



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 42

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 1976

SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (COLLINS): The hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: A point of personal privilege and I think, Mr. Speaker, perhaps a matter affecting the privileges of the House as well, but certainly the former. I refer to a story which was in this morning's Daily News. It makes reference to some remarks made a couple of days ago, Mr. Speaker. I was not in the House when the remarks were made - to my knowledge I was not, anyway - so it is the first opportunity I have had to react to the remarks. If the paper quotes the Minister of Mines and Energy incorrectly, well then, that will take care of the matter. He can stand and say that it does quote him incorrectly. Otherwise, I would like to deal with it as a matter of personal privilege.

I am referring to the story on page 1, headed, "Crosbie Charges Unknown M.H.A. With Co-operation With The Enemy." Assuming that the paper has quoted him correctly, Mr. Speaker, and I have not had an opportunity to check the Hansard record, but assuming that to be the case, I believe the minister has cast aspersions on all of us as members and tarred us all with the same brush in a sense. I did not send a copy of Hansard to either Mr. Doyle or Mr. Semonian. I know a number of other members who have not sent such a copy, or at least told me they have not sent any such copy of Hansard to Mr. Doyle or Mr. Semonian.

The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in responding, according to the newspaper report, indicated that he had not done it. I have now said that I have not done it. I hope every member in the House does not have to stand up and disassociate himself. The member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) has stood and said that he did not do it,

MR. NOLAN: Was it I, Lord?

MR. SIMMONS: I think, Mr. Speaker, the minister has made a very serious charge, the kind of spurious charge that he himself abhors. And he has often said, Mr. Speaker, that one should name

MR. SIMMONS: names when one makes charges. I would invite the minister to name names or to withdraw the remark.

It being, Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege I would like to make an appropriate motion which would serve to facilitate the situation at this time and I would move, seconded by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), that the House instruct the Minister of Mines and Energy either to name the member he says supplied Mr. Doyle and/or Mr. Semonian with the copy of Hansard or to withdraw without qualification his charge that a member of this House has done so and apologize without qualification to the members of the House. I so move.

MR. SPEAKER (COLLINS): The hon. the House Leader.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of personal privilege. I think before the motion can be entertained, Your Honour has to decide if a point of personal privilege has in fact been raised. Because I was in the House that night - I do not think I saw in this morning's paper the article to which the hon. member refers - but I was certainly in the House and there was no reference by the Minister of Mines and Energy to that hon. member. None at all. Whoever it was let him speak for himself. But I think the hon. member has raised a point of personal privilege which I assumed to be a suggestion that there was some sort of allegation involving him as a member. It may be that there might be something to be discussed on the question of privileges of the House. That is a different matter. But on a point of personal privilege, which the hon. member rose on, Mr. Speaker, I suggest there is none because the hon. member in his personal or in his capacity as a member was not mentioned in any way, shape or form, and I think that point should be disposed of.

PREMIER MOORES: It is not a matter of personal privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, to that point raised by the government House Leader. Could I just respond to the effect that I did preamble by saying that from the newspaper account I felt that I had been indicted in a sense, but quite apart from that I felt it

MR. SIMMONS: was a matter affecting the privileges of the House as well, and I introduced it in the dual context, a matter of personal privilege and/or a matter affecting the privileges of the House. I feel strongly that it is both.

MR. WELLS: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker. It cannot be an and/or. If it is a matter of personal privilege let that be disposed of. If it is a matter of something else then let that take its turn, but it not a matter of and/or.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, we can play with words all we like. There has been an unsubstantiated charge made. I did not send a copy of Hansard. I want it cleared up and other members of the House want it cleared up. I invite the government House Leader to stop playing with words and let us deal with the issue. The Minister of Mines and Energy has made an unsubstantiated charge. Let him substantiate it or withdraw it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, there is no breach of the privileges of the members of the House nor is there any breach of privilege with respect to the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons). I never addressed myself to him so he is not involved in the matter, nor is there any breach of the privileges of the members of the House. There has been none pointed out and I certainly do not intend to withdraw any statement I made unless it can be pointed out to me that it is an abuse of the privileges of the House. I would certainly like to have a copy of the Hansard. I cannot remember every word I said the other night and I think that should be obtained. Let us get a transcript of what was said, and if there was any breach of the privileges of the House I certainly would be quite willing to withdraw, I would not have any hesitation. But I submit there has not been either.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the minister? Does

MR. NOLAN:

the minister know for sure that any member of the House did what was suggested? Could it have been someone other than a member of the House?

PREMIER MOORES: Do you know for sure that there was not?

MR. NOLAN: No, I am asking a question.

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

MR. CROSBIE: This is somewhat irregular, Mr. Speaker, but I cannot say for sure that some member of the House sent a copy of the Hansard to Mr. Semonian, no. But it is quite clear that someone sent Mr. Semonian.

MR. ROBERTS: Was it the regular Hansard, you know, which comes out or was it just an extract?

MR. CROSBIE: I do not know because I was not there when he was reading it. I do not know. So I cannot say who sent -

MR. ROBERTS: I mean, Hansard itself is hardly a secret document.

MR. CROSBIE: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: It is unreadable but it is hardly secret.

MR. CROSBIE: So I cannot say who sent Mr. Semonian a copy of the Hansard.

MR. MOORES: The request was -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, whoever requested it obviously - it is a prima facie case.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I think the first duty of the Chair to establish whether there is a prima facie case for a breach of privilege, and I understand from the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) that he is bringing up the point that in speaking the hon. minister - I believe I understand correctly - that in bringing up the point that is in dispute the hon. minister breached privilege. Am I correct in understanding that point?

MR. SIMMONS: It is my contention that the minister made an unsubstantiated charge against the members, one member of this House. Without naming the member he cast aspersions on all. I say, Mr. Speaker, that is not within the privileges of the House or his privileges as a member.

MR. CROSBIE: This whole business, Mr. Speaker, is a silly business. The member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) of course is a silly person and this is a silly point. I withdraw that, Mr. Speaker, if they are going to groan and moan about it.

When I was making my remarks the other night I suggested that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) had sent this to Mr. Semonian.

MR. NEARY: And the minister withdrew that.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said he had not, and I accepted it. So why the other hon. gentleman is getting so highly insulted on this point, a breach of privilege, I do not know. But just so we will not be wasting time with it I will say that I am not saying that any member of the House sent it to Mr. Semonian. All I will say is that someone sent Mr. Semonian or his principal a copy of the Hansard of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is his principal?

MR. CROSBIE: His principal is Mr. John C. Doyle.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Having heard the remarks from both sides I would rule that a prima facie case for a breach of privilege has not been established.

The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, on another matter of personal privilege, I would like to give notice to the House at this time that in due course, when transcripts have been procured and necessary work is done, that I myself will be raising a question of privilege out of remarks that were made the night before last in this House. As of yet the transcript is not available. When it is I will ask the House to deal with the whole matter.

MR. SIMMONS: By whom?

MR. WELLS: By the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. ROBERTS: A point of order with respect to that.

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

MR. ROBERTS: I do not wish to speak on the merits of it at all. Indeed the hon. Minister without Portfolio has not made a substantive

MR. ROBERTS:

motion. But I do think that Your Honour - and I will raise this not as an objection, but I will raise it for consideration - the time in this matter must be looked at. Timeliness is of the essence with respects to points of privilege. While I have every sympathy, I may say, for the position in which the minister finds himself, the fact remains that the remarks in question were made on Tuesday evening - were they not? - Tuesday evening, and the House did meet yesterday and no objection has yet been taken. I do not raise that at this point as a substantive objection because the minister has made no substantive motion, and I might not raise it even then. I mean, I may or may not. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that matter must be looked into because timeliness, as Beauchesne will tell us, as the gentleman knows, is of the very essence of questions of privilege.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A man cannot sleep too long on his rights without losing them.

MR. WELLS: That is correct. Well be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, I give notice now that whether in a general debate or on a question of privilege, however, if there is any right whatsoever to bring something up and deal with it in this House it will be done when everything is ready.

MR. NEARY: You do not have to give notice of that.

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

On this matter, I do not believe a ruling from the Chair is required at this time.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

HON..E. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, in response to pressure from the Province of Newfoundland for additional funds for manpower training, in November, 1974 the Federal Government introduced a pilot training programme which was designed to encourage people receiving unemployment insurance benefits, and in certain cases people receiving welfare to enrol in special manpower training programmes while they were receiving either unemployment insurance or welfare benefits. The programme has been referred to as the DMI-UIC (Department of Manpower and Immigration-Unemployment Insurance Commission) pilot training programme and was funded for an amount of \$3.5 million of which \$1 million was allocated for the balance of the Fiscal Year 1974-1975 and \$2.5 million for the Fiscal Year that has just ended.

The Federal Government introduced the project on very short notice and with little or no consultation with the Province and because it was introduced after the start of the school year, Provincial training officials were very skeptical as to whether the project could be properly mounted. I say it was introduced with no consultation, even though we had made representation to the Federal Government for increased Manpower funding, the type of programme that was brought in, we were not aware of until such time as it was actually offered and ready to go. However, even with that through the joint co-operation between the Department of Education, the Department of Social Services and my own department steps were taken to respond to the proposal from the Federal Government to arrange special training programmes over and above the regular Manpower training programmes.

Having made a special effort to make the programme work, and having been, to this point in time, very encouraged with the results of it, the Province has protested the termination of the programme both at the official and ministerial levels with the Federal Department

Mr. Maynard:

of Manpower and Immigration. There have been numerous meetings between the officials of the department on a regional level, of Province to Federal level and there has been two meetings between myself and Mr. Andras, the minister of that department. However, after all that representation the most recent communication on the matter is a telex from the Hon. Robert Andras, Minister of Manpower and Immigration, in response to my plea to him to provide additional funds to continue that programme or indeed one similar to it, because everyone is well aware, I think, that the amount of money we have to spent on Manpower training programmes in the Province this year is inadequate to keep up our level that we have attained over the past few years. However, Mr. Andras in his reply, dated 4th. of February, 1976, indicated that he would be in a position within the next four to six weeks from that date to advise me whether the programme could be continued beyond the 31st. of March, 1976. To date we have not heard further from the minister despite my efforts to have a decision made before the termination date of the programme, which was yesterday.

We therefore have to assume, Mr. Speaker, that no additional funding will be made available from the Federal Government, Our officials have therefore developed a contingency plan whereby certain programmes, such as in the basic training for skilled development courses will be continued under regular funding at a cost of \$150,000 involving 210 training places.

This step will ensure that courses are continued in areas where the greatest need exist. We have to continue some of the courses that are now underway or else drop them in midstream, and that is not desirable. However, because of the termination of the programme by the Federal Department we are unable to institute any new training programme under that particular funding.

My preference would have been to continue the special pilot training programme at its maximum volume until at least June, 1976, in

Mr. Maynard:

order to permit a more orderly and sensible phasedown and in order to fully assess the value of the programme over the past year and a half. However, we cannot do it alone because in order to do so would mean a reduction in our regular training programme. Efforts will continue with the department to have them institute a special programme in Newfoundland in this regard, but I think it is appropriate to make the House and the public aware today that the special programme has been terminated and possibly will remain so unless the federal department is willing to co-operate with more funding in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: Further statements by ministers.

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to confirm that the government has agreed to assume the full responsibility for the payment of insurance premiums on all school buildings in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: That, of course, began today at noon. The premium came into effect today at noon. This agreement has been reached with the Denominational Education Authorities after a series of meetings between the Denominational Education Committees and the Federation of School Boards and the Department of Education.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, two or three of the main features of the policy. First of all, all of the schools in the Province will be insured for their full replacement value.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: In the past, very few schools were insured for replacement value. As a matter of fact, in a lot of cases the fires we had, they were as low as 40 per cent. In fact, many of the buildings were insured for far less than what it cost to build them when they were built.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Insured by whom?

PREMIER MOORES: By the school boards when they could get insurance.

MR. HOUSE: The school boards. The schools were insured in the Province - and we collected data on that - for just \$315 million. That was what they were insured for by the boards.

MR. ROBERTS: What was their worth?

MR. HOUSE: Their worth or replacement value was something over \$600 million and that is what they are insured for now.

The insurance policy is with a firm Marsh-McLennon. I believe, I am not sure of this, they are represented by Munn Limited here. It includes fire, vandalism, and malicious damage, and is non-cancellable for a three year period. It will also include coverage on furniture up to 10 per cent of the value of the

MR. HOUSE: building - that is for furnishings of the school, It will include boiler insurance and public liability.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That means equipment as well as the building.

MR. HOUSE: Yes, that is right.

This policy will cost the government approximately \$1.6 million. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that we have been able to reach this agreement with the Denominational Educational Committees and the Federation because now for the first time all schools will be fully covered under this new package deal which will cost considerably less than it would have cost the individual school boards even for the coverage they had.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Does the minister know what the estimate was?

MR. HOUSE: The estimate we had was something over \$2 million - \$2.2 million for that amount of coverage.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Compared to \$1.6 million.

MR. HOUSE: Yes, and, of course, for less coverage.

Now just an indication, Mr. Speaker, of the value to school boards is an example that was offered to me by one of the school boards in Central Newfoundland, the kind of a board that represents a large number of boards in the Province. That school board last year had a total operations budget of \$276,000. Of that amount \$65,000 was paid for insurance, which by simple arithmetic tells us that they had \$212,000 to operate the rest of their services. This board will have that \$65,000, which represents an extra twenty-five dollars per pupil or a 30 per cent increase in their other operations grant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: As I said, Mr. Speaker, this represents the same kind of effect it will have on a large number of boards in the Province. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Sir, we on this side of the House welcome indeed the ministerial statement or announcement by the Minister of Education. It is something that we have been very, very concerned with over the past few years. We have put questions to the various Ministers of Education and we have even put suggestions with respect to this whole business of insurance on schools, to the extent where we asked the question whether it would be indeed a saving if we did not have any insurance at all on all the schools. There probably would be a saving -

MR. ROBERTS: Self insured.

MR. ROWE: - you know, no insurance at all, and there would be the odd school burned down and some damage done, and it would cost money, true, but it might not cost as much as the actual premiums that would be required to cover schools totally for fire insurance.

So it is a very, very welcome announcement, Sir, and we give the minister credit where credit is due in this particular case. I think he has probably indicated there what the savings are in this particular case. Apparently \$2 million was being spent before in premiums for partial coverage, and now only \$1.6 million is being spent for full coverage which is arithmetically quite correct and represents a saving and increased coverage. You know, the one little thing I find a little bit distasteful is the fact that we heard of it through the press. The Ministerial Statement comes after press releases. I think probably the minister could probably inform the House beforehand.

MR. MORGAN: The minister did not announce it.

MR. ROWE: Who announced it, the school boards?

MR. ROBERTS: The Reverend Mr. Bellemy.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify that statement.

MR. ROWE: Right?

MR. HOUSE: We had to have concurrence of the school boards to adopt this measure and every school board in the Province were

MR. HOUSE: party to it and the statement was made in the press by the Secretary-Treasurer of the Federation of School Boards. It was not from this department.

MR. ROWE: Oksy! Fine! That is fair enough!

Well, Sir, I cannot say very much more on this except to give credit where credit is due. I sincerely -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: If the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) resigns or crosses the floor, I might make a wild dash, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I think that in all probability - I am not positive, but I think - in all probability the government are to be congratulated on this, and if they are, then especially the Minister of Education.

The government from time immemorial in Newfoundland has never insured its own buildings. It has been its own insurer, that is to say, it carried its own risk and it estimated always that it was cheaper to pay the cost of the building that was destroyed than to pay premiums on all buildings. This was the cheaper way out.

