to be some kind of orangoutang that has no sense, that is a buffoon who gets in and he does not care for the country because he is so busy in the row with the guy across the House that he has not got time to think about the problems of his country.

You see, Mr. Speaker, if we do not think about what we are here for, where does the thing go? And what are we here for? We are here to debate, discuss - nobody minds a bit of fun, nobody minds a bit of banter as the honourable Member for Bell Island and I often have, and I dare say I am on the receiving end of it more than he is. Nobody minds that. If you cannot stand that kind of heat, get out of the kitchen. But if we are going to degrade this institution, if it is going to be a place where blows take place, where rotten language is used, then I for one would not want to be here. I do not think the Member for Bell Island would. I do not think any of us if we stop and really think about it would want to be here.

You talk about attracting people into public life. You talk about young men, working men, business men, professional men, whatever they are who might look to a career in politics and to sit in this

provincial House, students in university, young people in school, they look at politics and they say, only a fool would be connected with that because there has to be something wrong with you. If you go to any other forum in this country, if you go to a school classroom, a university lecture room, a union hall, to any forum that we can think of where discussion takes place, a company meeting, a court room, I do not care where, certain standards are expected. You know, Mr. Speaker, certain people - and it does not have anything to do with education or anything like that - practically all people recognize these standards.

If you go into a tavern for a drink, certain standards are expected. Most people recognize these standards and abide by them. It is not parliamentary. It is just a case of good manners and ordinary decent behaviour. Yet the sad thing about it is that in the peoples' House where people are elected and chosen to deliberate and debate the affairs of the Province, it seems that after we get here for a while we forget the ordinary good manners that we exercise outside this House and sit down here in a little place like a bear pit and anything goes and anything can be said. That is the tragedy and that is what is sad.

Now, do

May 6, 1975.

Tape 2074

RH - 1

you do this and somebody, say Mr. Speaker, or somebody raise a point of order and Mr. Speaker say, no, you must not do that, just withdraw that. Are there no limits beyond which you cannot go and be brought to book by this institution, by this House? Because if there are no such limits, if you can entertain any kind of debate, any kind of language toward another member or in the House, then I suppose anything does go. Let us forget it. Who would want to be here? That is probably the essential and basic question that we are asking ourselves in this debate. I have no wish to castigate the Leader of the Opposition - I am as sorry as any man in this House that this thing took place - no wish in the world. But yet somewhere we have to draw a line and we are the disciplinary body of ourselves.

This comes to something else. We can impose discipline on members of the House who breach the rules of privilege. We can impose it and from time to time we do impose it and sometimes it is good that we are all brought up short because everybody from time to time has a tendency to be intemperate in language. But, you know, Mr. Speaker, we cannot have these sort of trials every day and we cannot have these sort of trials every week. The discipline of this House and the standing and the standard of this House is only going to mean something, is only going to have point, is only going to have standing in this community if we as members of the House impose this discipline upon ourselves individually.

It is all very well to get angry and it is all very well to have been upset. I have been upset at times in this House but I hope to God when this happens and when I do get upset that I can restrain my language, and I hope this for all of us, surely, if we are civilized people with some sense of respect for the people who put us here, surely we can restrain our language and keep it from the level which would not be tolerated in any other institution in the Province or the country. Surely, this House should set a standard which is above the average and the norm in the country, not a standard which is way down there

somewhere below a tavern.

That is the question here really, not whether it is one day or two days or ten days, not whether a person called a sot or struck somebody. It is a question of the overall standing and behaviour and standard of debate in this House because we have to remember, Mr. Speaker, that we were put here to debate the issues that affect Newfoundland, the issues that affect the governing of this Province within the provincial jurisdiction and the spending of the money of the people who pay that money in taxes. That is what we are here for and every minute and every moment that we forget that purpose then we are failing the people who put us here.

As long as I am in this House, whether it be a matter of days or weeks or months or years, Mr. Speaker, I hope and I pray that we do not have to have these sort of trials. This House is going to be enlarged in the future, in the next election, whenever it is, and there will be fifty-one members. If this sort of thing keeps on, it is going to be in even worse shambles. The Speaker of this House, Your Honour, is not like a judge in a court. Your Honour has not got that kind of authority. Your Honour has the authority to regulate debate between members, but it is only the members of the House itself and the members themselves that can really impose the kind of common sense and mature discipline without which this House will fail to function.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that this debate and this incident, sad though it is, if it serves no other purpose, it can bring this back home to us so that we can go on in the future without this sort of thing happening again.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable minister speaks now, he closes the debate.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the only substantive criticism that I have heard honourable members opposite with respect to this motion and the reason that was indicated that members opposite would be voting against this motion is because it was believed by them that the penalty being

imposed was not fair, that the penalty being imposed for the Leader of the Opposition was excessive and the submission was made that the action of the Member for St. Georges was so much more serious than the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition, that the same penalty should not be meted out. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition in this incident is much more serious, not that the action of the Member for St. Georges can be justified. It is not. It is wrong. Purely and simply, it is wrong, for any member or any citizen, for that matter, to resort to violence. But, Mr. Speaker, it is every bit as serious for irreparable damage to be done to a man's character as it is for a member to have an assault made upon his person. A person may very quickly get over the effects of a physical assault. I think we all know it is not that easy to get back a reputation or a good character once that has been taken away.

Now, the reason apparently that honourable members opposite submit that the Leader of the Opposition's conduct was not that serious was because, Mr. Speaker, as the Member for St. Barbe North, as the Member for Twillingate, as other members and the Leader of the Opposition himself indicated, was because allegedly the Leader of the Opposition did not know the circumstances, I believe, was the wording used by the honourable Member for St. Barbe North, did not have certain knowledge, Mr. Speaker, but when we ask what knowledge was it that made the difference we get some confusion. On the one hand, it now appears although this was in some doubt initially, it now appears that the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to admit that he knew that the honourable Member for St. Georges had a drinking problem.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: He agrees.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: You knew that he had a drinking problem.

MR. ROBERTS: - did last year -

MR. BARRY: So, apparently, Mr. Speaker, what makes the difference in

this case is whether the Leader of the Opposition knew that the Member for St. Georges had made this courageous battle and has mastered the problem, at least for now and we hope, I am sure everybody hopes, forever. But apparently, apparently, Mr. Speaker, this is the issue and if we look at it from another way, which is the only way that I can look at it, the direct inference that comes from that is that it is not as cruel, it is not as inhuman, it is not as shameful for the Leader of the Opposition to throw these barbs, to throw these taunts as long as he thinks that the honourable member is still trying to master his problem, is still battling against the problem.

Mr. Speaker, to me it is so much worse. If we accept, if we accept, if we accept that position taken by the Leader of the Opposition, he knowingly, knowing or he - sorry - he believed that the honourable member was engaged in a battle to attempt to master the problem. He knew that he had the problem of alcoholism. He believed that he had not managed to master it. So apparently he believed, Mr. Speaker, that it was all right, it was all right to throw these barbs, to throw these taunts despite the fact that he believed the honourable member was still engaged in the battle against this

dread affliction because that is what it is. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Hermitage asked how low can you get? Well, I could not agree more with the Hon. Member for St. John's North when he says that what we are talking about here is the standard of debate. That is the issue. That is the issue contained in this motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: The standard of decency -

MR. SIMMONS: Give us an example, Leo.

MR. BARRY: - the standard of fairness, Mr. Speaker -

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

MR. BARRY: - that should be set in this debate. And I believe it may be because of some character weakness of mine, Mr. Speaker, I may be missing something I believe, and I submit that all members of this House believe that the Leader of the Opposition knew what he was doing. He knew what he was doing.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman does not need to speak for us.

AN HON. MEMBER: I do not.

MR. SIMMONS: Speak for yourself but I did not know.

MR. REID: You keep quiet.

MR. BARRY: And it is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I have to view this -

MR. REID: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Listen to him.

MR. BARRY: - I have to view the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition with seriousness.