I think I put a number of questions on the Order Paper to which I have not as yet had any answer, but perhaps the answer has just been given me now by the minister. These questions have been on the Order Paper since last - when was it the House first met? October or November - because it is a matter of the utmost importance, especially with the fancy school buildings that have been erected in the last twenty-five or twenty-eight years, and especially with the fantastic increase in the money values of those buildings and the furniture and equipment in them.

The minister, without a doubt, when his estimates come before the Committee of Supply will tell us how this was done, whether tenders were sought and from whom the tenders were sought and the tenders submitted - the amounts of the tenders - by the various firms.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will never forget, in St. George's just before Confederation - about twenty-seven or twenty-eight years ago - Fred Scott, the late Fred Scott was the magistrate there, I think, at the time, the Redemptorist Order of the Roman Catholic Church told me - the priest there in charge, there was a group of them - that they had gone out and insured their property in Montreal and they had got a three year policy at a considerably lower cost, premium cost, that ordinarily they had been paying for one year, which looked very much like a - what is the word now? The new word for rake-off? -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Rip-off!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Rip-off! - it looked very much like a rip-off. So I will be immensely curious and interested to know how this insurance was in fact effected. Because \$1,600,000 a year premium payments is a mighty income for some insurance company and I am quite sure that a lot of insurance companies would love to have it, and I am quite sure that there was no need to limit it to insurance agencies within the Province. I am sure that the minister has gone far and wide to get the best bargain for the Province.

I think in all probability this is good. I am not confident. I am not sure of it. You know, I am not sure of it but the minister will tell us much more about it when his estimates come before the Committee.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I will yield to my -

MR. ROBERTS: Yield to him, let him have the floor.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: I would like to thank the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I would point out to the hon. House that I was not ignoring the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), but he had resumed his seat. But he now has the floor. The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief with the petition.

In fact the type of petition has been mentioned in the House many times before. But it comes from the Local Improvement District of Mount Moriah, Newfoundland. That is of course in the Bay of Islands district. There are 227 names on the petition and it says, or the prayer of the petition is - I will read the letter instead of the heading on the petition which is in essence about the same.

"Enclosed you will find a recent petition circulated in our community opposing any further increases which are being applied for by the Newfoundland Light and Power Company Limited." It is signed by the chairman, Garland Vardy and the secretary, Elizabeth Hann. So, of course, as you know, I do not know how many names, petitions have been brought to this hon. House already but I do hope that - I say we - that the government will find its way, will be able to see some way to keep the rates within reason. In fact I happened to call Corner Brook today and I was told the cost of my bill for the this past month, and I must say it has not gone up too much, but it has increased a whole lot since this time last year.

So I think everybody all over the Province, as you know, are finding the pinch and I think since petitions are continually coming in people are still thinking about it even through we are approaching the beautiful warm weather when we will not be using too much electricity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I support the prayer of the petition, Sir, so ably presented by my hon. friend from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) on behalf of his constituents who are violently protesting any further increase in electricity rates in this Province. I think the hon. member, whether he realized it or not put his finger right on the key, right on the significant part of the whole thing, and that is in the warm month of July, the hon. member indicated, people may have a tendency to forget about this. Well, Sir, this is precisely what is going to happen in July or August: We are going to see an increase I think it is of 9 per cent. I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Not with the by-elections.

MR. NEARY: Not with the by-elections coming up? Even with the by-elections coming up, Sir, we are going to see a 9 per cent increase in July, I think it is, the first of July, or Newfoundland Hydro will ask Newfoundland Light and Power Company to increase the rates paid to Newfoundland Hydro by July 1, and then the Newfoundland Light and Power Company in return will have to go down to the Public Utilities Board. And the Public Utilities Board being another agency of the government regulating another crown corporation, another government board will merely rubber-stamp the application after going through a charade, having a little act. They will rubber stamp it and in the warm month of July, my hon. friend is quite correct, the increase will go through. Well, this is rather unfortunate, Sir. That is the warning that I threw out many, many times in this hon. House, that people have to guard against becoming complacent about increases in electricity rates, because when everybody is on vacation and the weather gets warm, the next thing you know the thing will be sneaked through and the next thing we will have the one and three-quarter per cent monthly increases put back on again by the Newfoundland Light and Power Company. This is the sort of thing we have to guard against.

MR. WELLS: Point of order. The hon. member is entering into debate, contrary to the rules.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has concluded his remarks.

MR. NEARY: Too bad, 'Robert'! You will have to take your spite out on somebody else.

MR. NOLAN: I merely rise, Mr. Speaker, to support the petition as presented by our hon. friend, which in many ways supports many similar petitions that we have heard previously in this House, and we, certainly all of us here, support him in his efforts and the people who signed the necessary documentation or petition in their efforts to attempt to realize through whatever ways possible, legal ways possible, to try to effect some kind of a saving, because we have a situation now, whatever the reason, where in many instances people are paying for fuel, for heat in their homes what not too long ago they paid for rent, for their mortgages and so on. So it is quite a serious matter, and we certainly support the hon. member in his petition.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a number of petitions. I refrained from standing up before in supporting the petition from the gentleman from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), because I would like to do it now, and make it all one set of comments. I certainly support his petition and the prayer of that petition. The petitions which I have before me bear on the same subject. Before getting to these, just let me say, Mr. Speaker, that we are glad for the support we are getting from the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) on this matter, and we congratulate him for the courage it takes to do what he has been doing. The word that I am getting is that he must be the hardest working member in the House, or just about that. He talks about his light bill going up. Well, of course, all our light bills are going up, but I would suggest his is going up more, because he is burning the midnight oil in every sense of the term, if the word that is getting back to me is at all correct. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, he is in some respects a voice crying in the wilderness. I will not carry the connotation any further, because that leaves either me or the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), depending on who you consider to have followed him, as somebody next to the voice crying in the wilderness.

Mr. Simmons.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from a number of residents of the town of Bonavista, which has been forwarded to me, and it is my pleasure on behalf of these people to present the petition to the House. I do not think we need to say much in terms of words about those petitions now, because I think everything has been said. It is up now to the appropriate bodies to take some action. So rather than again elaborate on the prayer of the petition, which addresses itself to the exorbitant electricity rates, perhaps I could use this opportunity to invite someone from the government side - I notice that the Minister of Mines and Energy is absent. But perhaps in his absence the Premier or some other minister might indicate to us at this time what the status at the moment is of talks that were going on between the government and Newfoundland Hydro in particular? I wonder if these talks have concluded or if the announcement the Premier made about the rate being effective July stands? I am asking, Mr. Speaker, for some information. Now if there is some reason why we should not have the information by all means shout me down.

MR. WELLS: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I had relaxed for a moment. I thought we were back on general debate or on 'the estimates or something, but obviously this is out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. Whether the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) is relaxed or tense is his problem, Sir. It is not the House's problem. My colleague is making the type of remarks, Sir, which has been allowed in presenting a petition from time immemorial in this House. He is not entering into debate. He is merely addressing himself to the substance of the prayer of the petition which he is presenting, 'the material allegations; I believe, is the phrase used in the Standing Orders, and he is asking of the ministry a question, and I did not even think he was putting it

April 1, 1976

Tape noo 1633

Page 3 - mw

Mr. Roberts.

particularly controversially. I must have a word with the gentleman outside the House on that point. But he was asking a question, and I submit it is quite in order, and I submit he should be allowed to proceed without the harassment of the House Leader on the other side.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! The hon. members, I am sure, are quite familiar with the Standing Rule relating to the presenting of petitions. It is a rule that has come up many times in this House, Rule No. 92, so I will not read it again. But in commenting on the petition it has been permitted in the past that an invitation has been extended for a response to the petition from the other side of the House. And if the hon. member confines his remarks in that area without getting into areas of controversy I would rule him in order.

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Perhaps I would have been wiser, Mr. Speaker, to stick with the prayer of the petition because it is exactly what I was putting in question form. What is the government doing? That is what the petition is all about, Mr. Speaker. If they want me to put it a little more bluntly and to the point I shall do so. I thought perhaps it would be better, in very low-key fashion, to ask the question, because we are all in this together in some ways, and I am not wanting to make a great big controversial issue of it. But if the boys are going to sit over there and play games with this, the government House Leader and the rest of them -

MR. PECKFORD: On a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: - I will engage in it too, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: Is it correct in this hon. House for one hon. member to refer to other hon. members as 'boys', 'boys across the way'? I would like to have a ruling on that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: We have some girls here -

MR. SIMMONS: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker. To the point of order, I have other terms for them. But that is no point of order. The minister knows full well he cannot ask questions of Mr. Speaker. He can make a point, and ask for a ruling. But he has asked a question

Mr. Simmons:

Mr. Speaker, and he cannot question, Mr. Speaker on particular points, and I would suggest it is no point of order whatsoever. And he is not a boy, Mr. Speaker, in my mind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I would regard this as letting off a little steam. I do not think the House would regard a real point of order to be at issue here. I would ask the hon. member if he would continue his remarks, but make efforts not to get into an area of discussion that excites comment from the other side at this point.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I may say without at all, without us all taking exception to what Mr. Speaker has said that I can only, Mr. Speaker, address my remarks as I feel fit and within the framework of the rules. If these gentlemen choose to get excited, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it is because they have good reason. And I would ask again, Mr. Speaker, as the prayer of the petition asks, and I would invite some one, the men, the gentlemen from the government side -

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentlemen.

MR. SIMMONS: - the hon. gentlemen, and the Minister for Transportation as well, Mr. Speaker, I would invite them all to get up and tell us what they are doing about this matter. If they want to make it a partisan issue I will be with them any day at all, but I would rather hear, Mr. Speaker, what all of us together as a House of Assembly can do, and I very gently invited them, if they want to engage in snarky remarks, two can play that particular game.

Mr. Speaker, the petition is from a number of residents of the Town of Bonavista who implore the House to do its best to put whatever restraints are possible on the ever-rising cost of electricity. There are twenty on this particular petition.

MR. MORGAN: Twenty! Big deal!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker -

MR. WHITE: Write them all and tell them what he said.

MR. SIMMONS:

- each person can only sign his name once and those twenty are as important as if they were 100,000. Let the minister realize that.

MR. WHITE: Write them all.

MR. SIMMONS: If he sits there, Mr. Speaker, and undermines -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. WHITE: Write them all.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

I would bring to the attention of the hon. member the latter part of Rule 92 which states "That in no case shall a member occupy more than five minutes in so doing unless by permission of the House upon question put." The five minutes has expired.

MR. SIMMONS: I can conclude this one very quickly, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No leave! No leave!

MR. SIMMONS: I would request that this petition be placed on the table of the House and referred to the appropriate department.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have another petition I would like to present at this time. It is a petition, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: Sit down!

MR. SIMMONS: Shut up, 'Brian', boy! You are making a fool of yourself.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not be so foolish, boy!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Having presented a petition, the hon. member would then resume his seat and rise again to be recognized by the Chair, if he wishes to present another petition. Having done so I now recognize the hon. member for LaPoile who has risen for this purpose, I assume.

MR. NEARY: It gives me great pleasure, Sir, to support the petition presented by my friend the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), in behalf of twenty people in the grand, old, historic town of Bonavista. In supporting this petition, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it abundantly clear that this is probably the first occasion since I have been in this hon. House, although I think - no, there are probably one or two petitions that have been presented by members who did not represent the districts from which the petitions came.

Now in this particular case, Sir, this is a non-partisan issue, so I think probably members can be excused, and there is justification for members on this side and on the government side, presenting petitions that do not originate in their own districts. But I want to make it clear to the House, Sir, that only in the case of electricity or any other provincial matter that may come up would I be presenting petitions from districts other than my own district. In every other matter, if I get a petition it will be passed over to the member who represents that particular district. I just mention that in passing. Another it has happened, there is precedent in the House for it. But I would never, Sir, personally - I want to make it quite clear to members - concerning any other matter I would never present a petition in this hon. House from another member's district without prior consultation with the member or without offering him the petition to present.

I have had petitions on other matters and I have passed them over to hon. gentlemen, or I consulted with hon. gentlemen before I presented them. But in the case of electricity I think it is a free-for-all, Sir. So therefore I make no apologies for all the petitions and I am sure my hon. friends on this side make no apology for the petition.

It is a province-wide problem and it is something that we are going to have to face up to in this hon. House. I am sure that if you took the total count now, Sir, of the signatures that have been presented - the other day I indicated that I probably presented about 50,000 myself, probably another 20,000 or 25,000

MR. NEARY: from all the other members of the House, so you are up around 75,000 signatures, I would think, Mr. Speaker. And that is substantial representation and would certainly be enough to make the government sit up and take notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition —

MR. ROBERTS: No, I want to speak on this one, 'John'.

MR. NOLAN: Oh, you do? Sorry!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I might say a word in support of the petition from Bonavista South which was presented by my friend and colleague from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) and which the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) just spoke in support of. I would like to say a word on it, Sir, and in saying that word or two perhaps I could say that I am somewhat hurt that the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) has not entered into it. I hope he will. In so saying, I agree with the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), The normal tradition is either to give a petition to a member from another district if it has come to one, or at least to say, "Look, old man, I have a petition coming up this afternoon that is from your district."

The electricity one seemed to have crossed all party lines and also all district lines. The gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) — I do not know about his 50,000, I think I would rather have him on the revenue side of the Finance Department than on the expenditure side the way he puts numbers together — but, you know, his many thousands of names — 20,000 or 25,000 whatever in fact there actually were — came from all over the Province and that is right and fair.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point I wish to make, particularly in reference to this petition from Bonavista, the town of Bonavista, is that it may be signed by only twenty people — and the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) mocked that, he made light of it, he poured scorn on it — my colleague from Burgeo-

MR. ROBERTS: Bay d'Espoir pointed out, Sir, that one person is every bit as good as another, no better but no worse. But the fact remains, Sir, that these twenty people, at least seven on them, Sir, are signing in a capacity other than merely as private citizens. Because this petition is headed up by Gordon Bradley the Mayor of Bonavista. It is signed as well by Mr. Fred Gosling, the Deputy Mayor, Mr. Maxwell Way, a councillor, Mr. Douglas Strickland, a councillor, Mr. B Moulant, a councillor, Mr. Lloyd Little, a councillor and Mr. F. Sweetland a councillor. I have not checked with the Department of Municipal Affairs but I suspect there are only seven members on the council in Bonavista Town, which means that is every councillor in Bonavista who has signed this petition and had it sent forward to my colleagues and to me for presentation in the House which we have done.

MR. MORGAN: It was sent to whom?

MR. ROBERTS: It was sent to me.

MR. MORGAN: To you?

MR. ROBERTS: To me. To my colleagues and me, and because I had no particular desire to present several hundred petitions I asked my colleague. And there may be one or two others of my colleagues, Sir, who have been swayed into action by the eloquence of the gentleman from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) who first presented a petition today, and there may be two or three more of these petitions to be presented if one were to hazard a guess.

The point I want to make, Sir, is that while this petition may not be signed by a lot of people - and I do not know how widely circulated it was in the town of Bonavista - it is signed by the council, and the councillors in signing have affixed their positions which I believe would be an indication of the fact that as a council they support the prayer of the petition. Well so do I, Sir.

MR. ROBERTS:

I commend it to the government. I think the point of these petitions has been well made. I had not intended to rise at this particular time but, you know, I will since the matter -

MR. MORCAN: This is one of those form petitions you sent out.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course it was sent. It is not secret that it was sent out, Mr. Speaker. Of course it was sent out.

MR. SIMMONS: He took the initiative.

MR. ROBERTS: I took the initiative. The hon. gentleman did not care enough to take the initiative. I took the initiative, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. POWE: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: But I did not send it back. I did not send a stamped, self-addressed envelope. I did not ring up Mr. Gordon Bradley, who by the way is a very prominent citizen and I believe a well-known supporter of the hon. gentleman's and a good friend and son of the late Senator Bradley, a very fine Newfoundlander, a very fine man. I did not ring up Mr. Gordon Bradley and say, "Mr. Bradley will you send back the petition." I sent it out to him. It went to every municipality in the Province. And the mayor of Bonavista obviously felt seriously enough to sign it, his colleagues felt seriously enough to sign it and they then sent it back. If the gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) does not like that, Sir, his quarrel is not with me. I submit he has no quarrel with anybody. But I support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and I think it should be taken seriously as an expression of opinion by the council of that town. I commend it to the government and I hope they treat it with the respect it deserves and that is a very great deal indeed, Sir. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: If I may now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to present this petition again involving the same situation, and that is the controversial electricity rates in the Province. This, by the way, is from Branch, St. Mary's Bay. If it is in order I would like to say, if I may, Mr.

MR. NOLAN:

Speaker, something about the situation regarding the presentation of petitions. Privately I feel that if I am presenting - I do not care what it is on - a petition from any district other than my own - privately, and I am not speaking for anyone else and I do not really care what anyone else does - frankly I will notify the member concerned personally that I am going to do it. I mean I feel that if the House is going to work at all you have to have some rules, unwritten rules, that you have to go by. I am not sure sometimes that people think that we take some of these things too seriously when they hear some of the bickering back and forth and so on.

Anyway this petition from Branch, St. Mary's Bay. I do not know how many names are attached to it, Mr. Speaker, I did not count them all. There are a number of pages here of names. I did not count them all

MR. NEARY: You are supposed to count them and sign them.

MR. ROBERTS: There are 220.

MR. NOLAN: Well, I am not going to count them and sign them. I am merely presenting them in good faith in the House and if anyone thinks that I am -

MR. NEARY: We accept your apologies.

MR. NOLAN: Pardon?

MR. NEARY: What about the rules of the House?

MR. F. ROWE: Go ahead 'John'.

MR. NOLAN: It is amazing sometimes how the rules of the House come into play. Anyway I appreciate the comments by the hon. member. There are some numbers here, twenty-three on that page if you want it. In fact there are forty-three on that. Now we are going on, eighty-seven, 106, 231. So we are up over about 400 here on this, 300 or 400.

MR. NEARY: That is the right way.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, right. So anyway it is - this is not made in any way to attempt to embarrass the member for the area. I would not have mentioned it at all only it has been suggested here. This

MR. MOLAN:

situation is, as our hon. friend to our far right suggests, one that has really captured the imagination or concern of so many people around the Province. Now you can play the numbers game if you want, whether it is 50,000 or 100,000 or 200,000 but there are enough to cause every single member, no matter what side of the House he sits on, in my opinion, some concern. And it does. I have no doubt about it, not doubt about it at all. The thing is rising along with everything else. So I present this petition with respect to the people of Branch in St. Mary's Bay for forwarding it to us. I would like to table it now, Mr. Speaker, and have it presented to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: I rise to support the petition and to thank the hon. member for joining with me in my efforts to ensure that the people of Branch, in my constituency, are not unduly charged for their electric rates, and I would ask - that maybe the next time you see Dolf Nash to pass my regards on to him.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: If I may say a word in support of that petition.

The hon. gentleman from St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. W. Carter) has blundered right into it. The petition, Mr. Speaker, was sent forward by the Community Council of Branch. I forget the name of the chairman. If I had the petition in front of me I could see it.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Nash.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Nash is no longer the chairman of the Community Council of Branch, Sir. It was sent forward by the chairman of the council in Branch, and I think the hon. gentleman will find the seal of the community as well attached to it. So his attempt to score a fourth class political point will not succeed. Let me also say, Sir, that I am very glad the minister has supported this petition. It is fair enough. I would hope now he will also support the other request which the community council made, which is namely that representations be made - and I have made them, because the request was made of me to the Newfoundland Light and Power Company - because the power supply to the community of Branch is inadequate, apparently the voltage is not adequate. And I will not say to the hon. gentleman what was said to me in the letter from the chairman of the council, but I will say that the approach to me was made only after other approaches proved futile, and that is not quite the language which the council chairman adopted, but that is certainly the thought. So if the hon. gentleman from St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. W. Carter) wants to score some cheap political points that is his privilege, but, Mr. Speaker, the point which I make in supporting this petition -

MR. W. CARTER: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): A point of order.

MR. W. CARTER: Or it may be privilege. The hon. member is certainly, I think, misinterpreting the meaning of what I said. Certainly it is not against the rules of the House to ask another member to pass on his regards to a constituent that, I know, is very friendly toward the hon. members opposite.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. If we were to pass on our regards to everyone of the minister's constituents with whom we are very familiar, and very friendly, there would be nothing else that we did the day long, Sir. And they are far more friendlier now, I might add, than they were on 16th. day of September because, of course, they have had six month's knowledge of the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the point I am making in supporting the petition is that -

MR. MURPHY: : Eight years.

MR. ROBERTS: Eight years? Yes, I had forgotten. The hon. gentleman has been the member for that area, and for a larger area for part of it for eight years. He has been re-elected - he was re-elected what? Twice?

MR. MURPHY: Three times.

MR. ROBERTS: No, once elected, twice re-elected.-

MR. ROWE: Once as a Liberal.

MR. ROBERTS: - 1972 and 1974

AN HON. MEMBER: Every time he ran he was elected.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, every time he ran he had been elected, and he has been elected for every party he has ever run for, too, and he has had his share of those. He might have had trouble getting re-elected in White Bay North, Mr. Speaker, but I suspect that that is debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Speaker, the point I am making in supporting the petition is that the council of Branch have raised the problem that they are not getting an adequate power service. I have made representations at their request to the Light and Power Company, because it is in the franchise area of the Light and Power Company. I would invite the minister quite sincerely to join with me in doing that. I am sure he is concerned, and as I said the letter which I got indicated that the approach was made to me only after other approaches made by the chairman of the council had proved to be futile. I support the petition, Sir, and I know every hon. gentleman will, including, in particular, Mr. Dolf Nash, a fine citizen who may or may not have signed it, I honestly do not know, but he did not send it to us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join in supporting this petition and in telling the House that we will accept this as we have had all these petitions with enthusiasm and with the dedication that we are going to do the best we can to ensure that energy costs are kept as low as possible. I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is too bad that petitions are presented to this House and political points made on them, because the root of a petition is not to score political points in the House. It is to put forward the views of people in the Province who want to put a petition before the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: And the hon. Leader of the Opposition has certainly fallen from that tradition with these political slurs on the member for the district of St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. W. Carter). Every member of this government knows how dedicated he is to his constituents, in his incessant and insatiable lust to deprive the treasury of every possible cent for the people of St. Mary's - The Capes district and of Branch. It is just terrible, Mr. Speaker, that we have

Mr. Crosbie.

to confess to this House that we are worn out and beat out with the pulverizing that the Minister of Fisheries is constantly giving his colleagues to get the best service and best benefits for his district. And there is no member in the House -

SOME NON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: - there is no member in this House, Mr. Speaker, more aware of his constituents' needs and more vehement in seeing that they are carried out. And as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, just yesterday the Minister of Fisheries was assaulting me about energy rates and hydro conditions in the town of Branch.

SOME NON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: So we are glad to see that the Opposition are supporting the minister in his efforts to improve conditions for his district.

SOME NON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for presenting the petition. I certainly support it, and I also endorse the remarks made by the Minister of Fisheries in conveying my best to the hon. Mr. Nash down in Branch.

MR. PATTERSON:

I might say if it were not for my efforts and Mr. Carter's there would be no lights on the Cape Shore. I personally handled the petition and it was presented in this House by Dr. Frecker. So I certainly thank the hon. member for presenting the petition and there again I endorse the remarks of Mr. Carter.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have another petition which I wish -

MR. ROUSSEAU: May I speak to the one from Branch?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, sure.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I would like to get up on this petition for quite a different reason, if I may. I remember when I first went into the Department of Highways, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Transportation and Communications in December of 1974 and received very many letters from the people on the Cape Shore about the road situation. I must say of all the letters we receive in the Department of Highways regarding roads - you get some pretty blasty letters at times - these people were the most fantastic people that I received any representation from in my year in Highways, and far be it that I would not stand up and support a petition from these people. They were nice and very understanding and very considerate in respect to the roads on the Cape Shore on which this government has done a lot of work. I would like to stand up because the people are from the Cape Shore area and certainly give support to this petition.

MR. ROBERTS: Well said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present another petition on the same subject. I may say in doing so that I certainly support the one that has been presented by the member for Conception Bay South. I might say also, Mr. Speaker, to the Government House Leader if he is within hearing, that we have a number of petitions on

MR. SIMMONS:

this same subject. I think almost every member in the official Opposition has at least one petition. We agreed, Mr. Speaker - and I think it is fair for me to say this - we agreed before we came in here that we would be very brief about this because the matter has already been thoroughly discussed, and it was our full intention when we came in here this afternoon and some had even commented, indeed that I had been very low-key in putting my questions. That was for a very good reason.

MR. MURPHY: Very low, period!

MR. SIMMONS: Because we did not want, Mr. Speaker, to make this into another partisan hassle such as the one the Minister of Mines and Energy referred to. We would like to accord the people of the Province who signed these petitions their right to have their petitions heard, and we would like to have it done without all the harassment we have been getting. There is no need for this circus that we have had in the last fifteen minutes or a half hour since I first stood up, Mr. Speaker. We could have very gently and quietly and responsibly presented our petitions and we would be on to Orders of the Day by now just about.

Now, I have another eight or nine petitions - petitions now, I have not counted the names, petitions. Mr. Speaker, I have one, two three, four, five, six separate petitions. At the moment I am presenting one of them. I am doing this for a reason, because if the harassment continues we shall take our time, we shall not filibuster or that kind of thing, but we shall take our time to say the things that need to be said in response to what is being said from the other side. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, if we can be allowed to present our petitions then we shall do so very quickly. We will not filibuster. We will reserve the right, Mr. Speaker, to answer what is being said on the other side.

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is threatening the House and threatening the Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: No, I am giving you courses of action.

MR. CROSBIE: It is the most extraordinary statement I have ever heard, that the hon. gentleman threatens the Speaker that unless he is allowed to continue without anybody else saying a word on his petitions -

MR. SIMMONS: I never said that, 'John'.

MR. CROSBIE: - that he is going to present six. I just heard the hon. gentleman say it. No House has ever put up with that, Mr. Speaker; you should be threatened, Your Honour should be threatened, and the rest of us should be threatened by the hon. gentleman.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, outraged as I am by the vicious attack which the gentleman for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) just made on my colleague, 'Sugar Plum Simmons' here, I rise on that point of order, Sir. The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Speaker, is obviously trying his best to -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: No sugar there.

MR. ROBERTS: Well 'Thumper Lundrigan' over there.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Let us get to work.

MR. ROBERTS: It is infinitely better, Sir, than anything the minister has said in this House. The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy is trying his best, Sir, to provoke a debate, and my colleagues and I are anxious to get on to the main business of the day, which is Question Period and then the Interim Supply. I would request that the Minister of Mines and Energy raise only valid points of order, Sir. There was

MR. ROBERTS:

no threat passed the lips of my colleague, the gentle gentleman from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir(Mr. Simmons). He is merely -

MR. MURPHY: I have heard it all now!

MR. ROBERTS: Did "Ank" say something? If "Ank" said something it is the first time in twenty years, Sir. Mr. Speaker, the point I am making without harassment from hon. gentlemen opposite -

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

MR. F. ROWE: There is a point of order on the floor.

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I am sorry.

MR. ROBERTS: The reason I am speaking to a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. member from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir(Mr. Simmons) uttered no threats. He merely said he proposed to follow a certain procedure because he had been provoked and harassed and driven into it by the Minister of Mines and Energy. I, Sir, hope that this petition is allowed to be presented and anybody who wishes to comment upon it comments upon it because, Sir, it is now ten past three. We still have not reached the second Order of the Day in the routine proceedings yet, Sir, and there are more -

AN HON. MEMBER: Third.

MR. ROBERTS: - third, I am sorry - there are more petitions to come.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: On a point of order. I think the hon. member in his reference to my good friend from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir in using the phrase "Sugar Plum Simmons" was completely out of order which reflects upon the character of the hon. gentleman, his personality, his integrity and it definitely should be withdrawn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: I want to withdraw that, I want to withdraw that, Sir. My colleague here is a lot of things, Sir. He has never been called sugary, but he is a first class member and a first class debater which is more than I can say for the gentleman from Grand Falls on either count.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Is that so?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to this point of order. I am understanding more readily, more clearly every day why the people of Newfoundland are coming to regard this House with utter contempt. And I say the people are right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SIMMONS: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker. Can I speak to the point of order, Mr. Speaker? I have not done so. I have not spoken to the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: For clarification, Mr. Speaker, there was no threat intended or implied or said. I said I will pursue one of two courses of action. I will either present my petitions, as I am duty-bound to do, or, Mr. Speaker, if I continue to get responses from the other side I will reserve my right to respond.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The understanding I have taken from the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir's remarks is that there was no threat directed at me in the Chair of the Speaker, nor do I understand it to be directed at the House. I believe that he was stating a tactic he was contemplating on taking. So I rule that a point of order does not exist. I would point out to the hon. member that I will certainly accord him all the protection that the Chair can give him in standing to the floor. But it is traditional in the House that if remarks made by hon. members do excite comments from the other side and he responds to them or indeed if he tends to encourage them, that the Chair will not intervene. On the other hand if an hon. member wishes to be heard in silence the Chair does have the responsibility to ask hon. members to have the speaker be heard in complete silence.

The hon. member from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to present a petition on behalf of a number of people. I do not know exactly how many, Mr. Speaker, I have not undertaken to count them, but it would appear on this particular petition to be certainly eighty or ninety persons. The community involved is in my friend's district, the district of LaPoile, the community of Harbour Le Cou. I should just say a word in reference to a petition I presented earlier from Bonavista. I would normally, Mr. Speaker - and I have done so before - have gone to the member concerned. But as the member for LaPoile and the Leader of the Opposition have so well pointed out, this has been matter which has crossed all party lines. We have had any number of petitions and so has the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and I believe other members of the House, any number of petitions which did not emanate from our own constituency. I must say to the House I did not go previously to the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) but not deliberately so, but because I have already presented others from other districts on this subject and did not do so either. I would normally do so. As

Mr. Simmons.

my colleague from Conception Bay South has said, I think it is a courtesy which I ought to extend to fellow members of the House. I have a petition here from the people of Harbour Le Cou, from eighty or ninety names, persons it would seem, and I would like to present this petition and re-endorse again the comments that I have made so many times on this particular subject of the need to give heed to the prayer of the petition so well put forth by the people of Harbour Le Cou.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time, and in the interest -

MR. NEARY: They are a pretty organized bunch.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) would like to know - I would think within his categorization they are probably one of the organized ones, Mr. Speaker. I understand; I have been told indeed that no force was used in having people affix their signatures. I understand from a reliable source that every person who signed this signed it freely in their own handwriting, and in most cases using their own ballpoint pen.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the question of organization is not nearly as important here as the overall issue, whether the people of Harbour Le Cou and the people of all of this Province are completely fed up with the electricity rates. I think that is the issue, Mr. Speaker, and it is the one that needs to be put again, and again, and I am not concerned in the numbers game or whether it is organized or not. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) tells us that by his count he has got 50,000. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe him. I believe him, Mr. Speaker, and further I have done a calculation based on his formula, and I find so far that we in the official Opposition, applying the expansion formula applied by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), we have a grand total now of names presented of 3,758,402.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

I hesitate to interrupt, but I would remind the hon. member that even with the time out for points of order his five minutes has just about expired.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to present this petition to the House and have it referred to the appropriate department. I have other petitions.