MR. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is the member for Placentia West's right to speak his mind on this but he cannot make generalizations which includes my consensus, because I do not agree. He just said that every member of the House agrees with the position. I do not agree with it. I have heard four or five other members who do not agree with what he is stating. Just let the

record show that he is not quoting us correctly and if he is going to quote what we said, the essence of what we said, he do so correctly or not do so at all. I do not agree with what he is saying at all although he has just said directly that I do, and I do not.

MR. BARRY: A difference of opinion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): A difference of opinion.

MR. BARRY: But what is it, Mr. Speaker, that I am misconstruing here? I was concerned when honourable members raised the matter of were we being too severe, I was concerned, Mr. Speaker. I thought that I should go back over the facts as I knew them and see if I was satisfied, if I was still satisfied that the position being taken was the proper one. I reviewed the fact, the comment made by honourable members opposite, that the circumstances of the honourable member's condition had been in the newspapers in 1971 and 1972. I looked at the reference to the Waterford Hospital in the statements by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I looked at the statements, the request by the member for St. George's to the Leader of the Opposition last Tuesday asking him to cease and desist from this line of questioning. And in the opinion of the Premier, who was there, there should be no question in anybody's mind after that was finished as to what the problem of the honourable member was that he was battling with. I looked at the fact that the member for St. Barbe North, the member for Twillingate, did not believe it necessary, and I can understand it, because I did not believe it necessary either to go over to the Leader of the Opposition and explain the honourable member's circumstances, because I believe, I reasonably believe and I submit other honourable members reasonably believe that the Leader of the Opposition had to know, he must have known what the condition was.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not correct. -

MR. BARRY: They say it is not correct. The Leader of the Opposition admits that he knew of the condition.

AN HON. MEMBER: Both the member for Twillingate -

MR. BARRY: So obviously he is saying that he does not know, the honourable member does not know or did not know that the problem

was being solved. Well the submission that I am making is that it is even more serious, it is even more serious, a line of approach to take, a systematic line of approach of throwing barbs and taunts at a particular member's weakness. If an honourable member of this House believes that the member is in the course of trying to master that problem or weakness it is even more serious.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to establish here - and it has to be done by way of the imposition of discipline, disciplinary measures. There is no other way when you reach this stage that it can be done but to establish a standard of decent debate of trying to define what is fair ball and what is not fair ball to use again honourable members' comments, to decide what is hitting above the belt and what is hitting below the belt. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that, and the vote will tell, that anybody who has been sitting in this House for the last several weeks is satisfied that there was a systematic and calculated attack on the Hon. Member for St. George's that could only be considered intolerable. And I challenge any member here to say that he would be able to sit down in the same circumstances and have this, listen to this day after day after day, Mr. Speaker. Now, as I say, there is no excuse for the action of the Hon. Member for St. George's, but I submit all honourable members can understand the awful pressure, the intolerable pressure that had to build up by this course of action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

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

MR. BARRY: Now the Hon. Member for Fogo mentioned how unfortunate it was that we had to debate the private life of the Hon. Member for St. George's in the House today. I agree, Mr. Speaker. It is unfortunate. It is unfortunate that we come to a stage when the only way we can protect an honourable member's private life, the only way we can protect an honourable member's character and reputation is by submitting it to the floor of this House for debate, because that

was the situation we found ourselves in, Mr. Speaker, and I submit it may be, Mr. Speaker, that we are all at fault. It may be that it was because of our concern for embarrassing the Hon. Member for St. George's, because we all knew of the problem and maybe it was just because we did not want to magnify these incidents when they came on the floor of the House and cause additional embarrassment to the Member for St. George's, that this unfortunate incident developed. Maybe we all contributed to it. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that it has come to a pretty stage when we have to submit the private life of an honourable member to the floor of this House in order to protect an honourable member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

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

Two honourable gentlemen to my right, the member for Bell Island and the member for Hermitage have consistently over the past ten minutes been interrupting the Minister of Mines and Energy. I have on a couple of occasions uttered the immortal words, "order, please" to no avail. I have taken this opportunity of bringing it to the honourable members' attention that these interjections are out of order. I hope I do not have to do it again.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I need not go into any great detail why this House must impose its own discipline. And apparently I got the impression today that some honourable members opposite are not aware of the fact that when we are in this honourable House engaged in the proceedings of this House that in one sense you are above the law in that anything that happens within this House, that is a breach of the privileges of this House, cannot be dealt with by the courts. It must be dealt with by members assembled here today.

MR. SIMMONS: : A kangaroo court.

MR. BARRY: Well if that is what the honourable member views the proceedings of this House as, a kangaroo court -

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

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible).

May 6, 1975

Tape no. 2075

Page 5 - mw

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - the honourable member had better explain.

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

The member for Hermitage is proceeding in a confrontation with the Chair. I have already brought it to the honourable member's attention that interruptions were to cease. They are completely out of order, unparliamentary and it has been brought to his attention. Evidentially on the first opportunity he has again continued these interruptions.

MR. SIMMONS: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I was exercising, I was operating on a precedent of this House. I was being provoked by the Member for Placentia West. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in a ruling, and I quote this as a precedent, Mr. Speaker, a ruling yesterday in reference to some remarks, some interjections that were made by the Member for St. Georges, as it happens, ruled that the Member for St. Georges had no choice but to reply to the remarks because they were provoking. I, Mr. Speaker, submit that I had no choice but to reply to the remarks that had been made. For the same reason I say there has been a precedent on the matter.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! Order, please! Well, in the opinion of the Chair, humbly as it is, there is humble disagreement, the honourable member has not been so provoked that he has no choice but to reply, not in the way in which he did. If the honourable member has a point of privilege or a point of order there is a way to do it. It is not to sit back in his seat and snipe at the member who is speaking. That is not the way to do it. The honourable member has been here long enough to know that and while he is here and the Chair has brought it to his attention, he is on his notice. The Chair has no alternative but to enforce these rules. So, the honourable member's point of privilege is not a point of privilege and he has again been put on his notice.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it was raised today that this is not something that should be dealt with by this House, that this was a political forum. It was suggested that possibly the legal action would be more appropriate. Mr. Speaker, the question of privileges of the House and the necessity for having certain privileges of the House go back a long way. I submit, back even before the time of the honourable Member for Hermitage. If you want to check any of the books, Mr. Speaker, you will find that not all of the privileges, but certain of these privileges are very jealously guarded by this House, by the Canadian House of Commons, the Senate, the British House of Parliament. Just to quote from Beauchesne, "The House has always asserted the right to provide for the constitution of its own body, the right to regulate its own

proceedings and the right to enforce its privileges. The House of Commons, as an example, has the exclusive power of interpreting a statute so far as the regulation of its own walls is concerned and even if that interpretation should be erroneous the court has no power to interfere with it directly or indirectly." Now, I am just using that, Mr. Speaker, to show the seriousness of what we are involved in here today. When we move to discipline any member of this House we are in effect acting as the ultimate court as far as that particular incident is concerned. Therefore it is a step that should not be taken lightly nor, Mr. Speaker, I would submit is it a step that should be brought into contempt by allegations such as that is a kangaroo court or by allegations that it is political motives that are bringing about the action.

This motion has become necessary because there has been a serious breach of discipline, a serious breach of the privileges of this House by two honourable members. One has been dealt with. This motion is set out to deal with the other submitted breach of privilege. But let us not underplay the need for putting this motion, for the House voting on this motion and supporting this motion because I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition in this case is to go unchallenged, if we accept the inference arising from the remarks of the honourable Member for St. Barbe North, for whom I have the greatest respect, Mr. Speaker, or the remarks of the honourable Member for Twillingate, two honourable members for which I have the highest respect, and it is all the more reason why, you know, it is sad and depressing to see the argument that they are putting forth because their arguments, much more than anything I could say, support the position taken by the Member for Bell Island that this sort of thing will happen again. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this sort of thing surely will happen again, particularly if we accept what I submit, respectfully submit, is a serious error in logic. If we accept the inference that because the Leader of the Opposition did not know that

the honourable member had mastered his problem, that therefore it was not all that serious what the Leader of the Opposition was doing, that therefore somehow or other it becomes all right. If we accept that the meaning of if you cannot take the heat, do not stay in the kitchen, if we assume that that means that as long as you have some basis, however tenuous, for assuming that an honourable member has a particular weakness, that therefore you are entitled as another member of this House to get up and throw taunts and barbs and insults with respect to that particular weakness of that particular member, if we assume that, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for Bell Island is perfectly correct. It will happen quite often, I submit, that we will have breaches of the privileges of this House. It will turn into a bear pit, Mr. Speaker.