MR. CROSBIE: May I speak to that petition, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SIMMONS: May I continue, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: We are again, of course, pleased to receive it. All I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that we are hoping we will be proceeding with the estimates today or tomorrow, and the first department will be Mines and Energy. And on the estimates of the Department of Mines and Energy we can debate in detail all this question of increases and possible increases and petitions. Well, that is the place for it to be done. If the hon. gentleman wants to present his petitions, fine, but once he finishes them, and we get some other business done, we will be going on to Mines and Energy and he will have a grand chance to debate the whole issue.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, as I have said we are in no way wanting to delay this matter, and we are trying to do it just as quickly as we can, and we would long since have been finished had we not had the partisan discussion that we were drawn into earlier in the afternoon.

I would like to present, Mr. Speaker, a petition signed by fifty-eight residents. I cannot determine the community, but this petition comes from the district of LaPoile, and it is signed by fifty-eight persons, and again the prayer of the petition is the same. It is one of the organized petitions, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: Lou Blundon.

MR. SIMMONS: - well organized petition. Now, Mr. Speaker, the first name, and I think it is permissible to give names - is it? The

Mr. Simmons.

first name on that petition is W.S. Ashford, Mr. Speaker. And on this petition - another organized petition, Mr. Speaker, which is included, for the record, in that grand total of 3,758,402 - the first name on this petition is Evelyn Knee. And again I do not know the community, but I do know from a covering letter that it is from the district of LaPoile. I would like to present that petition to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like also to present a petition signed by another twelve or fourteen persons, including the president of the United Church Women, Evelyn MacDonald. I am not sure of the community. It came in without any community name on it, but she did sign her name in the capacity as UCW, president of some particular local of that organization, I would assume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of twenty-seven residents of another community in the district of LaPoile. Again I do not know the community. The covering letter indicates it is from the district of LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Could you tell me where these petitions are coming from?

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the first name

Mr. Simmons:

on that particular petition for the information of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is James H. Bungay, and twenty-six other names follow. I assume their signatures were affixed freely and out of their outrage over the rising cost of electricity.

MR. NEARY: They have already signed two or three. I would not take it.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting point, I will not raise it at this time as a point of order, but it certainly is an interesting point as to whether or not a person, a resident of the Province can sign more than one petition. I would submit that he can, and he can have one here every day of the week if he is so inclined. I do know that Mr. Bungay has signed this, apparently in his own handwriting, as well as a number of other people.

I have, Mr. Speaker, also a petition signed by 186 persons altogether. It would appear from the names that it is the town of Port aux Basques. I see the name Battiste, or Battiste as they pronounce it in some cases, Kettles and so on. And the first name on this particular petition, Mr. Speaker, is Solomon Billard. And this petition here, Mr. Speaker, is one of the organized petitions as well. Again I believe they all come from Port Aux Basques. But, Mr. Speaker, this one is particularly significant in the light of what the member for LaPoile has been saying, because I want to say to him through you, Mr. Speaker, that not only is this petition one of the organized ones, and not only was the same sheet mimeographed or the same stencil used each time, but the front page has a notation on it which I am sure is not intended only for me or for the people in the official Opposition but for the member for LaPoile too, because the notation on the front page says: "Regards, Lou."

I have pleasure in presenting the petitions and ask that they be referred to the department to which they relate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Are there any further petitions?

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A comment on the petition?

MR. WHITE: No, I am going to present a petition.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. NEARY: I have already spoken on these. These petitions have been presented.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I would -

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

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): On a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: On a point of order. Just for the record, Mr. Speaker, I vouch for the fact that these are all original petitions. I looked through every last one, there are no duplications there. They are originals signed in original handwriting, Mr. Speaker, for the record.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member has given information to the House, I would not say the point of order needs to be ruled on.

The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a number of petitions from my district, and one from the adjoining district of Twillingate. The petitions are from the town of Durrell, 266 people; the town of Embree, 130 people; Comfort Cove and Newstead, 296 people; and from the community of Change Islands, 300 people. And another petition from Lewisporte signed by 81 people. Mr. Speaker, there has been enough said with respect to electricity rates in the Province. It is still one of the biggest issues that I am confronted with when I am talking to people, not only my constituents, but other people as well.

I noticed the other day, I was watching a programme with respect to electricity rates in the Maritime Provinces, and some of them, and I saw a gentleman being interviewed in Cape Breton where his electrical rates were higher - or his bill was higher than his old age pension cheque. So there has to come a time, Mr. Speaker, when we have to come to grips with this particular problem, and I just wanted to add my support to this petition and all the others that have been

Mr. White:

presented here today, and to say no more because there has been enough time taken up already.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. P. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from eighteen members of the Integrated School Board on the Burin Peninsula. It reads: "At a meeting of the Burin Peninsula Integrated School Board, having a membership of thirteen" - there are eighteen people; the other five are probably teachers, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: The Burin Peninsula Integrated School Board.

MR. P. CANNING:- "it was agreed on motion to support your petition. The following Board members and staff of the School Board strongly object to the government's making a decision permitting an increase in electrical rates."

Mr. Speaker, I support this petition, and have a few remarks to make, Mr. Speaker. Number one is, Mr. Speaker, I sat on that side of the House for twenty-three years and

MR. CANNING: I had twenty-four petitions presented to me and in twenty-three years, I am proud to say the prayers of twenty-three of them were answered.

Mr. Speaker, what I have noticed here since I came into this session is that there is petition after petition coming in, and they are coming to the Opposition from the government member's districts. It probably happened two or three times in the whole twenty-three years that a member for another district got a petition referring to the next district -

MR. SIMMONS: I got them.

MR. NEARY: Once.

MR. CANNING: I do not remember. Just in case it did I said it only happened a few times. I am wondering, because when I was on that side of the House I certainly would be embarrassed if a petition was presented by another member, because I would begin to think that the people of that district did not have any confidence in me. So I am wondering if the petitions coming to this side of the House are petitions plus a vote of non-confidence in the conference.

MR. FLIGHT: Good point 'Pat'. Good point.

MR. CANNING: Most of them are from other districts.

Their names are Lloyd Lake, who is Chairman of the Board - some fine people here doing a good job, I can tell you, for the present and future of Newfoundland - Robert Shave, Sam Harris, Ralph Billard, William Brushett, -

MR. SIMMONS: Friend or foe, 'Alex', friend or foe?

MR. ROWE: He does not have any foes.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, one thing I am going to do here Mr. Speaker, for the rest of this session. I was sent in here by people to represent them in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: We all were.

MR. CANNING: Yes, we all were, And we were all sent in to do a job in this House and to be listened to. Mr. Speaker, when I get up in my seat I can assure you that I am not standing up to blow off bull or hurl insults at somebody or drag somebody's name

MR. CANNING: into the House. That I did not come in here for. I have never done that and I do not intend to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CANNING: I came in here to represent the people of Placentia West. This is my twenty-fourth year representing them, and, Mr. Speaker, what I want from this House is what the people of Placentia West want from this House and I am going to demand that I get it, and that is, that I am going to be heard when I rise in my seat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CANNING: Anytime, Mr. Speaker, I am out of order I assure that I will bow to your orders. I am capable of doing it. I do not know all the rules and I am capable of breaking them at any time, but I will sit in my seat and I will obey your rules. But there is one thing. As from this moment, the next time that I get up in this House to speak - I do not care who it is, if it is the Leader of the Opposition, or the Premier or anyone else who starts to mutter - if I am asked to sit down or yield I will do it. For a question I will do it. If I am out of order I will sit down, but from now on if a person utters a word when I am speaking in this House I am just going to stop. And if he keeps uttering, Mr. Speaker, I will leave and I will go out and go up in the district and do better work up there in the district perhaps, do greater service, than to be in here wasting my time in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (COLLINS): Order, please!

The hon. member has made a strong plea for silence whilst he speaks. I am sure that hon. members will respect his wishes.

The hon. the member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. CANNING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I should like to finish those names of fine people. I do not know if it will be recorded or not but I would like to read their names in the House. They are doing a fine job, as I said, for the present and the future of Newfoundland. They are teachers, guiding schools. I was down to Alex Haggood -

April 1, 1976, Tape 1642, Page 3 -- apb

MR. CANNING:

that is a familiar name. It seems like an old constituent of mine who moved up to, perhaps, Grand Bank or he could be in Burin. I guess he is in Burin. I knew where they were when they were in my district. I know them all and they all know me, but they have left and we have some new people in so I am not familiar with where they are at the moment - Lloyd Thornhill,

MR. CANNING:

Captain B. Reader, Jake Mullins, Charles Martin, Onslow Hillier, Thomas Pope, Hubert Barnes, Frank Banfield, Cyril Leaman, Melvin Grandy and George Senior. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Well said.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOP: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present two petitions. As both petitions are pertaining to the same subject matter I will present them at the same time. Before doing so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to just remark about the way in which some petitions are presented in this House pertaining to other members districts. I was the culprit last year or the year before, I am not too sure -

MR. ROBERTS: The victim.

CAPT. WINSOR: The victim.

MR. ROBERTS: The culprit was the other fellow.

CAPT. WINSOR: The culprit was the other fellow, right. When the then member for Grand Falls, he did not have the decency or the courtesy to mention that he was going to present a petition from my district but he had the audacity to get up and present three, one after the other. So, Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentleman, then as he was, is no longer there. I am here, and I am still happy to present petitions from the district of Fogo, and I have two.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CAPT. WINSOR: I have two now, one from Tilting -

MR. CROSBIE: You are the survivor.

CAPT. WINSOR: -Survival of the fittest - containing eighty-four names, and one from Carmanville containing 106 names.

MR. ROBERTS: You might say 'seniority' was not enough.

CAPT. WINSOR: That is right. The latter, Mr. Speaker, Carmanville,

CAPT. WINSOR:

is now becoming a very modern town and many young couples there are building new houses. Unfortunately for them they are heating their homes by electricity so much so now they wish they had not done it. However they are caught in this ever increasing electrical rate, and this was last Winter, some of them have received bills up to \$100 and more. So what is the hope for those fellows? They are not men who are making big salaries, just average salary earners, and yet they find themselves now where it is going to take a great deal of their salary to keep their homes comfortable enough to live in.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support those two petitions and ask that they be received and laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which they relate.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 133 residents of the communities of Piccadilly and Ship Cove in the district of Port au Port. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is the same as the rest and I do not intend to say too much about it except to say that this is a rural area where the residents are not the wealthiest in the Province. I think at the present time, unofficially, there is probably a 40 per cent unemployment rate there, and many of the people there are part-time fishermen or farmers and many of them, their income is not nearly close to the rest of the Island's standards and those are the people who are hit hardest by these rates, Mr. Speaker. I have had many calls from constituents in this area. And as well on talking to the Light and Power Company in Stephenville I have found that they have had many requests to come out and check the meters because the people just could not believe that the rates could be so high.

As well those people on fixed incomes are finding it very, very difficult and I hope that the government will see fit and will truly realize, as I am sure they do, that this is a very serious problem

MR. HODDER:

and particularly serious for people who are perhaps not as well off as other areas of the Province. I ask that the petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George's.

MRS. MCISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 116 residents of the Codroy Valley in the district of St. George's and 274 residents of Port aux Basques in the district of LaPoile. The prayer of the petition is similar to others presented in the House. In commenting I would just like to say that I think from the number of petitions being presented that the people of Newfoundland are showing their concern and dissatisfaction. I sincerely hope that the government will take a sincere look at this proposal before allowing these increases to materialize. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that this petition be placed upon the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the Community Council and other citizens of Rencontre East, Fortune Bay. The prayer of this petition, of course, is the same as the others, that they do protest very strongly the decision to increase the electricity rates charged by the government owned corporation, and that many people will suffer considerable hardship if this increase is permitted to go on.

Now these people in Rencontre - it is one of the smallest settlements, I suppose, and the most isolated in Newfoundland. The income level is marginal, and they would suffer a great deal of hardship if any further demands are made on their income. I am sure this is well known by the House. And I would say that if we had saved some of the hot gas that is being generated in the House it would keep the thermal station going in Holyrood for a week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINSOR: So I would say no more and ask that this petition be tabled and presented to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petitions so ably presented by my colleagues, and particularly that one so ably presented by my hon. friend, the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow). I had not intended to support any more of those petitions, Mr. Speaker, simply because I know everything that could have been said has already been said. However, I would like to support those petitions in light of a situation that we witnessed last week. In the process of supporting petitions presented by members of the Opposition, a member opposite made an attempt, and a very humorous one, to belittle the efforts of the Opposition in presenting petitions. He suggested that we should set up a competition between the P.C. Opposition of Nova Scotia and the official Liberal Opposition of Newfoundland, maybe 1,000 or 1,500 and let us see what happens. It is very humorous. It is very funny, but very ironical, Mr. Speaker, when that same night

Mr. Flight:

on the Watson Report, the Nova Scotia Power Commission and a concerned citizen of Nova Scotia, and the increase in electricity rates in Nova Scotia was the subject. It was very ironical and not so funny.

We heard on the Watson Report the Finance Minister of Nova Scotia admitted that electrical bills had gone from \$50 to \$200 in one year in Nova Scotia. Now, Mr. Speaker, in making a humorous situation of it, in attempting to, you know, belittle the efforts of the Opposition in presenting these petitions, the hon. member compared the Nova Scotia situation with the Newfoundland situation. Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland was mentioned on four or five occasions in that programme, and one reference was made that the only reason that Nova Scotia had to increase their electrical rates by almost 200 per cent was that Nova Scotia depended completely on oil for the generation of electricity. And the minister, whether he knew what he was talking about or not, indicated that if Nova Scotia were in the same position as Newfoundland is in, then indeed there would not have been necessary to increase the electrical rates in Newfoundland. Well I would suggest, it is a well known fact that most of the electricity that have been generated in this Province is being generated by water power.

The minister also referred to the Lower Churchill situation, Mr. Speaker, and through his government's inability to negotiate with Quebec and Newfoundland and the Federal Government, getting power from Quebec, the Eastern Grid was talked about. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, all these petitions are protesting the vicious increase that we have seen this past year in Newfoundland. And at the same time the minister has indicated that there is a freeze on, that the freeze will not necessarily stay on, that the consumers in Newfoundland will be expected to pay for the electricity. He compared the situation to Nova Scotia.

AN HON. MEMBER: Compared to what?

MR. FLIGHT: I am saying he compared it to Nova Scotia. Mr. Speaker, I am serving notice on this government that there is no way that the people of Newfoundland can afford or will stand for the type of increases in electrical power in Newfoundland that the people of Nova Scotia have stood for and obviously will have to stand for. I support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. W. McNEIL: I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the local district of Massey Drive. The prayer of the petition is the same as the previous ones that went before. So I will not elaborate on them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Corner Brook.

MR. MCNEIL: Massey Drive is in Corner Brook, yes. By now the government should realize the seriousness of the electricity rate increases, I am sure that the people of the Province have spoken out, and that they will do all in their power to lower the burden of the electricity rate increases. So, Mr. Speaker, I will not take any more time of the House. I ask that this petition be placed upon the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: - nine petitions, Sir, with exactly the same prayer as the other petitions that have been presented this afternoon. So I will not elaborate on it. I think that all that can be said has been said. We can get into it on the estimates of Mines and Energy. I will simply refer to where these nine petitions came from, Sir, and the number of people who signed the petition: The town of Point Leamington signed by the town council of Point Leamington, which presumably means that the town of that particular area agrees with the petition: the local improvement district of Peterview, Sir; the community of Woodstock which has - and in this case it is signed by 166 people: thirty-eight people at large, seventy-nine people, Sir, no particular community attached to this; the I.B.F.W. union local here in St. John's: Melrose, Trinity Bay, 200 signatures attached; the town of Victoria, 212 names attached; and Greenspond, Sir, 95 signatures attached.

MR. ROWE:

Sir, I ask that these petitions be placed upon the table of the House and referred to the department to which they relate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order! I would invite hon. members to extend their welcome to the Reverend Benjamin Mdaba from Kenya who is in the Speaker's gallery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have four or five or six petitions that I would like to present, Sir. In presenting them perhaps I could read just one brief reference from Beauchesne which I think is very relevant, citation 331 on page 256 of the edition we use, that "the right of petitioning the Crown and Parliament for redress grievances is acknowledged as a fundamental principle of the constitution, and has been uninterruptedly exercised from very early times." Now, Sir, that is what being done here today, and that is what has been done throughout the last couple of weeks in this session in a way it has never been done before. I really do not know how many signatures have come in on the petitions which have been presented. I certainly have not counted them all up. I doubt if anybody has. But I would imagine there are, seriously, around 50,000 or 60,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who have signed petitions, all of which were organized in the sense that in each case somebody had to take the bit of paper and go around door to door or put it up on a notice board and say sign if you feel this way, all of which were organized, all of which were genuine in that they represent the legitimate and proper and honest feelings of people who were entitled to express their feelings because they are citizens of this Province.

I am a little sorry today that gentlemen opposite choose to try to make it a partisan occasion. I think we have got away from that again now, and I hope we stay away from it. The Minister of Mines and Energy tells us his estimates will be called, which is good news, because it will give the House in Committee the opportunity to debate the matter which, of course, we cannot do during the presentation of petitions.

Mr. Roberts:

Mr. Speaker, the petitions which I present come from - the first group are from the Northern Peninsula, three are from my own constituency, sixty-two people in the community of Anchor Point, which is on the St. Barbe Coast in the district of the Straits of Belle Isle; 163 in the community of Main Brook, which is in Hare Bay on the Atlantic side, the ocean side of the district of the Straits of Belle Isle; and 261 from the communities of Cooks Harbour, Boat Harbour, Wild Bight, and the suburb of Cooks Harbour called Cape Norman, the site of the lighthouse and three or four families live out there, 261 people there.

Then in addition, Mr. Speaker, there is a petition from the town of Hawkes Bay in the district of St. Barbe represented by the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. It is signed by, I am told, 162 residents of that community.

The prayer of all of these petitions, Sir, is exactly and precisely the same. The prayer, and it has been well rehearsed in this House, well expressed, all I need to say, Sir, is that these people too do not wish to see the electricity rates increased unilaterally, arbitrarily, without explanation or without justification. They do not want to see them increased at all, of course, who does. They do not want to see them increased in the way in which the government went about it. The government may have changed their minds now, I hope so. Of course, we will have the opportunity to debate that.

Mr. Speaker, let me also present petitions which do not come with addresses on them, and I have checked Beausnesne, and our own precedents, and I can find no requirement that addresses be affixed to a petition. The requirement is that original signatures or marks be affixed. These are from citizens of the Province who have -

MR. MURPHY: Are they from Newfoundland?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, they are from Newfoundland. And I shall sign them in the way - the gentleman from St. John's Centre thinks they are from outside.

MR. MURPHY: I have no idea where they are from.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, they may be - Mr. Speaker, the mere fact I am presenting them indicates that I believe them to the best of my knowledge to be proper, and we can only present petitions from the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman - I know some of these people, Sir, and in any event the mere fact under our rules that a member presents a petition, Sir, is prima facie evidence that the petition is in order. If the hon. gentleman wishes to challenge them, Sir, he has the right and the duty, I would suggest to him, to appear before the Clerk of the House to get the petitions and then go on from there. We have been through that in this House, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. gentleman was in the House when a petition was challenged.

MR. MURPHY: I never heard it before.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I can tell when it was challenged -

MR. MURPHY: I never heard of it before.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the hon. -

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - gentleman may never have heard of it, I can remind him, Mr. Speaker, since he wishes to be reminded, that it was while he was sitting here, I am not sure if he was Opposition Leader or not at the time, while the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) was Premier, and a petition was brought in with respect to the district of Trinity South, and the late Captain Uriah Strickland was the member, and the petition had been taken up by citizens, by people, and there were considerable acrimonious controversy back and forth across the House. The gentleman from Twillingate got quite heated, as I recall it. There was quite a lot of debate back and forth, not about the petition, but about the circumstances which gave rise to it. And among the allegations that were made at that time, was the fact that some of the signatures were not genuine. I do not recall what came of it. I have not looked it up. -

MR. HICKMAN: A police investigation was started.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. HICKMAN: The House ordered a police investigation.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Justice, who I guess was then Minister of Justice in a previous reincarnation, in the Buddhist sense, reminds me that a police investigation was ordered, I would have thought the police would have had better things to do, but in any event an investigation was ordered I assume it was carried out.

AN HON. MEMBER: By whom?

MR. ROBERTS: By the House. The House can do what it wishes. But this House, Mr. Speaker, which can do what it wishes can still do foolish things. It once had a judge of the Supreme Court before the House, back what? 1830 or 1840, at some point. The only way out of that imbroglio, Your Honour, in case it should happen again, is the Governor dissolve the House.

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

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): On a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. Leader of the Opposition reminded us about Beauchesne. I prefer to go to our Standing Order 92 that every member offering a petition shall confine himself to a statement of the parties from whom it comes, the number of signatures, and the material allegations. The Standing Order here also provides that a person may only speak five minutes on a petition. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has managed to speak now for five minutes on something, but not presenting his petition.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that his five minutes have now passed. He has not talked about the petition, so he has to take his seat. And certainly he is very out of order in what he is talking about because it has no relationship to the petition he has presented. He is getting into debates and this is not this period is for. The petition period has already gone on for this period of time and it is driving everyone crazy.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman. He is quite right. He has read the reference to Standing Order 92 correctly, and I regret if I was out of order. I was

Mr. Roberts:

trying to deal with a point, I think a valid point, raised by the gentleman from St. John's Centre. As for the five minutes there were nine petitions here at five minutes each, that would give me forty-five. I have chosen, I think wisely, not to present them one at a time, because I think, you know, once is enough. And I had not intended to go into this disposition on petitions, but the hon. gentleman from St. John's Centre, I will not say led me astray, but helped to lead me astray.

The petitions, I think, Mr. Speaker, are -

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

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. Okay. I am sorry.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

MR. MURPHY: The point of order I raise, I understood the hon. Leader of the Opposition say that he did not know where they came from. Basically that was my understanding. There were no addresses as a community.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

I did not understand that a point of order had been raised prior to the one raised by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

MR. MURPHY: I am speaking on the same point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): There were remarks made, but I do not think the point of order had been raised. In regards to the latter point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has indicated he has wandered. This was clear I think, and I was about to intervene. In regard to time I estimate he has about a half a minute left. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I present the petitions, I present them with whole-hearted support. I would ask that they be received by the House and referred in the appropriate way to the department to which they relate, and I do hope, Sir, we get on to

Mr. Roberts:

the Mines and Energy estimates today so that we can debate these matters as I think they should be debated. Thank you very much, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Health.

HON. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have not found the occasion yet to rise and support the petitions which have been presented from day to day because there have been a lot of people doing that. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that it reminds me of our days when we were quite young down on the landwash, when the tide went out, with our bottles trying to catch tansies, one fellow would sing out that he had ten tansies, another fellow would sing out that he had fifteen tansies, and someone else would yell out down in the corner of the cove, I got fifteen, and I got a great big fatter one. Ray Guy used to call it, "The outharbour delights, arsing around down in the landwash." I wonder what he would call this?

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like for the Minister of Justice to tell the House how many RCMP constables are in Churchill Falls at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Fifty-one.

MR. NEARY: I did not hear that answer, Mr. Speaker.

MP. HICKMAN: Fifty-one.

MP. NEARY: Fifty-one.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: My question is supplementary to the one asked by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) but I would address it to the Minister of Manpower. Sir, let me preface it without a preface by saying nobody condones violence no matter what the cause. Could the minister, Sir, tell the House exactly what has happened at Churchill Falls and exactly where the matter stands? I know everybody in the Province is concerned and anxious about the situation, and of course all we know are the fragmentary or incomplete news reports. I think the media are doing their best to cover it but by its very nature it is a difficult story to obtain and to cover. Could the minister please tell the House exactly what has happened and what is happening at Churchill Falls?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, there is a two part answer to that question. As to what is happening in the negotiations at this point in time, there is no movement in the negotiations for settlement of the dispute. As to what is happening with any other action at Churchill Falls, I would think that would be more appropriate for my colleague, the Minister of Justice, or my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, to answer that question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. ROBERTS: My question was re-directed.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: In reference to the question of the Leader of the Opposition, what has happened in Churchill Falls yesterday, Mr. Speaker, is certainly not a very pleasant situation. There has been a great degree of lawlessness,

MR. CROSBIE: and, of course, we can only go by reports from the site, but apparently yesterday morning there were some sixty to seventy people who were on strike on the picket line when the manager of the site accompanied by the controller drove to the site to go into the generating plant. They rushed their car -

MR. ROBERTS: Who are 'they'?

MR. CROSBIE: The sixty or seventy men involved rushed the car. They locked their doors. The men involved then gathered around the car, they rocked the car, slashed the tires, kicked in the headlights, and spent some time tipping the car around. Luckily they had a radio-telephone device with them and were able to get the R.C.M.P. who came, and the people causing the difficulty then dispersed. After the tires were changed they were escorted back to the headquarters, the temporary headquarters of -

MR. ROBERTS: They being?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Burlington and -

MR. ROBERTS: The management people.

MR. CROSBIE: Right. They were escorted back to the temporary headquarters that they have in Churchill Falls while the strike is on, which is a trailer, I believe, in the town centre - some where there is a large trailer. They were escorted back to this headquarters, to the management's headquarters. The fifty or sixty or seventy people involved in these activities then went and surrounded the headquarters, shouting threats and the usual kind of thing that gets shouted, I presume. They threw snowballs at the headquarters, they tore out the telephone line that enters the headquarters building, they slashed tires on cars parked in front of the building. Then after a while they left, they seemed to disperse from that scene. Some of the occupants then, some of the management occupants of the headquarters went out to replace the tires on the cars. While they were out there so engaged the fifty or sixty or seventy men came back and jostled them and gave them, generally, a bad time. So they went back into the headquarters again, and the building was then again

MR. CROSBIE: surrounded. Every window in the building was smashed out by those surrounding it.

MR. ROBERTS: Which building?

MR. CROSBIE: The headquarters building, the trailer that I have mentioned.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is the temporary headquarters?

MR. CROSBIE: The temporary headquarters of the company's management. The telephone lines were torn out the second time - they had been replaced in the interim while the picketeers, or whoever they are, were gone. As I say, every window in the trailer was broken out and then rocks and snowballs and the like were thrown in through the broken windows. Twice the headquarters was rushed, but they managed to keep the doors shut from inside. There were R.C.M.P. on the scene but not in sufficient numbers to take any action. Their advice to the management personnel was that they could not interfere, they did not dare - not that they did not dare to interfere -

MR. ROBERTS: Not that they could not interfere.

MR. CROSBIE: That they would not be wise or would not be -

MR. HICKMAN: They did not have enough men.

MR. CROSBIE: There were not enough men there to handle the situation, so that if they attempted to interfere this would only result in a much worse situation, so their advice to them was to stay inside. This continued on during the day. During the afternoon there were - and by the way, the tires were slashed again and the cars were damaged - during the afternoon five more R.C.M.P. officers arrived at Churchill Falls and the R.C.M.P. then told them - I think that made a total of about fifteen there - that they felt it would be safe then to escort them out five at a time. They were escorted out five at a time and taken to their -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The management personnel were escorted out?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: From the temporary office?

MR. CROSBIE: From the temporary trailer.

MR. ROBERTS: They were under siege, were they?

MR. CROSBIE: Well they had been under siege for most of the day, and instructed to stay inside, it was not safe for them to come out. They were escorted out then five at a time by the R.C.M.P. who escorted them to their homes. I think there were some twenty of them in this headquarters trailer.

The shift that was in the plant, the shift of supervisors who were in the plant on the night shift could not get out in the morning. The morning shift could not get in because of these activities so they stayed inside the plant. So as I say, around five o'clock or five-thirty they got home. Then that evening some sixty or seventy strikers and some of their wives - apparently their women - also marched through the town. They overturned garbage cans -

MR. ROBERTS: That evening was last night?

MR. CROSBIE: Last night, yes. They overturned garbage cans, they damaged some skidoos, did other damage to cars, they marched through the residential area where they - for example, in connection with the financial controller - they beat on his garage and made themselves generally a nuisance outside with threats and the like. They marked 'scab' on his car, and this kind of activity. That was done to many more houses of management representatives.

MR. ROBERTS: Were they company cars? Did the company own them?

MR. CROSBIE: I am not sure who owns the cars. I guess they are both. Garbage was thrown around on all those locations. Skis outside were taken and destroyed, this kind of activity. This went on until around 10:00 P.M. in the evening when it quietened down. I think at one o'clock this morning the RCMP reinforcements arrived in there, and as my hon. colleague says there are now fifty-one in on the site there and I think things are quiet there this morning.

There have been several statements made by the union representatives, Mr. Speaker, which I am informed by the company are not correct. It is not true that a striker on a skidoo was struck by a company car yesterday or the day before. There was an incident where a striker on a skidoo going along on his skidoo turned the vehicle over on his own. He was not struck by any other vehicle. He was found by the security people and taken in an ambulance to the hospital facilities there where he made an accusation that a company vehicle had struck his skidoo and injured him. This is confirmed by the RCMP that there is absolutely no truth to that. So that is not the cause -

MR. SMALLWOOD: How do they know there is no truth?

MR. CROSBIE: They investigated and -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Any investigation, how could they know? You cannot always prove a thing did not happen.

MR. CROSBIE: The thing did not happen. Witnesses saw it. There were witnesses and they -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS: There was no evidence to suggest that it did.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the point is that there is no evidence to suggest that this skidoo with a man on it was struck by a car, whether company or otherwise.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He said it. Now he said it.

MR. CROSBIE: Right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well that is evidence.

MR. CROSBIE: And there was contrary evidence that he was not struck by anyone, he overturned the skidoo himself. That is not the cause of any difficulty or trouble at the site.

It is also not true, Mr. Speaker, that there are any scabs so-called working, operating the plant at Churchill Falls. Anyone who is working operating the plant is a member of management and not a member of the bargaining unit nor anyone doing work of the bargaining unit. They are all supervisors or management personnel. There is only one man who arrived in there since the strike started who was not there before, and that was a gentleman hired from Ontario Hydro, a line superintendent who was hired before the strike began and arrived there after the strike began. I think there may be four other people from Montreal who are helping to operate the airport.

There was another incident involving a company employee who was on a skidoo and who was assaulted while on the skidoo going about his work checking transmission lines, whatever the work is. In any event, Mr. Speaker, that is -

MR. NEARY: Well, a company employee, a striker?

MR. CROSBIE: Not a striker, a non-striker, you know, who is still working for the company, who was on a skidoo and was assaulted yesterday.

So this is what is reported as being a general state of affairs at the site yesterday, Mr. Speaker, which is most serious. Now the situation with respect to law and order and what is legal and proper is one issue. I do not think that any members of this hon. House will disagree that the law must be maintained and the public security and property have to be -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: - have to be protected, and that is most important. That

MR. CROSBIE:

applies whether there is a strike or a collective bargaining dispute or not. Of course all members of the House I am sure maintain that position. So the first requirement is for law and order to be maintained. The actions which I have mentioned of course are certainly illegal, and action will be taken in that connection.