No member of this House can be permitted to interfere with, to damage the character and reputation of another member. If that were permitted, Mr. Speaker, it would be the end, as far as I am concerned, for one of the few institutions of a free democracy that have been built up over the years. I heard the Premier mention today, the Member for St. John's North referred to it, how do you expect to attract people to get into politics if coming in they know they are going to be subjected to this sort of conduct. How do you keep the members that you have in and how do you keep respect for this House?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask that all members of this House support this motion. I think the reason for the motion has been clearly set out in the course of debate, an unnecessarily lengthy debate, Mr. Speaker, but that is passed now. I ask all honourable members to avoid the brutalizing conduct that we have seen here, the degrading conduct that we have seen here and let us all get back to doing what we were elected to do and that is making laws, Mr. Speaker, to protect the interests of the people of this Province. So, I move, Mr. Speaker, that the motion be now put.

May 6, 1975.

Tape 2076

RH - 4

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): The motion is that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition be suspended from this honourable House for two sitting days. Those in favour of the motion "aye", those opposed "nay". In my opinion the "ayes" have it. Noted on division. The motion is carried.

It is also noted that today's sitting constitutes the first day of the honourable member's suspension as with the honourable member for St. Georges.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put the same question, Sir, that I put to the honourable the Premier yesterday about the economic condition of Western Newfoundland as a result of the Bowaters closedown, Atlantic Gypsum closedown, North Star Cement closedown, the Linerboard Mill closedown, I asked the Premier yesterday if he would get me some information concerning these closedowns, if any jobs would be lost permanently as a result of the closedowns, what effect if any the closures are going to have on the economic state of the western part of the Province and the Premier promised to get me the information today, Sir, I hope he is in a position now to make a statement.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The honourable the Premier.

MR. MOORES: I have to apologize to the honourable Member for Bell Island, Mr. Speaker. Today was, I think, an unusual day and I have to apologize for not having gotten the information. I do apologize.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I trust the honourable the Premier will get the information tomorrow, also the information on Price Newfoundland Limited, how many closedowns they are going to have this year?

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable the Premier would react to a statement, the day before yesterday, I think that originated in Ottawa that housing starts in Newfoundland are going to be down substantially this year, Does the Premier know anything about that and if so would the Premier tell the House just what is happening concerning housing starts in Newfoundland?

MR. MOORES: No, I do not, Mr. Speaker. I do know that housing starts have been down considerably here for the first part of the year, as they have been all over Canada, as I understand. I have been in touch with the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Commission, They expect a considerable upturn, it is almost imminent, but housing starts have been down everywhere and all I can say, Sir, is that I have been advised that they expect an upturn very quickly and you know housing starts in this Province really are not very material starts until April-May because the construction season only begins then. I think it will be probably June before we get an accurate

figure as to if they are down or up.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, another question for the honourable the Premier, Sir. Would the honourable the Premier tell the House when the actual construction will commence on the expansion to the Come By Chance Oil Refinery, when men will be hired for construction? Will it start this year? Just what is the situation now? Could the Premier update the Come By Chance Oil Refinery expansion for us?

MR. MOORES: That has been answered, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier aware that it is several weeks now since it has been answered, I am asking the Premier to update -

MR. MOORES: Yes, any answer is no different.

MR. NEARY: Well what is the answer? Could the Premier repeat the answer so we will refresh our memory.

MR. MOORES: I strongly recommend the Member for Bell Island look it up in Hansard, Mr. Speaker. The answer that was given, very briefly, is when the British Guarantee, the ECGD, the Export Credit Division of the British Government, when they have given approval to the plans that have gone in and with changing times, recessions, the recession as it is, and the changing times in the oil business, until such time as they have given their okay, the project, we are, you know, have established our position but we must have the British Government's go ahead before anything can start.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question concerning this matter, Sir. Would the Premier indicate if there are any ongoing discussions now with Mr. Shaheen and his group? Just what sort of discussions are taking place? Are they here in Newfoundland, in New York or in Europe, if there are any discussions going on at the moment? Would the Premier care to tell the House just what is happening?

MR. MOORES: The only discussions at the moment, Mr. Speaker, are literally by telephone. We have not had Mr. Shaheen or his people here nor have we been in New York. I do know Mr. Shaheen's people are in London on a fairly

continuous basis, talking to the British Government and as I say, until such time as something has been clarified there, there is really not much point our talking to them other than to insist as we do to try to get them to come to a conclusive position.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for the President of the Treasury Board, Sir, Would the President of the Treasury Board care to confirm or deny public reports that the Liquor Store at Burgeo is open, that the doors have not been locked as the House was told by the Minister of Mines and Energy when he was Acting President of the Treasury Board that all liquor stores in Newfoundland had been closed.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. DOODY: All the liquor stores in the Province of Newfoundland that are operated by the Newfoundland Liquor Commission are closed, Mr. Speaker. There are six agency stores which are operated by individuals, not by the Newfoundland Liquor Commission. One of these stores is situated in Burgeo. I would be very surprised if that store were closed because it is run by an individual who is not associated with the Union. It is his own private business. I would be amazed if he is closed. I imagine the only thing that would close it would be pressure of business. I understand that he is quite active.

There is one in Trepassy also which is doing extremely well, I understand, and there are four others in other parts of the Province, I imagine that they are also getting an indirect benefit from the unfortunate strike but certainly since it is not unionized it is extremely unlikely that they are closed.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable the minister could tell the House, Sir, if there are any new developments on the strike of employees of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation, any effort made to get the parties back to the bargaining table yet?

MR. DOODY: We are, as I explained or expressed to the House a day or so ago, Mr. Speaker, we are most anxious to get back to the bargaining table. We are most anxious to talk about the matter. I understand that

some representation has been made to the Department of Industrial Relations, Manpower and Industrial Relations. I understand that efforts are being made to bring both sides together. There is still a pretty wide gap in the positions of both sides but I would hope that they will get together pretty quickly. They are starting to get rather difficult. There are quite a number of people who I imagine are feeling the pinch by now, quite apart from the strikers.

MR. NEARY: We are all parched.

MR. DOODY: All parched.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not know who is acting Minister of Fisheries, is the Premier acting Minister of Fisheries?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

CAPT. WINSOR: Well, whoever is acting Minister of Fisheries, the honourable Minister of Agriculture^{?)} is he aware that many fishermen in Conception and Trinity Bay suffered storm damage, gear damage and I think as well along the Northeast Coast there was some damage suffered by the last storm of last week, how will compensation be paid, if so how soon can they expect it?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Fisheries (Acting).

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the problems, some of the officials in the Department of Fisheries called me on it this afternoon. The situation is being investigated and as soon as we get a full report on it then it will receive the consideration of the government.

CAPT. WINSOR: Have you any idea of approximate time?

MR. COLLINS: Well just as soon as the information can be put together, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of Treasury Board, Sir, would the President of Treasury Board care to tell the House if it is government policy for departments to rent cars for the use of ministers when their own private cars are out of commission, in for

repairs, is this government policy to hire rented cars for ministers?

MR. DOODY: No, Mr. Speaker, that is not government policy. To the best of my knowledge it is not being done or has not been done. There is no such policy. I understand Ministers of the Crown receive a car allowance which compensates them for use of vehicles. I do not see any hiring of cars -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary, would the minister undertake to investigate this matter, to see if any ministers have in actual fact rented cars at the public expense when their own cars are in for repairs?