As far as the dispute between the employer, CFLCo is concerned, and the IBEW who are there on strike, negotiations were held in St. John's here about ten days ago over a two or three or four day period. All issues have been agreed except with respect to the question of pay and I think vacations. The company made a new offer in that connection, and it was taken back by the union representatives to their membership who voted not to vote on the matter at all but to continue with their demand that the recommendations of the majority in the Conciliation Board Report should be implemented. Now that is the situation, Mr. Speaker. We all know what the legal position is, that the employees are entitled to go on strike, to act collectively and withdraw their labour. They are entitled to picket. There is an injunction issued by the Supreme Court on February 16 which provides that there should be no more than four pickets at the entrance to the company site, to the generating station.

Of course, apart from the injunction there are the ordinary laws and rules that apply and which forbid this kind of activity. So as a

Mr. Crosbie:

result of the request, as I understand it, of the man on the spot, the Minister of Justice arranged for more RCMP to be sent in to the site yesterday and last night. He was requested to do that and arranged it and it was certainly necessary, and as far as I know today matters are quieter. So, Mr. Speaker, there are two situations. One is with the collective bargaining dispute, which as long as we permit strikes in this Province or in this country, there is no way of prohibiting it or stopping it or forcing it to be stopped unless some extraordinary circumstances occur that might dictate that. But, Mr. Speaker, I think, on behalf of the government I certainly believe it should be made clear that no government can permit this kind of activity no matter in what circumstances do occur in this Province, and this government does not intend to permit it to occur, and I am sure that the Minister of Justice will see that enough RCMP patrolmen remain there as long as they are needed until this very unfortunate situation cools down or the situation corrects itself. But I am told by the people involved that it was a day and a night of terror in at Churchill Falls, and that cannot be permitted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, Sir, to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. In view of the serious situation at Churchill Falls, the deterioration of the situation which will probably be further provoked by a statement just made by the Minister of Mines and Energy, would the Minister of Manpower now tell this House if he is going to grant -

MR. CROSBIE: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please. Point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, that question is quite improper. It is not a question. Those remarks and the remarks just made about the statement I have made are not in order, and it should be ruled out of order, and in addition to which it is inflammatory.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Manpower.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, there is a point of order before the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

Standing Order 31, section(c): "In putting any oral questions, no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated except so far as may be necessary to explain the same " - and so on.

I would rule that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) had exceeded the limits of our rules, and I would request and order that he withdraw the remark that offended.

The hon. member for LaPoile,

MR. NEARY: The remark was unparliamentary, is that what Your Honour is saying?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Outside the Standing Orders which states that no argument or opinion is to be offered.

MR. NEARY: Sir, if I did not conform with the Standing Orders I accede to Your Honour's request and withdraw it.

I want to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower. In view of the fact that the union have asked on a number of occasion for an industrial enquiry into the whole industrial dispute at Churchill Falls, does the minister now think that the time is ripe to grant the union's request and to set up an industrial enquiry, the same as had been done in St. Lawrence, Buchans and in other industrial disputes in Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I will answer the question in the same manner as I have answered it a couple of times previously. When I believe that the time is appropriate for an industrial enquiry into the Churchill Falls dispute or any other dispute.

MR. NEARY: Are you going to wait until the army has to be called in?

MR. MAYNARD: I will make the decision, and not the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), or anyone else on the other side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Do not be so arrogant!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Manpower or the Minister of Energy concede that we have got the same situation, identical to the situation that was indeed in Buchans less than three years ago, and that situation became violent? Indeed violence was allowed. It was allowed by this administration. A company official ran down an employee. That sparked some of the worst violence that that town had ever seen. It sparked the sacking of the company general office, and there would have been complete violence except for the fact that then, and only then did the government see fit to appoint an industrial enquiry, and that cooled the situation. Can we not learn by mistakes, because it happened?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Point of order, Your Honour. This is a very, very serious situation, and because of that I would like to suggest in the way of a point of order that members confine themselves to the rules. In this case the hon. member is asking a minister for an opinion, which is totally contrary to the rules as expressed in Beauchesne, and I would like for that kind of -

MR. ROBERTS: The citation?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - you can read it in Beauchesne - that that rule be enforced
Your Honour.

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

I understood the Speaker to say that in addressing a question to the minister that one would have to stay within the realm of relevancy, except for making clear what he was referring to. And certainly we have two precedents. We have Burgeo, and all within this past four years, and I am very familiar with it and the members in this House are very familiar, and the Minister of Manpower is very familiar with the situation at Buchans. And this government of the day categorically refused to get involved until such time as Buchans went through one of the worst nights, and we have the same thing in Churchill Falls right now.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

May I rule on the point of order that was raised. In putting a question certain explanatory remarks may be made, but then should be followed up by a question within the rules provided in our Standing Orders. I did not understand that having listened to the preamble that a question had been put by the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), and I would ask him, therefore, if I misunderstood him, would he repeat the question, just the question. We have the preamble, and I am sure hon. members have it in mind. What was the question that he wished to put?

MR. FLIGHT: The question is, Mr. Speaker, in the process of making his mind up as to whether or not the minister will appoint an industrial enquiry to look into the situation in Churchill Falls, will he follow the precedents of the Buchans' situation two years ago to use that as an example?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

Has the hon. member finished putting the question?

MR. FLIGHT: No, I am afraid the minister has not got the question. I am going to rephrase it again. Will the hon. minister in making his decision as to whether or not he will appoint an industrial inquiry into

Mr. Flight.

the situation at Churchill Falls, will the incident in Buchans three years ago have any bearing on his making his mind up to indeed appoint an industrial enquiry?

MR. WELLS: A point of order on that question, now that it has become clear what the question is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. House Leader.

MR. WELLS: The hon. minister has said that he will decide, and it will be a ministerial decision, when and if an industrial enquiry will be made. And I think it must be presumed that when the minister makes up his mind, whatever it is, that he will take everything relevant into consideration. So that he cannot be asked at this stage, Mr. Speaker, hypothetical questions as to what he might or might not take into consideration in making up his mind. Obviously he will take everything that is relevant into consideration.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

I am prepared to rule at this point that the question was hypothetical by its very nature and that it is, therefore, out of order.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister, Sir, what criteria - at what point will the minister enter into the dispute to appoint an industrial enquiry? What criteria? What ground rules? On what will he base his decision? Can the minister give me an answer to that question? What will cause the minister to make up his mind?

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

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): A point of order has been raised.

MR. CROSBIE: That question is not in order. It is a question that is asking what advice the minister proposes to give the Crown, and what factors will be involved in it - page 148 of Beauchesne.

MR. NEARY: That is precisely what I am asking, Sir. What will cause the minister to make up his mind?

MR. WELLS: He is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

The question is out of order.

The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. House Leader indicate when he is going to recommend the name of the committee on committees, I guess, which is the best phrase I can dig up for it, according to Standing Order 84 (a). I do not know if there is any need for me to read the Standing Order, but there is to be a committee appointed to name committees.

MR. WELLS: I have the names, Mr. Speaker. I propose to do that at the appropriate time tomorrow.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): A supplementary?

MR. ROWE: No, it is not a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if he has been invited to enter into the investigation in connection with the Winter Carnival at Memorial University, or the investigation that is going on within the Students' Union?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thought I saw in the paper a statement attributed to a gentleman who is an office holder in the Students' Union saying that he was going to turn it over to the CID.

MR. HICKMAN:

If he did the normal course would be followed, that they would investigate and then report the results of their investigation to a Crown prosecutor. But there has been no formal request made of me, or informal for that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know - I think this may be a question for the Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment. If not he could refer it to another minister. And if it comes under federal jurisdiction I would ask the minister if he would be kind enough to make representation to the appropriate agency. But, Sir, in view of the fact that there are a number of cars being sold on the market now that require unleaded gasoline only, can the minister give any indication to the number of gas stations throughout the Province that do not have tanks with unleaded gas? Because it has come to my attention that there are a number of communities that have gas stations which have tanks which have only leaded gasoline. This poses a problem to the consumer because he has to have the catalyzer cleaned or removed every so often in his cars.

MR. MURPHY: I really do not know. I have not had any representation from any districts or any parts of the Province with regard to the unavailability. But if the hon. member has any indication I would like to have it. If not I will question the Consumer Affairs Bureau tomorrow and find out what the story is.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: A question for the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. A number of years ago there was a community pasture opened in Victoria, Carbonear. What now is the status of that community pasture on the basis of productivity?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

HON. J. ROUSSEAU: I presume the hon. member is referring to the pasture at Swansea in Carbonear. That pasture, Mr. Speaker, was begun, I think, in 1973. Working on it for a couple of years, I think they have about 1,200 acres now that have been fenced and about 225, 250 acres cleared. On that 225 or 250 acres that are cleared we will have it opened this year. Actually it has taken that long to fence the 1,200 acres and to clear the 225 which allows of course for future expansion. We anticipate there

MR. ROUSSEAU:

will be 160 to 180 animal units able to be accommodated this season. For the information of the House an animal unit is one mature cow or seven grazing sheep. So 160 to 180 units, consisting of either 160 or 180 mature cows of the equivalent of seven sheep for every cow.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. F. ROWE: Am I correct, Mr. Speaker, in saying that horses are not allowed in that Swansea community pasture? In view of the fact, if the answer is yes, is the minister planning to do anything in terms of setting up a community pasture in that area that would accommodate the great herds of horses roaming around through private property and through communities, particularly during the summer months imposing problems to these communities?

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. WELLS: I refer, Your Honour, to Standing Order (31) saying "Mr. Speaker shall disallow any question which he does not consider urgent or of public importance provided also that if in the opinion of the minister to whom a question is addressed it requires a lengthy answer." This, I am sure, is very important but it is not of urgent public importance today that the question of the horses be dealt with. The hon. member might like to put it on the Order Paper for answer at a future date.

MR. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think it is very urgent in view of the fact that there have been people killed driving their vehicles along the highway and ploughing into a horse up the Trinity side, the South side of Trinity Bay and on the North side of the Conception Bay Highway. So I think it is of utmost urgency and it requires a very quick answer if the minister is giving any consideration to getting some sort of an area to house or herd or enclose horses.

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

MR. E. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. It is unfortunate that the Government House Leader would have to bring up this matter right now of public urgency. After all the questions that have been asked in this House that I refer to as nonsense questions, it is unfortunate that

April 1, 1976.

Tape 1652

RH - 3

MR. R. MOOPES:

he has to bring up this ruling right now. I would also like to say that who determines what is of public urgency, this House or the people of Victoria? The question was asked of me by a number of councillors in the community of Victoria. Now I consider their urgency to be of more importance than the hon. House Leader's.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

The hon. House Leader is, of course, quite right in stating the rule, and it is the prerogative of the Speaker to disallow questions that are not of public urgency or of public importance. I do not recollect any questions have been asked that have fallen outside that definition. I do not think that the House can recognize that foolish questions or frivolous questions have been allowed to be put here, and have been answered. This has not been the case. At the present time the question put as a supplementary falls within the scope of the Question Period, and is consistent with the questions that have been placed in the past, none of which, I would reiterate, have been foolish or frivolous nor have they been ruled so.

The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Just as another point of order since the question has been ruled in order, the supplementary question, I was wondering if the minister has an answer?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The community pasture of Swansea, Carbonear is meant for the north side only of Conception Bay at this point in time. That was the original intention of it. Until it is filled up there, we are not looking at the growth of any more pastures in the Province at this point in time except to enlarge existing ones. Now, you know, the opening, of course, we will look at it, but at present I do not know whether the horses are anticipated to be housed or not, but certainly our first desire would be to have the cows, the mature cows and sheep or grazing animals of that nature there.

MR. SPEAKER: A further supplementary - the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. This may sound unimportant to some members but, Sir, did the minister say that this Swansea community pasture is for the north side of Conception

Mr. Rowe.

Bay only? Because if he did there has been a letter forwarded to the Heart's Content Town Council saying that that particular community pasture is for the use of the whole peninsula there, the Trinity Bay side.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I will take notice of that and clear it up.

Primarily, I know it was primarily for the north side. I will take notice and give it to you tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): I will permit two more questions.

The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: A question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In view of the fact that the deadline for licence plates, I think, has just about expired, I wonder if the minister can tell us how the year has gone in terms of numbers of vehicles for pleasure driving, if you like, and commercial vehicles? And also I ask the question in view of the fact that I understand that a number of companies that normally, with trucks and so on that they have, have not been licencing this year as yet in view of the fact of construction being uncertain and so on, I am wondering if the minister can provide any information on this to the House, please?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was informed only today by my Registrar of Motor Vehicles that up until yesterday afternoon that a total of 140,000 vehicles had been registered, and last year the total number of vehicles registered was 193,000, which means now there are approximately 53,000 or 54,000 vehicles to be registered. Most of these vehicles, I assume, and we are assuming,

Mr. Morgan.

are vehicles of a nature of camper-trailers and family trailer type vehicles which are not normally registered at this time of the year, and also construction equipment, and trucks and boat trailers and that type of vehicle. So that is the situation to date.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, Sir, if he has received in the last twelve months a report by a private detective, a report that was done by a private detective in connection with pilferage and theft at the Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I have not been in the department for the past twelve months so I will have to take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The Question Period has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Young) Order, please!

The hon. Member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, when the Committee last met, Sir, we had dwelt for some time on the Department of Justice and the administration of Justice in this Province, and I had presented some factual evidence in this hon. House, in accordance with the rules of the House. I presented this evidence uninterrupted, without any points of order being raised, presented some evidence, Sir, of some pretty serious things that were going on in this Province. Whether they were legal or illegal, is not for me to say.

In response, Sir, to the factual information that I provided to the House three hon. gentlemen to the hon. Premier's right, the Minister without Portfolio, the Government House Leader; the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Minister of Justice resorted in typical fashion to the personal attack. They tried to undermine my factual information that I had presented to the House by trying to hit at me personally, by trying to undermine my credibility. Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, fortunately they failed. And I want to tell the House now that I am not going to be intimidated. I am not going to get involved in any personalities or muckraking. If the hon. gentlemen persist to counter debate by lowering the decorum of this House to the personal attack, I will try, Sir, to resist as long as I can, but if they keep insisting, Mr. Chairman, I may have, I may be forced to get down in the muck and roll with them, and if it comes down to that, Sir, if it comes down to personalities and muckraking I can do my share of that too.

But at this particular -

MR. HICKMAN: Would would do that?

MR. NEARY: The hon. member has not felt the brunt of the attack at all.

MR. HICKMAN: No, and I am not going to!

MR. NEARY: What I am going to do, Mr. Chairman, in this particular case is turn the other cheek, because I know wherein I speak that the evidence that I put forward to this Hon. House was factual evidence. There were no personalities involved. I gave names of companies, individual owners of these companies, if I did not give the names of the companies the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Mines and Energy and the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), the Minister without Portfolio, would be the first to stand in this House and say, "Name names", I have had that flung at me before so I named names, and then they tried to twist it around the other way.

Well, Sir, I have laid out my case, and I make no apologies to any member in this House. And I certainly will not be scared off or back away from anything that I said within the rules of the House. Your Honour will remember that not once during my whole speech was I interrupted on a point of order, or a point of privilege or anything else. And there is nobody going to scare me now, because, Mr. Chairman, I want to report to this House now, - and I am just going to deal briefly with this matter, I will deal with it again later on today, - I want to report, Sir, since I made these statements, since I made these disclosures and these revelations that my telephone has not stopped night or day in the last twenty-four hours, From lawyers!

Mr. Neary.

Mr. Chairman, do you realize - and as I said in this hon. House, there are respectable law firms and mortgage companies and lending companies. They are trying to do an honest job, and they want to see this thing cleaned up. I had calls from two lawyers, and they told me I could use their names in this House. I am not going to at this point but I will maybe later on. They gave me authority to use their names. And I have had calls from managers of finance companies and mortgage companies and lending companies who are researching for me, who are going to provide me with documentation and who are satisfied to let me use their names, if the House will only agree to set up a royal commission to look into this whole matter. And there it is, Sir. I cannot be any fairer than that. I have laid out my case. I think I have made a good case. The public interest has been aroused, and the only thing that I can say, Sir, is that anybody who cannot stand the heat, then they better get out of the kitchen.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Justice, Sir, in replying - before I get off that, Mr. Chairman, before I get off this matter of personalities; you know, I would not mind it so bad if I had not sat in this hon. House when I heard the mother of an hon. gentleman in this House, her name raked in on the floor of this House for a paltry \$50 a month rent she was collecting for a little bungalow downtown. I did not hear the Minister of Justice or the Minister without Portfolio -

MR. WELLS: The Minister without Portfolio was not in the House.

MR. NEARY: No, not in the House at the time, but that did not matter the other day about all the precedents that we have from the hon. gentleman's colleagues. And what about the leases that my

Mr. Neary.

hon. friend from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) was so hepped up on when names were dragged out in this hon. House, almost put these people to the brink of a nervous breakdown? That is perfectly all right. There is nothing wrong with that. As long you do not touch the establishment, those who hold the power, who hold Newfoundland in the palm of their hands, as long as you do not touch them, they are the untouchables, you are all right.

Well, Sir, I can tell the hon. House right now that if I am any judge of the repercussions, the case I laid out in this hon. House the other day, that the people of this Province want a royal commission, and we would be doing a disservice, and my hon. friend's who lowered the debate to the personality attack would be doing their profession a dishonour if they, themselves, do not join with me in asking for this royal commission. Not to go on a witch hunt, Sir, not to put anybody in jail! Before you can bring legislation into this House, Mr. Chairman, you have to identify the problem, and at the moment we do not know what the problem is. I got a pretty fair idea, but the case I laid out in the House the other day is just the tip of the iceberg. The problem has to be identified, and the only way, Sir, it can be identified is through a royal commission. And then draft legislation to plug the loopholes, and to make recommendations, and above all, Mr. Chairman, to make restitution, to give refunds and rebates to all those people, these poor innocent victims who are trying to get a home for themselves, to give all these people refunds, rebates. Anyway I will deal with that later on again this afternoon, but I want to get back to the Minister of Justice again, Sir. I have got another beef with the Minister of that department, and another reason why I am questioning the administration of justice in this Province.

Mr. Neary,

Mr. Chairman, two years ago in this hon. House the Auditor General's Report, 1974-1975 - and I hope I got it with me - was tabled in this hon. House. In that report, the Auditor General's Report, Mr. Chairman, page twenty-five, headed,

MR. NEARY:

Department of Fisheries, the Auditor General made a very, very strong recommendation - the Department of Fisheries, Item 64 - quoting directly from the report, Sir, "Fishing gear bounties subdivision 14-04-03-01, a review of the procedures in effect during 1973-1974 - remember the year now, 1973-1974 - for the processing of fishing gear bounty claims disclosed the following weaknesses; (1) suppliers original invoices covering purchases of fishing gear were not signed by fishermen as evidence that they had received the gear on which bounty was claimed. Mention of a similar situation was made in my report to the House of Assembly for the year ended the 31st. of March, 1972." So in the previous year - no, the previous two years before that - the Auditor General had brought to the attention of the government and of the House.

"(2) Verification forms returned to the Department of Fisheries by fishermen were signed, but the signatures were not witnessed as required; And (3) an examination of twenty claims disclosed that in the case of each of two claims the claimant signature on the application for bounty form appeared to be different from the signature appearing on the verification form." Pretty serious charges these were, Sir, made by the only independent, I suppose, official of this House, the Auditor General, appointed by the House.

"It is most important", he says, "that measures designed to detect and/or prevent payment of fraudulent bounty claims be strictly enforced by the Department of Fisheries, since it has been established" says the Auditor General, "through prosecution that payments totalling \$98,425.00 have been made to claimants who filed fraudulent claims." Mr. Chairman, remember the dates, 1972-1973; 1974-1975. The Auditor General drew to the attention of the government and of this hon. House the fact that fishing gear bounty may have been paid out and was being paid out illegally.

Mr. Chairman, a year ago the then Minister of Fisheries, the now Minister of Mines and Energy, made a statement in this hon. House that he thought that there was a little bit of fraud involved in assistance on the loss of fishing gear in this Province. And the

Mr. Neary:

ever since has been trying to take the credit, Mr. Chairman, the minister has been trying to take the credit, for taking the initiative in this matter of what now is becoming the fishing gear scandal in this Province. The minister announced it in the House that he thought there were fraudulent claims, but the minister at the time did nothing about it. Even though the Auditor General talked about it for four years, and it took a fire over at the Department of Fisheries, it took a fire, Sir, in order for the government to do anything about the situation.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, before we allow Interim Supply to go through this hon. House it is incumbent upon the Minister of Justice to stand in his place in this hon. House and tell us, give us an interim report on what is happening in connection with the investigation into fraudulent claims, into forgery or theft or anything

Mr. Neary.

else that has gone on in the Department of Fisheries. It has been kept secret long enough. It has been hidden away in the closet now long enough, and it is time, Sir, that we brought it out in the light of day. Most of this money, Mr. Chairman, came from the Government of Canada, and that makes it all the more urgent, Sir, makes it all the more urgent of why, Mr. Chairman, we should have an interim report from the Minister of Justice before we pass Interim Supply, especially the minister's salary. I am quite prepared here today, Sir, to allow most of these departments to go through without too many questions. Unless I get satisfactory answers from the Minister of Justice and his colleague who is sitting next to him as to why something was not done about this situation, I am going to move that their salaries not be paid, not be included in the Interim Supply, that we reduce the ministers' salaries to \$1. The Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, would be the first to stand in this hon. House and accuse me, or accuse my friend from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) or accuse the member for Port de Grace (Mr. Dawe), or accuse the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) of being inept, incompetent, negligent in his duty by allowing this sort of thing to go on. Maybe the minister was too preoccupied with kicking out BRINCO, wheeling and dealing on the linerboard mill and sniffing around to see who sent Hansards down to Mr. Sémonian, or whatever his name is, and I might tell the minister that I left this hon. House the other day, and the next day I went to the Editor of Debates, and from what I can learn from the Editor of Debates, the requests for that speech that the hon. minister made last Fall, November, made it look like a bestseller, and most of the requests for the speech came from his own colleague. Is the minister aware of that?

The next time before he starts pointing the finger of suspicion, he should do a little more careful investigating. I still have my copy. I went and asked for one, and I believe my friend from Conception Bay South

Mr. Neary.

(Mr. Nolan) went and asked for one. I do not know how many more members on this side went and asked for them. I did. I make no apologies for it. That is my right. But, Sir, I will tell you I am concerned about the fact that the Minister of Mines and Energy went up to the Editor of Debates, who is supposed to keep matters confidential between members and himself in this hon. House, and bullied him into telling who came and asked for copies of that speech, used his strong arm tactics to bully it out of the Editor of Debates, and the Editor of Debates - I would not embarrass the Editor of Debates or the Legislative Librarian by asking such embarrassing questions, and the minister should be ashamed of himself. The number of requests that went in were fantastic, so I understand. It made it look like a bestseller, and well it should. Even the Premier sent for a copy, I understand. I could be wrong. The Premier can deny it or confirm it.

PREMIER MOORES: No!

MR. NEARY: I am wrong. Well, Sir, my usual source of information at this particular time is wrong. But, Sir, the government members themselves went and asked for copies, because they could not believe it. And I can tell the hon. minister that down sitting in the cafeteria in this building, having a coffee, that I was told that thousands and thousands of copies of the minister's speech were sent out to the national and international business world, the financial business world. I do not know if the minister was aware of that or not, but I was aware of it at the time, and I was very concerned about it, and I am just as concerned about the credit of this Province as the hon. minister.

But, Mr. Chairman, in all fairness to the honest people in our fishing industry, and in fairness, Sir, to the federal government

Mr. Neary.

and to the federal taxpayers from whom comes the financing of the Gear Replacement Programme, the Minister of Justice, Sir, must immediately give this House detailed information in connection with the fishing gear scandal that

Mr. Neary:

was allowed to go on under two ministers - not the present minister, I am happy to say, my old friend - the present Minister of Health and the present Minister of Mines and Energy. And I remember old Bully Boy standing up in this hon. House and pouncing on the poor little member for Bell Island saying, ah he was inept, incompetent when he was in his Department of Social Services. What about the millions that we heard about, the reports about that went out when the minister was head of that Department of Fisheries. Was he incompetent and inept and inefficient and negligent in his responsibilities? Or is it only the lower strata, the lower form of life, the non-lawyers? Are these the only ones who are incompetent and inept? I say, Sir, that minister should have been suspended by the Premier while this investigation was going on. Not that the minister himself did anything wrong! The only thing that he did wrong was that he was incompetent! And I am surprised in this particular case at the Minister of Mines and Energy, he does not usually goof like that. But in this particular case, Sir, he was negligent in his responsibilities as Minister of the Department of Fisheries. And he should have been suspended. And before he gets one red cent of salary under Interim Supply he will have to prove to me, Sir, that he was on top of this.

The Auditor General 1972-1973, 1974-1975 brought it to the attention of the government and to the attention of the House, and then the minister tried to get up and claim credit. He was the first to discover it, he said. But it took a fire, Sir, over at that department to bring it to light. This is a major investigation, Sir. It involves fantastic amounts of money, I am told, I am told it runs into the millions of dollars, and my pious sanctimonious friends from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) and St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) if they want to keep their integrity intact, they better shift their seats pretty quickly, because I am told this one could bring the government to its knees, bring down the government I am told. And, Mr. Chairman, for some reason or other I am getting the impression, and I could be wrong, that the investigation is being slowed down, suppressed

Mr. Neary:

while the House is opened. That the government has no intention of allowing that report to come out while this House is opened. And they have no intention of ~~laying~~ laying the report upon the table of the House. The biggest scandal, Sir, to take place in the whole history of this Province, and probably in Canada. Aw the hon. Premier can look at me askance all he likes.

PREMIER MOORES: What are you talking about?

MR. NEARY: I am talking about the fishing gear scandal.

The people of Newfoundland, Sir, want to know now what is being done about this investigation, and why it has all of the appearances of being slowed down. How many members of the fraud squad both CID and RCMP are involved in this investigation? How many accountants? And how many auditors are involved? Is it moving swiftly? Are the reports that are submitted to the Minister of Justice's office getting out of his office quickly?

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! Could I ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to see that the people in the corridors refrain from talking, please.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it is time the whole matter was brought into the light of day, Sir, so that the people of this Province will know, Mr. Chairman, what vipers are nesting in our Provincial bosom.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Mines and Energy, no doubt I will provoke him into getting up on his feet again in this debate. We will probably get interim supply passed before the day is over. There is no need of worrying about it. The government will be able to pay its bills and its salaries, and teachers and nurses. But this is the first chance, Sir, that we have had to get answers for these very urgent matters, these very urgent questions. And I do not think that we would spend a few hours in a better way, Sir, than trying to pry and drag and prod out of the Minister of Justice an interim report on what is being done about this great scandal.

Mr. Neary.

I would strongly recommend, Sir, that the Minister of Justice present an interim report on this gigantic fishing industry scandal before we even get to this subhead, before we get to his salary. Because if I do not get satisfactory answers - and I do not care, Sir, how long we have to debate Interim Supply. I am satisfied to let all the other departments go through, boil it right down to the minister's salary and the Minister of Mines and Energy's salary, so that the civil servants can be paid. I am quite satisfied to do that. But, Sir, the reports that are making the rounds outside of this hon. House are absolutely unbelievable, and they are widespread, and the whole thing seems to involve all levels of the provincial fishing industry.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit that it is the responsibility of members on either side of this hon. House to assure the people of this Province that this investigation is moving ahead quickly, that there are a battery of experienced men in both the RCMP and the Newfoundland Constabulary moving as swiftly as they can to try and bring this thing to ahead as quickly as possible. I could be wrong, Sir, I have the feeling that the government are dragging their heels on this investigation, on this real stable full of manure, and the reason they are dragging their heels, Sir, in my opinion, is that they do not want the report to come out while the House is sitting. They do not want the report, they do not want members on this side of the House clamoring and calling to have the report tabled in this hon. House. But as I said a few moments ago, Sir, in all fairness to the taxpayers of Canada, of Newfoundland, and the Government of Canada, who I understand is withholding now any further payments, that we level with these people and these agencies and these governments, and lay it on the line.

The minister will get up - I know what he is going to say - look, I have heard him so often. He is the greatest master of procrastination that I have met in this world.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who?

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Justice.

MR. NEARY:

I remember once just prior to the police strike, the first police strike we ever had in Newfoundland, the Minister of Justice had the report locked up in his drawer, and the hon. Premier of the day, my good friend and colleague from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) was driving in around the bay and heard the police were going on strike. And when he came he summoned all of us to the Cabinet room to find out, what is this, what is going on, what is this all about? They had made a submission, presented a brief to the government, and the Cabinet had not seen it. It was locked up, so I am told, in the minister's desk. The next thing we knew we had a strike on our hands. And everyone in the Cabinet at that time knew what the cause of that strike was, what the reason was behind it. The minister will now get up and say, "Oh, we cannot give an interim report. We cannot say anything about an investigation. We cannot say it could jeopardize the investigation! That is what the minister will say. He will start pounding his breast and say, "As Minister of Justice of this Province it would be irresponsible for me to say anything about an investigation that is being conducted by the police, because it could jeopardize the investigation, and that would be improper for a Minister of Justice of this Province." I say, nonsense, hogwash, balderdash. I am asking the minister to assure this House, and we do not have that yet, that this investigation is proceeding quickly; that the Minister of Justice assure the people of this Province and the people of Canada

Mr. Heary:

that this investigation is not being suppressed, that this investigation is moving as quickly and as swiftly as possible. Give us a few more details that can assure us, tell us whether the report will be tabled in the House. Or does the minister just intend to take it down in his own department and scurtinize it and have these nine counsels that he boasted about yesterday in the House as being the improvements to justice in this Province, he is going to have all these people peruse it down in his office by candlelight, or are we going to drag it out in the open and put it on the table of the House? Mr. Chairman, it is public money, and the minister has no right to conceal any information in connection with this report.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any doubt in any Newfoundlander's mind at the present time that public monies were spent on compensation for gear that was never lost, and gear was replaced, Sir, that was never delivered. And, Mr. Chairman, the action, as I said a few moments ago, that was taken by the government was not taken as a result of the initiative of any minister of the Crown, was taken as the result of a fire that occurred in the Fisheries Department and the CID and the fire commissioner went into investigate the fire and discovered examples of embezzlement. That is how it came out in the open, otherwise we would have never known about it. It would have been suppressed. It would never have seen the light of day. The minister can claim no credit for that. The Auditor General is the man that first brought it to the attention of the government and this hon. House, back in 1972, the year of witch hunts, Sir, the year of witch hunts by the hon. administration when they took over, but this one escaped their attention for some reason or other. And then they now reluctantly, grudgingly are having it investigated because the fire commissioner and the CID uncovered the evidence.

So far, Mr. Chairman, we have heard of one poor little, innocent little gentleman from up the Shore being taken into court and prosecuted. I understand that his conviction, his charges had nothing to do with the fire or nothing to do with the Gear Replacement

Mr. Neary:

Programme. Is that correct?