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of investigating the car driving habits of all of my colleagues, if the honourable member has some particular accusation that he wants to bring against a particular minister then I suggest that he do that but - now this is another one of these smear, innuendo jobs, now it appears that the entire front bench of the government is running around to the rental car agencies hiring motor cars at taxpayers' expense. This just is not so, Sir. I am not going to investigate some nebulous charge which is really not a charge at all. It is just another one of these hints, or smears.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, it is not a smear, Sir. I am asking the minister, Sir, if this is happening would the minister investigate and make a report to the House?

MR. DOODY: If you can demonstrate that it is happening, certainly yes.

MR. NEARY: Well, I will give the minister the information outside the House.

MR. DOODY: Right. Do not forget.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. DOODY: No, I would be glad to give it to the minister inside the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Sir, I wonder if the President of Treasury Board would tell the House how many students will be hired for summer relief in the public

service this year?

MR. DOODY: I do not know the exact number, Sir, but there will be a considerable number. All departments will be hiring some. There are also additional students, university students, who will be brought in under the policy of government of hiring a specific number of new university students each year. I do not know what the number will be. If the exact number is of importance to the member I can certainly obtain it for him. Do you want it by district also or -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question, would the minister tell the House if any special arrangements will be made for students in Corner Brook who are unable to get jobs this year as a result of a cut-back in the Bowaters Operation, North Star Cement Operation, Atlantic

gypsum operation in the Linerboard Mill at Stephenville, any provision made for these students to get jobs?

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the situation in Corner Brook, the Premier has undertaken to get the information for the honourable member.

MR. NEARY: Concerning the close down.

MR. DOODY: The honourable member is intimating now that there is going to be some great long term economic close out in the Corner Brook area. My information, and I do not have the full figures on it, is that this is not the case. But the preliminary indications that I have is that most of these firms that he mentioned will have layoffs of about two weeks or so or shutdowns for about two weeks or so. The exact information on that the Premier has undertaken to provide for the honourable gentleman tomorrow. As for specific plans to look after this two week period for the students in Corner Brook, certainly nothing specific for that one particular town has been done. We are doing everything that we possibly can to provide as much student employment as can be done for the entire population of the Province for the coming season.

MR. NEARY: Of course, Mr. - a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The honourable minister would not be aware of statements that were made by two companies on the West Coast because the minister was away on vacation, but is the minister aware that Bowaters and North Star Cement have definitely stated that they would not be able to employ students this coming summer? That is why I am asking the minister if the government has considered any special arrangements to employ these students.

MR. DOODY: As I have just indicated, Sir, the Premier has undertaken to get that information for the honourable member by tomorrow. If there is a specific exclusion of students from these particular companies certainly we will have a particularly hard look at that particular situation. As the member has indicated I have been away for some time. He has also got that point across, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. NEARY: Go ahead.

MR. SIMMONS: A question for the acting Minister of Fisheries. I understand that the Chairman of the Committee, the Select Committee on Fisheries, may be ill. Will this affect the reporting date of the Committee, to the House, that is, and in particular does it affect the holding of any future hearings around the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Fisheries, acting.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I just became aware of the fact that our colleague, the honourable Member for Placentia East is ill. I do not know the extent of his illness. I will certainly take the question under advisement and try and get some information for the honourable member. I do not know how long. I will certainly look into the situation.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, for the minister's benefit the member is in hospital. Perhaps he will take it under advisement. A question for the Minister of Transportation: Would he indicate the status of the DREE agreement as it affects highways? Has it been signed and if so when and what are some of the details of it, the amounts and so on?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, Mr. Speaker, it has not been signed. I was talking to Mr. Jamieson's office, say, Wednesday. I think it was late last week. We have some tenders which have now come in and which we would like to award in the very near future and we brought it to the attention of Mr. Jamieson's Executive Assistant. He was in Cabinet at the time and I am now in the midst of drafting a telegram to Mr. Jamieson which I would expect will get off tomorrow or next day, tomorrow I hope, to indicate to him that tenders are now being received and that we would like to award them. Again, it is up there. We are waiting for the signature and I have an indication it should be signed, again, imminently. I hate to keep using that word but I can only say we are told. But we have brought to his attention that several tenders have now been received. They are working in Burgeo, as a matter of fact.

We had a couple of more closed recently and as soon as we receive a reply from the telegram, at least to allow us to proceed with the award of tenders on the projects that we have received before the signing, as long as we have his okay to do so we will take his word they will be included.

Right now, no, the agreement has not been signed and as I have suggested to the House previously that when it is signed, it will be, I presume as is in the past, a joint announcement, the federal and provincial ministers responsible.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Do I understand the Minister of Transportation to say then that the tenders which have been received for various jobs including Bay D'Espoir Highway, Burgeo and others, those jobs in which tenders have closed and a low bidder has been determined that in none of those cases has the contract actually been awarded? Is that correct?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, they have not been yet and that is the tone of the telegram that I will be sending Mr. Jamieson in anticipation of the signing of the total agreement. We will ask that these tenders be allowed to be awarded and with his okay that they will be included. If Mr. Jamieson should wire back, it is not our intention to award any tender unless we have concrete evidence that it will be included in the agreement. But either verbally, I will accept Mr. Jamieson's word verbally, as a matter of fact, but if he says it is in the agreement then I am prepared to award the tenders. But unless I have his word that it is in the agreement then I am not prepared to award the tender.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, just one other supplementary on the same subject to the minister. Do I understand then, Mr. Speaker, is that the low bidders have had no instructions from the minister's department to proceed with the work, no authorization at this point in time?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Which one are you talking about now?

MR. SIMMONS: Well, any of the jobs which would involve joint financing,

May 6, 1975.

Tape 2078

RH - 4

DREE and provincial financing. Do I understand from the minister that in those cases where a low bidder has been determined that the low bidder has not been instructed to proceed with the work?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Is the honourable member trying by a very circuitous route to get down to the Burgeo situation?

MR. SIMMONS: No, no.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The Burgeo situation as they were told in all probability that it would be included. That is the only one we have any - But the other one, no, they have not been and I would hope they have not been. I have not authorized them to be told and I hope they have not been told. Until I have a definite commitment from Mr. Jamieson that the contracts are going to be honoured in the agreement then the contract will not be awarded. You know, as far as I am concerned I have not given any authorization for the award of any contract. We will wire them. As I say for those we have now ready to award and hopefully he will let us award any one while he has the total agreement in abeyance for signature.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. W. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to the honourable House through you, Sir, on the results of an investigation which was recently carried out into allegations of a motor car rental trickery by members of the Cabinet. I am pleased to report, Sir, that my investigation has demonstrated the fact that one minister is indeed driving a rental car. He obtained it through virtue of his own good credit standing at Hertz and is using his own hard earned dollars to pay for it. The scandal has really not materialized and I must disappoint the honourable Member from Bell Island once again.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: I am glad I have managed to keep the government honest again, Sir.

MR. DOODY: Another coup.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Premier is outside there in the corridors, Sir, and I have a question for the honourable the Premier. If he can hear me, would the Premier, S.O.S. please, come to his seat. Would the honourable Premier come to his seat?

MR. DOODY: You manage to keep talking.

MR. NEARY: The question I want to put to the honourable Premier is this, Sir, if he is listening to me. Has the Premier had any representation from any organizations in Newfoundland to have his government direct the Public Utilities Commission to hold regional hearings in connection with the application on behalf of the Newfoundland Light and Power Company for an increase in rates? Sir, perhaps the Minister of Mines and Energy might want to answer the question in the Premier's absence. But I understand, Sir, there have been representations -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Member for Bell Island is now proceeding to make a speech.

The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: He is asking a question and answering it, Mr. Speaker, which is a good tactic. Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any formal representation that has been made. The President of the Federation of Municipalities made a statement to this effect in the course of a speech made in the presence of both myself and the honourable the Premier. I think it should be pointed out that government cannot order the Public Utilities Board to do whatever government wants, and that this Board is set up in the fashion of a court, as an independent body, to determine the reasonableness of any application for rate increases or other matters relating to utilities. But I can say that this government supports the principle of full and complete hearings being given on any rate increase or other matter that the public or any group indicates, or any individual for that matter, indicates that a hearing is needed. I know that the Public Utilities Board, in my experience, has always acted fairly in this sort of situation and I am sure the same procedures will be followed in the future as they have followed in the past and that full and complete hearings will be given.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question. Would the minister tell the House if he has yet received a report from the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Corporation in connection with the recent application by Newfoundland Light and Power Company and if so what does the minister intend to do about this report?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What report?

MR. NEARY: The minister promised the House, Sir - let me refresh his memory - that the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Corporation were investigating the application because they has applied for more than they had promised the minister they were going to apply for. Instead of applying for five per cent, they had applied for fifteen per cent, approximately fifteen. The minister told us the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Corporation was looking into it. Well, what is happening on it?

MR. BARRY: Sit down and I will tell you.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would like to check Hansard, at no time did I say that the members of the Power Corporation would be checking into this. The members of the Power Corporation, the Newfoundland Hydro have nothing to do with Newfoundland Light and Power. I said that officials of the Department of Mines and Energy will be looking at the evidence presented by the Newfoundland Light and Power Company. This is presently being done, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to point out that there is a considerable quantity of material, I think some 300 pages approximately, which were delivered to my office during the last week. This is presently being looked at. Mr. Speaker, if government decides that further action is necessary, government will be taking it. Again I must point out, as I pointed out in the House earlier, that on a rate application such as this the Public Utilities Board has the authority to retain any consultants, any assistance that is necessary, whether they be engineers, accountants, economists or whoever else, to ensure that they adequately access the evidence given in justification for a rate increase.

Now, unless a government feels that there is any special circumstance arising in this case, the normal procedures would

prevail here. It may not be that there is any. There has been no special circumstance brought to my attention yet. But again I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have not completed our analysis of the evidence. If some special circumstance does come up, I will bring it to the attention of the honourable member.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. When can we expect to get the report from the minister's officials who apparently are having a mini hearing. I mean, this is what it amounts to. When will we get the report?

MR. BARRY: We are not having any hearing.

MR. NEARY: But, the hearings of the Public Utilities Commission start very soon, I think it is next week sometime. When will the minister be in a position to report to the House on his mini hearing?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would let me out of the honourable House to get back to the office and do a bit of work - that is said in jest, Mr. Speaker. The problem is that it has to be the decision of the minister as to what if any action is necessary. With the sittings of the House up to now, Mr. Speaker, I have not had the opportunity to complete my analysis of the evidence that has been delivered to the office. I hope that within a very few days, as soon as I have a chance to finish reading this, Mr. Speaker, this, I might add, very voluminous brief presented, I will get the information back to the honourable member.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Industrial Development, Sir. In view of the slump, Sir, in the paper markets of the world at the present time, would the minister tell the House if there are any discussions current, going on at the present time concerning a third paper mill for Come By Chance?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. DOODY: To the best of my knowledge there is no paper mill at Come By Chance, not a first nor a second and I sincerely doubt very much if there is going to be a third in the immediate future.

I am well aware of the fact that there is a tremendous slump in the paper markets of the world. As a matter of fact, Bowaters

and Price have both announced it and so has the linerboard mill. I can assure you that the members of this honourable House are doing everything they can to use up all the paper that they possibly can. Anybody who has been in any of the offices in the building has certainly seen tremendous amounts of paper being shuffled back and forth. Apart from that, Sir, there is very little that we can do about the market conditions.

Forecasts are more favorable in the long term, Sir, than they are in the short term, but that is of little consolation to those people who would be laid off for maybe a couple of weeks or so during the coming season.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, another question for the Minister of Industrial Development, Sir. When the oil refinery was built at Come By Chance we were told that this was the foundation for a great petro-chemical complex. Would the minister tell the House if there are any possibilities at all now after three years of his administration of a petrochemical complex being established at Come By Chance as an off shoot from the oil refinery?

MR. DOODY: As the honourable economic Czar across the way is undoubtedly aware, Sir, the original design of his administration or the original design that was worked on by the previous administration did not at any time incorporate the necessary machinery or components for the ethylene capacity that is necessary for a petrochemical plant. He has asked me if there is any possibility in the future of their being a petrochemical industry at Come By Chance and I am certainly delighted to say yes, there is a very marked possibility, but it is a possibility. Before it can become a reality, there have to be certain components added to the existing plant, a hydrogen cracker and various other items which are quite expensive and quite sophisticated. Before a petrochemical complex can be built out there these components have to be put in place.

There are no immediate plans at the present time to put this thing in place. Once again it is a matter of financing. We have talked to the principals about this on several occasions on many occasions and

they are considering it. They are looking into it, and we are trying to persuade them that they should go along that route. Hopefully we will be successful in convincing them, and more particularly in convincing their financiers that this is a desirable course of action to follow.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. BARRY: Address in Reply, Mr. Speaker, Order No. 1.

MR. SPEAKER: The Address in Reply. I think the honourable Leader of the Opposition adjourned the debate, but he is not with us tonight. So, I recognize the honourable member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it now that we have defeated the frivolous and Biblically phrased Opposition amendment, we are now back on the main motion. The Speech from the Throne allows speakers to range far and wide. In fact anything that I say cannot be ruled out of order. There is a tradition of this House and I suppose of all the provincial Houses across Canada, that there are two times when a member may get up and speak on anything, provided, always provided that the laws of decency and good taste apply.

So, rather than mention a whole lot of items, I thought I would not waste my ammunition but would restrict it to three or four, because I am quite aware that the world will little note nor long remember what we say here. First of all though, I would like to make specific reference to an honourable member of this House. I feel that this House would be remiss in its duty if it did not take note of the presence during the last two and a half years of the Member for Labrador South, Mike Martin. As far as I am concerned he has lifted the practice of politics far above that of personal interest. Evidence of the respect in which he was held is the complete silence and attention that prevailed whenever he rose to speak, which was not too often because he only spoke when he had something to say.

He choose not to align himself with either of the major parties in this Province, preferring issues to alliances. But, I suggest that his name is just as current in Labrador as the names of either of the two aforementioned parties. The loyalty that he

May 6, 1975

Tape 2079 (night)

IR-5

inspired has been just as fierce. His resignation is either now or will be soon lodged with yourself Mr. Speaker. When it is acknowledged, I would like to ask you that you pass along the high regard of all the members and our sincere best wishes in the new role he has chosen for himself. We know it will be an unselfish one. I think by the comments that I hear around that this sentiment is unanimously endorsed.

I think at the same time, although the second member that I would like to talk about has not resigned from this House he has given notice that he is resigning from the cabinet, namely, Dr. Rowe, the Member for Carbonear. And I would just like to note in passing that I feel that this is a loss to the administration, and I feel that he has done an extremely good job during his tenure there.

I have already had opportunity to speak highly of him in caucus. But I would like to read into the record now the fact that I think that his tenure as Minister of Health was a very successful one and he gave unselfishly of his time and energy. And I think we all regret the fact that he is not going to be any longer a member of the administration, although he will be an active member of the House.

The next topic that I would like to take up is one that is extremely close to my district, in fact, with the exception of the Member for St. John's South, mine is the only district, the district of St. John's North where an urban renewal development is still taking place. And I would like to put into the record now some recommendations that I have been making all along, and some of the arguments that I have been making in support of the unanimously passed resolution last year asking the administration to bring in legislation to give a house for a house in matters of expropriation.

There can be little justification for replacing a \$200 shack with a \$35,000 home, complete with all conveniences. Few governments could stand the cost, and no government could justify the attempt. Happily there are very few, if any, such homes remaining. However there have been some basic changes in housing in the last ten years. The Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, more commonly known as CMHC has become a pivotal institution in the realm of housing, and has enforced much higher standards than were formerly accepted. No mortgage money is available for substandard housing. Neither the Department of Health nor the many municipalities will tolerate unplanned, or unserviced homes to be erected. So the following situation is all too typical.

A house built over twenty years ago on what was then the fringe of the municipal area may be built on concrete or wooded piles. It may be far too close to adjacent buildings and if it has services, chances are they would not pass inspection today. Nevertheless, this hypothetical house, of which many examples exist, may well be roomy, well heated and because of its location may be immune to the storms that would otherwise blow through it. Chances are it may have been added to in an unplanned way, and although these additions are useful the whole house may be ugly and actually these additions may detract from its value. Problems only arise when this house is sold. While adequate for the occupants for which it may retain cherished memories, when viewed objectively it is seen for what it is, a substandard house impossible to modernize.

If and when it becomes necessary to expropriate such a house even paying generous market value will not prevent gross distress to the occupant. Inflation and an unprecedented low vacancy rate has rendered a comparable replacement impossible to find and the beleaguered occupant is forced into the market for new houses. This is the reality of the situation however generous the offer seems to be on the surface. Therefore, in order to be fair it is necessary when forcibly expropriating a private home to pay a price sufficiently high to enable the occupant to purchase a decent new home within a comparable area.

It may be argued that the government of the day lacks sufficient funds to embark on such an imaginative path. In that case, let the government guarantee private owners that it will leave them alone until such funds are available.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we were advised by the Acting House Leader tonight, only a few minutes ago, that this House is better advised to turn away from barren disputation and to get down to the business of passing laws to protect the people of this Province.

And I can think in my humble opinion of no law that would better serve to protect the people of this Province than a law enshrining the principle of a house for a house. As I said earlier it was a matter that was discussed at great length during Private Members' Day last year and the principle was unanimously endorsed by this House. Both sides took part in the debate, no one disagreed with the principle and right now there are a few houses, I could mention names and cases if I were forced to, I do not intend to but if asked I can supply names and addresses of people who are about to suffer undue hardship as a result of the Mundy Pond Urban Renewal Scheme.

AN HON. MEMBER: A house for a house.

MR. CARTER: A house for a house. And I feel that these people should be guaranteed, because of the change in circumstances, because of the inflationary situation, because of the shortage of houses, I think these people should be guaranteed that when it comes to the crunch government will see that they get a comparable house for a house that is expropriated without any undue hardship or cost to themselves. I think this is a very important point and I wish it to be so noted.

Another point that I would like to discuss, and fortunately all these points are relevant because of the rules of this House, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Are what? Relevant?

MR. CARTER: Are relevant. They are all relevant. We can all say anything provided we observe the - the only limits we have to observe are those of good taste and anything goes. So - I would like to mention another sore point with me and that is the Arterial Road which forms the boundary between the existing District of St. John's North and St. John's South. To complete it will cost in the realm, cost somebody, in the realm of \$30 million to \$40 millions. I understand that the Federal Government is willing to participate on a seventy-five/twenty-five basis, that is to say,

seventy-five federal twenty-five per cent provincial.

However, I would like to see this development at least delayed for a while so that some of that money can be used for what I consider to be an urgently needed upgrading of the existing Kenmount Road.

MR. NEARY: Are they still blockbusting down there?

MR. CARTER: Pardon?

MR. NEARY: Are they still blockbusting down there?

MR. CARTER: Blockbusting where?

MR. NEARY: Tearing down some of the houses along the route.

MR. CARTER: No. The Member for Bell Island has asked if they are still tearing down some of the houses along the route. What is happening is that the proposed route brings the Arterial Road right into City Hall, and houses that have caught fire or that sustained damage are not being repaired. The Brownsdale Hotel, I believe, was demolished. There is another store near there that caught fire a little while ago. It is not being repaired - I do not think. There are a number of other houses that are certainly not being repaired, and anyone who owns property along that route is not about to spend any great amount of money repairing their houses. However, I would like to see that the money that is allegedly set aside for this project be diverted to what I consider to be the urgent necessity of widening the Kenmount Road also in the District of St. John's North.

I realize I may range far beyond the boundaries of my district but it is customary in this debate to talk about one's own district first, anyway.

AN HON. MEMBER: - that new road -

MR. CARTER: The ring road? The ring road is the -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CARTER: Well, for the honourable gentleman's further information, as I understand it there is to be a crosstown arterial, the idea of which is to connect up all the existing main arteries in the city. I have said in the past that I would rather

see the crosstown arterial built before the main arterial road is
brought in to Downtown St. John's.

MR. NEARY: I agree with that.

MR. CARTER: The ring

road is much further in the future. The so-called ring road is one that will surround the city and bring traffic all the way from the Waterford Bridge Road area right around to the Logy Bay Road skirting the fringes of the city. That is much farther in the future. The only thing that I can say is that I wish the route of it would settle down because I have had a number of complaints from people who say, well, we think we are in path of the ring road. We are not allowed to build. We are not allowed to put on additions. We are not allowed to sell. We are not allowed to buy. We are not allowed to do anything. We would like government to speak loudly and clearly on this situation so that we may know what is to become of us. And I would urge government to do just that.

The chief point, however, that I wish to make tonight is I wish some of this \$40 million could be set aside immediately this summer to widen the Kenmount Road into at least four lanes. The shoulders are already there. It would take very little extra fill to make the road a bit wider. It is only necessary to put up guardrails and to extend the paving. And anyone who lives -

AN HON. MEMBER: How far out?

MR. CARTER: Well as far out as we possibly can. Once you pass the so-called overpass over Topsail Road, if the road becomes three or four lanes and then it soon becomes a divided highway going out to the intersection of the -

MR. NEARY: I would like to see it go all the way to Holyrood.

MR. CARTER: Well, the member for Bell Island says he would like to see it all the way to Holyrood. Perhaps that would be a good idea. However, at least it should be brought to the Overpass because there is a tremendous bottleneck of traffic there both in the morning and in the afternoon. And if we were to add up the cost. the cumulative cost of all the time that is spent and wasted in traffic jams and if there were some way of putting a price on all the frayed nerves and the lost tempers, then, I think, that that amount of money

would more than suffice to widen that existing road. So I would recommend that to the administration, and I hope that my words will not fall on deaf ears, at least, they are being magnificent and recorded -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. CARTER: - and presumably somebody may read them.

The last point that I would like to make is something that is not terribly important. There are a lot of other things I could mention, but I will restrict myself to this last point, and that is Newfoundland time. It used to be called Anderson time, after John Anderson who popularized it here in Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ted Anderson.

MR. CARTER: No, John Anderson. He was a member of the Upper House back around the time of the first World War. The idea of Anderson time, as it was called, that is to advance the clocks an hour in the Spring and retard them an hour in the Fall, was to give people more time to spend in the summer after supper in daylight.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CARTER: During the last war we went on double summertime, that is to say the clocks were advanced still another hour making it a total of two hours. At the moment Newfoundland time is half an hour different from Atlantic Eastern Daylight Time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Standard.

MR. CARTER: Sorry, Atlantic Standard Time. And there was a movement a little while ago to bring our time back to that of Nova Scotia. But fortunately that was defeated. I am suggesting now that Newfoundland time be permanently moved ahead one-half hour. This has been popularized by other people in the past. But what makes me consider it to be of vital importance is the fact that it is quite dark in the months of November, December around the time that school children are returning home from school. And I feel it is a danger and that if the extra half hour were to be permanently added to our time all the year round it would be safer for children coming home from school.

It would be more convenient in the summer. After all how many members here get up at four o'clock in the morning? Does the Hon. Member for Harbour Main get up at four o'clock in the morning?

MR. DOODY: I got savoury in my yard.

MR. CARTER: Does the member for Gander get up at four o'clock in the morning, every morning in the summer?

MR. COLLINS: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: Would he not rather get up at four thirty?

Would he not like to sleep in for another half hour?

MR. DOODY: You are a good man John.

MR. CARTER: Anyhow I will leave that with honourable members for their consideration, five points altogether. There are a few words that I did want to say about the member for Labrador South, and I did want to make mention of the present Minister of Health, the member for Carbonear. I did want to mention this house for a house legislation. I think it is very important. I have some copies of what I said if the press are interested. The arterial road, I think, should be looked at long and hard. And perhaps this Summer we might get an extra half hour of daylight. I should really speak to the Minister of Toussim. I think it will make some difference to tourists. So, I suppose, I should end, Mr. Speaker, by saying that we should thank His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor for reading the Speech from the Throne. After all, that is what this debate is about. I have made a few recommendations to the administration. I hope they will be looked at, listened to, perhaps even acted on. And I look forward to another active year of legislative debate, harangue, discussion, input -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: not interspersed with the kind of acrimony that we had today and yesterday. So thank you, Mr. Speaker, That is all I have to say for the moment.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I believe I am the last person on this side of the House to speak on the main debate on the Throne Speech, and it is my understanding, with the Acting Leader of the House of Assembly

that unless I am very provocative there will not be a long list of speakers on the other side, because obviously if there were going to be a great number of speakers on the other side, I would like to reserve my time until later on. So I assume that the gentleman's agreement still exists unless I am extremely provocative.

Now, Sir, I will not be too long on this Address in Reply. I stand here, Sir, sort of making a farewell speech, believe it or not. It is conceivable that this will be a farewell speech for me with respect to my particular district. Sir, the Hon. Member for Labrador South yesterday resigned from his seat. He elected for reasons of his own to leave the political arena and leave his district in this particular case. Sir, in my particular case -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: - it is the same result but for a different reason. Because of redistribution, Sir, I find that in the event that there is an election between now and the next Address in Reply, if there is an election, there will be no St. Barbe North. However, Sir, I am still the member for that particular district until the election is called, and I would just like to take a few short moments to point out once again a few of the major problems existing in the district of St. Barbe North. One third of it will become, the third South of Plum Point will become a part of the new district of St. Barbe. And the Northern two-thirds will become a part of the new district of the Straits of Belle Isle. And it is my understanding that the Leader of the Opposition will be seeking the nomination for the Straits of Belle Isle, and it is still my understanding that the present member for St. Barbe South will seek the nomination for the new district of St. Barbe. So, Sir, if they are within hearing distance, I would like them to know that all of the major problems that existed at the time I became elected to that district still exist.

Now, Sir, honourable members can say, poor member. Well, if they want to say that, fine and dandy.

But, Sir, the fact of the matter is that there is 100 miles of the Great Northern Peninsula Highway going through that district and not one single inch of pavement exists on that Highway nor on any of the branch roads to the communities or on any of the community roads. Honourable members may say that what happened over the past twenty-three years, why, you know, have not more been done. Well, the fact of the matter, Sir, is I can remember as a university student back in - no, high school student back in 1956, I believe, working on a geological survey up there when there was not even a road. So, a road has been pushed through to St. Anthony along the Great Northern Peninsula Highway but the constituents of St. Barbe North, Sir, feel very strongly that they have not been dealt fairly with respecting the laying of pavement and the reconstruction of that Great Northern Peninsula Highway.

I indicate to both members who have a reasonable chance of being elected, it is a fifty per cent chance, that these members will be re-elected and therefore will be responsible for what was St. Barbe North and that they make a special effort to see to it that when it comes to reconstruction and construction of the Great Northern Peninsula Highway and subsequent paving that that part of the district gets its fair share because, Sir, it is a situation where you have forty-three small communities stretched along 100 miles of Coastline. It is not a situation where you have two or three centres of great population. You have a dispersed population and the road, the highway in that district is the most important factor in the daily lives of these people with respect to the transportation of products of the sea, oil, food, merchandise, getting back and forth to the St. Anthony Hospital, social life, whether it be hockey or anything else. Sir, the road is the most important factor in their life. That district which appears now to be so lengthy because of the road conditions would be a very small district indeed if we had a reasonable highway in that particular area.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: How long is the Great Northern Peninsula Highway?

MR. ROWE: The Great Northern Peninsula Highway from Deer Lake to

St. Anthony is approximately 300 miles. I cannot remember exactly what proportion has been paved but the area from Deer Lake to Wiltondale, the area through the Gros Morne National Park, the area from between, well, Port au Choix, Port Saunders and Hawkes Bay has been paved and between the Gros. Morne National Park and Wiltondale South I believe has been paved. The area around Parsons Pond has been paved. The area from the Daniel's Harbour Mine to Hawkes Bay is in the process of being paved because of the carriage of the mineral zinc to Hawkes Bay for shipment.

So that district, Sir, will essentially be paved in the very near future but poor old 100 miles north, solid dirt. Now, the honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications mentions the Brig Bay area. Last year the government in conjunction with the Federal Government decided to do a little bit of upgrading, seven miles North of the Roddickton intersection and I understand that there is more to be done now from St. Genevieve to Anchor Point which, you know, there is nothing wrong with that. It is welcomed news indeed. But, Sir, it would have been far better if the government had to have taken the advice contained in the petition signed by 9,000 residents of the Northern Peninsula which I presented three years ago which asks that the Great Northern Peninsula Highway be paved in segments distributed equally throughout the Northern Peninsula in order that people could avail of the job opportunities because of the construction phase and then, of course, avail of the services of a good highway once constructed.

I am simply saying, Sir, that as far as highway construction up to this point in time the district has been very sadly neglected. We are beginning to see a little bit of upgrading and reconstruction but no contracts or tenders for pavement. Sobeit for highways.

Sir, the other thing that I could mention is the unique situation with respect to the fisheries in the district. Again because we have a straight Coastline, forty or so small communities with no great

centre of population, you cannot start setting up great huge fish plants in that area and it has never been the desire. It was for a while until most people realized that it would be a great white elephant. But what is required in this district are a few multi-purpose fish handling facilities and cooling units and holding units, in other words, feeder stations. Again, we have to await upon an agreement between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government for that. The Minister of Fisheries made a number of announcements but it is pending upon an agreement with the Federal Government.

Water systems, Sir, still represent a problem in the district. I have gone through all of this before, fisheries, educational facilities particularly North of Plum Point, the Green Island Cove, Green Island Brook, Pines Cove, this area of the district you would not believe, Sir, the educational facilities that exist there in this modern day and age. The people in that area have been promised a school even during the Liberal days in that area if the Flowers Cove Elementary School proved to be a success as a experiment, which it has been, the Flowers Cove Elementary School. So there is a need for an elementary school in that particular area.

Medical services, Sir, has been promised for three years and something will be done to the nursing station at Flowers Cove to make a proper medical clinic in that area serviced by a doctor with diagnostic facilities there something similar to the situation that we have in Port Saunders. Sir, I have brought these matters to the attention of all honourable ministers concerned but unfortunately because of the revolving Cabinet of the Premier I have to sort of re-negotiate and rewrite and reconvert the needs in my district with respect to the fish handling facilities and medical facilities and educational facilities.

A case in point, you know, was the departure of the honourable Minister of Health, Dr. Gus Rowe. Well, he is still an honourable member for the district. He, I believe, knew the exact problem with respect to the medical services in St. Barbe North. I believe the honourable minister was about ready to make a move towards the renovation

May 6, 1975.

Tape 2082

RH - 4

of that nursing station and the construction of a medical clinic something similar to Port Saunders. I hope that -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: In Flowers Cove?

MR. ROWE: In Flowers Cove, right. I sincerely hope, Sir, that the departure of the minister will not in any way affect the plans of the department in that regard. The honourable the Premier was not in his seat when I opened my remarks but I just remind the Premier that I am sorry in making my departing

speech as far as being a representative for the District of St. Barbe North if in fact there is an election between now and the next Throne Speech. For reasons different than the Member for Labrador South, I agreed with the Minister of Mines and Energy, the acting House Leader that I would not become provocative during this Address in Reply. I have a number of points that I could talk about, but the fact of the matter is, Sir, I have spoken to them either on the estimates, the budget speech or on the amendment. That, you know, refers to the cabinet size, what happened with respect to the Commission on Re-establishing the Electoral Boundaries of the Districts, the executive assistants, the situation with respect to borrowing in this Province. We can go down through a great, long list.

But, Sir, I sincerely ask that whoever the members, because there have to be two members, whoever the two members are and no matter what side of the House they sit on after the next election, I hope somehow or other they get the message that the two-thirds of St. Barbe North that they get, the upper two-thirds and the Straits of Belle Isle and the lower one-third, South of Plum Point, have in my sincere and honest opinion been neglected very badly over the past several years, very, very badly indeed. Something has got to be done to rectify the situation because the people in St. Barbe North have been more patient than I could have believed a group of constituents could be. They are a victim of their own social structure in that they reside in a great number of communities where the traditional rivalry between communities sometimes still exists and consequently you do not have this great getting togetherness of a great number of people that can force government one way or another to act.

The people in the Hawkes Bay - Port Saunders - Port au Choix area once they get together are a large force. Such is not the case in St. Barbe North or in the area of St. Barbe North. I hope that the two members representing these portions of the district after the next election will bear that in mind and bring it to the attention of the government in power of the problems that do exist and sometimes why we do not hear this screaming and yelping that you get from power blocks in other parts of the Province.

Now, Sir, I have very little else to say except that I am assuming that there may not be another Throne Speech before we are in new districts. It is a bit of an assumption, I realize, on my part. But in case the opportunity does not arise again, I would like to say that I have made very, very many good friends and acquaintances in the district of St. Barbe North. They have always been fair to me. They have always been demanding, and they been demanding because of the fact that they do not have a lot of the conveniences that exist in other parts of the Province. But, they are very kind people, very friendly people, and I find it very sad indeed, Sir, to have to leave the people of St. Barbe North because of the fact that the government has seen fit to wipe it out because it is a remote district. It is small population-wise, but it has as many problems and more than the majority of districts in this particular Province.

Unfortunately, Sir, I am afraid that the commission and the government together when the new boundaries were drawn up did not take these factors into consideration, but this was pointed out in the debate at the time. But, Sir, I am sad that the district has to go the way it is going through the actions of the present administration. I would like to just take this opportunity to thank the people of St. Barbe North for giving me the opportunity and the honour of representing them in this House of Assembly.

I sincerely hope that I have been successful in trying to get some of the problems of that particular district through to the present administration. I hope I have been able to do that. I sincerely hope that within the next year that administration will see fit to solve some of the problems that have not been acted upon, at least up to this point in the game. Probably it is a good thing, Sir, that we are nearing an election because as everybody knows the pace picks up as the government approaches an election. I sincerely hope that St. Barbe North or the remnants thereof will be the recipients of the actions of this government prior to the upcoming election.

So, Sir, I think I have fulfilled my promise to the honourable the acting House Leader in not being provocative. I hope that we can get on with the regular business of the House. Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that the motion made by the Select Committee to draft the Address in Reply be adopted. Those in favor, "Aye". Those against, "Nay". I declare the motion carried.

The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, be it resolved that when this House adjourns today it will stand adjourned until Thursday, June 5, 1975 at three of the clock provided always that if it appears to be the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker or in the case of his absence from the Province, the Chairman of Committees after consultation with Her Majesty's government that the public interest required that the House should meet at an earlier time than the adjournment, Mr. Speaker - than the adjournment, sorry - Mr. Speaker or in his absence the Chairman of Committees may give notice that he is so satisfied and thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated by such notice and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time.

I am not sure if I have got all that. Basically we are going to adjourn until June 5 unless for some reason it is necessary to call the House before then.

MR. NEARY: What are we going to discuss when we come back? The ombudsman -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You.

MR. BARRY: The Orders of the Day will be brought out. There are a number of important pieces of legislation that have already been given first reading, Mr. Speaker, very serious legislation of much importance to this Province.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will get a copy of the Order Paper in due course like the rest of us.

MR. THOMS: We do not get the agenda. We only get the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

On motion that the House at its rising do now adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, June 5, at three of the clock.

Contents

May 6, 1975	Page
Privilege of the House	
Mr. Barry, Acting Government House Leader, brought to the attention of Mr. Speaker two breaches of the Privilege of the House in that on May 5, 1975 after the Speaker had left the Chair Mr. Dunphy had assaulted Mr. Roberts within the precincts of the House after the Leader of the Opposition had continued libelling the Member for St. George's. Mr. Barry moved that Mr. Roberts and Mr. Dunphy each be suspended from the House for two sitting days.	6120
Mr. Speaker ruled that a prima facie case of breach of privilege had been established, that for convenience each case would be considered separately and was debatable.	6120
Mr. Speaker then called the motion to suspend Mr. Dunphy.	6120
Mr. Dunphy expressed his regret, apologized to the House and said he stood ready to accept whatever punishment the House decided upon.	6120
Mr. Speaker then named Mr. Dunphy and he withdrew from the House.	6121
Mr. Roberts wished to speak to the motion but Mr. Speaker ruled that since Mr. Dunphy had been named and had withdrawn from the Chamber then under such circumstances the motion was no longer debatable.	6122
The motion that Mr. Dunphy be suspended for two sitting days was adopted.	6126
Moved that Mr. Roberts be suspended for two sitting days.	6126
Mr. Roberts	6126
Premier Moores	6133
Mr. Simmons	6136
Mr. Morgan	6148
Mr. Rowe	6152
Mr. Marshall	6172
Mr. Gillett	6179
Capt. Winsor	6183
Mr. Neary	6185
Adjourned debate.	6200
The House rose at 6:00 P.M.	6200
The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.	6201
Mr. Neary (continued)	6201
Mr. Wells	6207
Mr. Barry, Acting Government House Leader.	6213
The motion was put and carried on division.	6224

Oral Questions

Report sought on the condition of the economy of the west coast of the Province. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	6225
Housing starts in Newfoundland. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	6225
Start of construction on the extension to the Come By Chance refinery. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	6226
Query as to discussions with the Shaheen interests. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	6226
Locale of discussions. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	6226
Query as to the truth of a report that the liquor store at Burgeo is open to the public. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	6227
Efforts to get parties to the dispute of Newfoundland Liquor Corporation employees back to the bargaining table. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	6227
Storm damage to fishing gear in Conception and Trinity Bays and along the Northeast Coast. Capt. Winsor, Mr. Collins, Acting Minister of Fisheries.	6228
Query as to whether it is government policy to provide rented cars for ministers whose private automobiles are undergoing repairs. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	6228
Assurance sought that the matter would be investigated. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	6229
Hiring of students into the public service during the summer months. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	6229
Query as to whether special consideration will be given to the hiring of West Coast students. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	6230
Query as to whether the illness of the Chairman of the Select Committee on the Inshore Fishery will affect the date by which its report is due. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Collins.	6232
Status of the DREE highways agreement. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Rousseau.	6232
Query as to whether although tenders have been received and the lowest tender determined still contracts have not been awarded, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Rousseau.	6233
Query as to whether low bidders have therefore not received instructions from the Department of Transportation and Communications. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Rousseau.	6233
Request for the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities to hold regional hearings into the application of Newfoundland Light and Power for increased rates. Mr. Neary, Mr. Barry.	6235
Report on the application by Newfoundland Light and Power. Mr. Neary, Mr. Barry.	6236
Possibility of a paper mill at Come By Chance. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	6237
Possibility of a petro-chemical industry at the Come By Chance refinery site. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	6238

Contents - 3

Orders of the Day

Address in Reply

Mr. Carter 6239

Mr. Howe 6248

Motion made by the Select Committee to draft the
Address in Reply was adopted 6256

Moved that the House adjourn to 3:00 P.M.
June 5, 1975. was adopted. 6256

Adjournment 6256