MR. W. CARTER: That is correct.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Fisheries says that is correct. Yet everybody in this Province, Sir, thinks that that is the gentleman that was being investigated. The minister should clear that up if he is so interested in people's character, and he does not want to see people's character assassinated. What about that gentleman?

MR. W. CARTER: You are doing a great job on him now.

MR. NEARY: I am not, Sir. I am doing a good job on him.

MR. MURPHY: You certainly are.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I am trying to clear his name. I am trying to separate him -

MR. MURPHY: You are, are you?

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I am trying to separate the poor fellow from this overall investigation, and this is a crowd that worry about people's character! The minister sat back and never made a statement, never said, "No, this had nothing to do with the fire or with the Replacement Gear Programme." I never heard the minister come out publicly. I believe I heard the Minister of Fisheries try to clarify the situation, or somebody, I do not know who it was, it certainly was not the Minister of Justice.

AN HON. MEMBER: Darn right!

MR. NEARY: No, you are darn right, Sir. That would be improper. Aw that would be improper. Protecting a man's character is improper. Aw, yes, they sure, sure, Mr. Chairman, they turned it around the other way when it is somebody on this side of the House, involving somebody near, a minister or a member on that side. Then that is character assassination. And what about the woman who got charged and then let go, charged for burning down a school? What about her character? Is the minister worried about that? And what about the day - Mr. Chairman, I tell you, look, you know, as I say, I got a job to restrain myself - the day that I was put out of the House by a

Mr. Neary:

government vote, not by the Speaker, not for breaking any rules of the House, but through brute force by the government because they had a majority, I was put out in the gallery, and my two little children up with the Guides sitting in the gallery. Well I would like to get the remarks made by the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) when I was out sitting in the gallery unable to defend myself, and my two little children sitting in the gallery. I was slimy, and I was this, and I was that. Go up and check Hansard if you do not believe me!

MR. NEARY: That was all right. The Minister of Justice and the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister without Portfolio, that is all right as long as you do not touch the establishment! Oh, you could touch me! I am just dirt under their feet! But I have news for the hon. gentlemen. I have no intention of backing away from them. Truth, Sir, is the best defence. I claim now, Mr. Speaker, I claim that the minister, both ministers, have been negligent, have acted irresponsibly in this fishing gear scandal. The minister who succeeded my hon. friend from Gander (Mr. Collins) - and I am prepared to let him go scot free at this moment, even though he was minister of that department for a couple of years - it was the Minister of Mines and Energy who should have been on top of this. What kind of a sloppy department was the minister running?

AN HON. MEMBER: You ran a sloppy department.

MR. NEARY: Oh yes, Sir, I was running a sloppy department down in Social Services because I tried to run it myself and walked on the toes of the civil servants. The minister just let her go! He did not keep a tight rein on her at all, let her go to the four winds! What a sloppy way to run a department!

As a result, today we have before us the biggest scandal, the greatest example of corruption ever to face the people of this Province and of this nation. Not a word! They do not give us any explanation. The minister will get up and say, "Oh, there is an investigation going on." How many police, I want to know? How many police are investigating? How many loads of fishing gear have been brought back so far from the Southern Shore and other parts of Newfoundland? How many accountants, how many auditors, how many experts, how many RCMP fraud squad are involved? Does the minister know or does he care? Or is he just prepared to go out and catch the petty little crimes? The little fellow that shoplifts, that steals a dictionary, grab him and throw him into court. Do we have two sets of standards in this Province? Do we have a law for the rich and a law for the poor?

MR. PEARY: I can see the minister. The wheels are turning. He is going to get up now and say, it would be irresponsible of the minister if he got up and gave us a few details about this. Irresponsible! Three or four million dollars of the taxpayer's money down the drain, wasted, extorted, chiseled, and the minister remains silent. All he can do is tell us it would be irresponsible of him if he gives us a few of the details.

I do not want to know at this moment who is going to be charged, how many are going to be charged. That is not what I want to know. I want the assurance of the minister that this matter is so urgent that there is a whole battery of accountants, auditors and police checking on it, looking into it, and that when they make a report it will be tabled in this House, and not just for the minister to get down with his magnifying glass to go over it to see if we are just going to charge this one or charge that one or charge the other one. That is not good enough, Mr. Chairman, so I am calling upon the minister now to give us an interim report.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I have time in the forty-five minutes that I have, to deal with the other matter but, Sir, I want to deal with this matter of the buck being passed in the car-wreck programme that appeared in yesterday's Telegram - a picture of the Minister of Transportation with the story. Did anybody take the trouble to read it? I am not going to read it all. I will just read some of it. Here is something for the minister to think about: "Ducking The Issue" this little piece is headed. "Do not pay any attention if they send you back to Environment" - quoting the Deputy Minister of Environment - "They are just ducking the issue," he said. "You are trying to find out about the extra dollar on the registration -

MR. MURPHY: Point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order has been raised.

MR. MURPHY: Did the hon. member say the Deputy Minister of Environment?

MR. NEARY: Yes, the Deputy Minister of Environment is quoted in this.

MR. MURPHY: The Deputy Minister?

MR. NEARY: Is a Mr. Downey the Deputy Minister?

MR. MURPHY: No, Sir.

MR. NEARY: What is his title?

MR. MURPHY: He is not Deputy Minister.

MR. NEARY: Well, okay, I will come to it then, whatever he is.

Do you want me to read the whole story?

MR. MURPHY: I do not care, boy! Take it home and eat it if you like, as far as I am concerned.

MR. NEARY: "Mr. Downey said the Department of the Environment had initially put forth and promoted the idea of disposing of the car wrecks but that the programme had been taken over by the Department of Transportation and Communications.

MR. NEARY: As far as he knew, he said, the arrangements with AMM were still in effect though they were still not as active as he had hoped. The Assistant Deputy Minister estimated that the company had picked up 16,000 wrecks in the past. The Deputy Minister of Transportation and Communications, J.A.G. MacDonald however, had a different story to tell. He maintained the programme for disposing car wrecks was administered and co-ordinated by the Department of Provincial Affairs."

"Mr. MacDonald said last year the sum of \$250,000 was estimated to the Department of Transportation for abandoned vehicle disposal and that the administration of the disposal was not his department's concern." Now, Sir, what I want to know, whose concern is it?

MR. MORGAN: What do you not ask it in the Question Period?

MR. NEARY: I asked it during the Question Period, Sir, -

MR. MORGAN: You did not today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - and I debated it during the late show last week and I was met with complete silence, stone-walled, rammed right up against a stone wall, they call it stone-walling in Ottawa.

MR. MORGAN: You attacked the company last week.

MR. NEARY: I did not attack the company, Sir.

MR. MORGAN: Sure you did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: I know the reason why, too.

MR. NEARY: What is the reason why?

MR. MORGAN: You know the reason why.

MR. NEARY: What is the reason why, Sir? Mr. Chairman, members should know that you do not impugn motives of other members of this House and I want the Minister of - I better not. I am trying to refrain, Sir, from getting involved in personalities. But I would say that it would be far better for the minister if he took Mrs. Lundrigan's advice and went and resigned from the Anti-Poverty Association, and I have got a letter down in my office demanding the minister's resignation because he has not done anything.

MR. MORGAN: That has no connection -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, you know, if the hon. gentleman is going to refer to me, refer to me in a proper position. I have no connection, none whatsoever with the Anti-Poverty Organization of Newfoundland or Canada at this time. None.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, Sir, was sent to Ottawa by the Anti-Poverty Association and became a member of the Consumer Association of Canada as a result of his representing that group. Well, Mrs. Lundrigan is now demanding his resignation from that group.

MR. MORGAN: The Consumer Association has nothing to do with it.

MR. NEARY: Who has nothing to do with it?

MR. MORGAN: The Consumer Association. Get your facts straight.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member used it as a stepping stone to get on this Consumer Association -

MR. MORGAN: Get your facts straight.

MR. NEARY: I have got my facts straight.

MR. MORGAN: Ask your colleague over here.

MR. NOLAN: You are not a member of the Anti-Poverty Association.

MR. MORGAN: That is right. I am not.

MR. NEARY: No, but the hon. member did become a member of the Consumers Association of Canada as a result of their sending him up to Ottawa to this conference.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, look, I want to clarify. It is a point of order for clarification. My position is I am on a board, an advisory board to the Federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs which now has no minister. The board was to advise the minister on consumer affairs. That appointment was made and I was recommended for the position by the Consumer Association of Canada, not by the Anti-Poverty Association.

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order, Your Honour, and I am not going -

MR. MORGAN: That is a clarification point.

MR. NEARY: I am not chasing rabbit tracks right now, Sir, I am going after elephants. I am after the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Mines and Energy, the two biggest guns in this House. I am going after them, and the Minister without Portfolio to a certain degree is the Government House Leader who thinks so much of his integrity and his honesty. Will the minister get up and tell us who is responsible for passing the buck in this car wreck business?

I would estimate, Mr. Chairman, that \$500,000 of the money collected for the dollar on the licence plate, almost \$500,000 is being paid out to this company and we cannot get any information. We cannot even get the contract.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I would like to advise the hon. member that his time has expired. Forty-five minutes have elapsed.

MR. NEARY: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be back at it again in a few minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: Before the hon. member rises, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to have the late show it is necessary to rise the Committee so that the Speaker can take the Chair and announce that the late show can take place and we will then come back in Committee.

I move that the Committee rise.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and has made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Chairman of Committees reports that the matters referred have been considered and reports progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again presently. . . .

Two matters prior to 4:30 p.m. today were passed on to me for debate when a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House at 5:30 p.m. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) indicates dissatisfaction with an answer to an oral question on March 29 to the Minister of Justice concerning bonuses, finder's fees, interest rates charged by certain mortgage companies and legal fees. And the hon. Leader of the Opposition of the same date indicated dissatisfaction with an answer directed to the Minister of Health regarding closure of 200 hospital beds.

MR. WELLS: Call Motion 5 - Interim Supply.

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, what I have to say will not take very long, in fact, very, very few minutes, but it is in connection with a matter that I, for one, and others discussed in this House the other evening concerning bonusing and second mortgages here in the House. It has been suggested that perhaps a royal commission should be set up to investigate this matter. You will probably notice that in the examples that I gave the other evening I made no references to either companies, law firms or even the individuals concerned even though I did in fact have the information before me. But I felt that the facts, as I outlined them, would be sufficient to at least interest the members of the House, and they could form their own conclusions.

Mr. Nolan.

Now there were a couple of things I did not say, which perhaps I should have, to perhaps let the members of the House and this Committee, Mr. Chairman, to decide whether or not there should be a royal commission to investigate it or not, and it is this - by the way I have something to say about lawyers now and the Law Society, and I will immediately sit down if any member or any lawyer would like to correct me on what I am going to say, because it is quite possible that I am in error. I have been informed that it is, at least, nonethical within the Law Society, for example, if the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) is representing me as counsel, for another lawyer to call me so that he can represent me or her rather than the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) - is that so?

MR. ROBERTS: You mean, soliciting business?

MR. NOLAN: Yes, that is what I am saying.

MR. ROBERTS: Hardly!

MR. NOLAN: Well, now what I am saying to this House is that a gentleman who represents a substantial company, in terms of assets and so on and in dealing in financing in this Province, has told me - and at least one or maybe two others who I can think of - that one, this is exactly what has happened to him, that he did get a call from a lawyer asking that he be given certain business. And going further, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman also states that the individual in question, whom obviously I cannot name, but if the royal commission with the powers of subpoena and the administering of oaths where one can testify under oath then you will get some of the truth of this thing.

MR. NOLAN:

because I am also told by the same individual that the individual in question, even though this gentleman is working for and is employed by a certain firm in a good position, was offered funds under the table in order to get that business if he would act there. Now if anyone disputes what I am saying, all I say is call the royal commission, set up the royal commission and investigate this thing and subpoena those. And also I think out of that will come additional information that will prove that while we were saying here in the House the other night that nothing was illegal, that in fact there are some things going on that from where I sit is an embarrassment to those who have been doing business in financing and so on, doing it well, to those in the Law Society of Newfoundland, who have represented people ably and well and decently, most decently as I know personally, and in fact I know of members of this House for a long, long while, fine men and women. And I feel their reputations should not be bandied about, should not be jeopardized.

This thing is beginning to mushroom and it is bad. I would like to make it perfectly clear in this House-because it seems to be that at least the House Leader has taken exception to some things said and so on - that at no time in no way have I ever thought about or considered any of his association in any business, whether it be legal or otherwise, to be unethical, never. I state it here publicly and now. But I am saying to you as a non-lawyer, as a layman, if what I have been told by a man of some repute is going on, I say it is your duty as lawyers and as members of this House to find out exactly what is behind it.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: This is wrong. Because if they are willing to do this to a man who represents a big company and even to go beyond him and go to his superiors to try to put the pressure on to get the legal business, if they are willing to do that, what are they going to do to the poor little uneducated housewife who is looking for a loan

MR. NOLAN:

from St. Anthony or from anywhere else? Now that is all I have to say on this matter, Mr. Chairman. I felt that it had to be said. It will only come out and there is no good of the Minister of Justice or anyone getting up and saying, "Go make a charge." I am making no charges. I am telling you what this gentleman said in my presence. I did not ask him. I was told. The only way this man will ever testify so he will not be crucified is under oath before a royal commission.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I will have time to finish my remarks before five fifteen or not but at least I have -

AN HON. MEMBER: Five-thirty.

MR. WOODROW: Before five-thirty, I am sorry. At least I will take the opportunity of speaking. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that at the present time before the House is the matter of supply. Whilst I do not proclaim to be as learned in the political arena as many other hon. friends, yet I have had a lot of experience in other walks of life and feel that I can add something to this debate. When we are speaking of supply, Mr. Chairman, we are speaking of money. When we are speaking of money, Mr. Chairman, we are speaking of the money that belongs in large measure to the people of Newfoundland, and may I add to the ordinary people of Newfoundland. Most of the people of Newfoundland that I have met are ordinary people. I feel that the government of the day, the Progressive Conservative Government, under its present leader wants everybody to speak in this House on such an important matter as money. I am sure that -

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is the first premier that ever did.

MR. WOODROW: I know. Absolutely. But he certainly showed what a fair man he was on television last night.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: And that is in fact one of the reasons why I have been prompted to speak today. He wants not only the members of his cabinet to speak, I feel, but those of us who are referred to as backbenchers. I would like to say that speaking of money, in a sense, I have been a member of , rather a Minister of Finance, not in a government field, mind you, but in another field. I have been a Minister of Finance for almost twenty-five years, and there were times, -

MR. SMALLWOOD: I found that out.

MR. WOODROW: I know you did.

I would to say that I have dealt with ordinary people. And sometimes I had to stretch a dollar, maybe a dollar had to stretch sometimes. They used to use a phrase about an elderly lady over in Benoit's Cove, they say, she could stretch a dollar from Benoit's Cove to Frenchman's Cove, and sometimes I had to stretch a dollar I can assure you maybe from here, let us say, to Harbour Grace.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman will have to stretch the government's dollar.

MR. WOODROW: Yes. And the going was not always easy, I can assure you.

Now I have referred already to the honest talk that the Premier gave last night. I felt he was terribly honest, and this was brought out this morning -

AN HON. MEMBER: You said terrible.

MR. WOODROW: No, no, I used the word in the right sense - that this was brought out this morning. Do not try to upset me because I have been used to speaking, you know, you can try all you like, but I do not mind.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: It was brought out this morning. I know one has to be careful, granted. But this was brought out this morning by Mr. Jamieson on open line.

MR. MORGAN: And he opposed the station, too at that.

MR. WOODROW: Absolutely. In any case, he was honest and sincere. And I think I will not be out of place if I am permitted at this moment to congratulate the Premier for being so frank and so honest, not only last night, Sir, but in fact, you know, many other times, in fact he has not coached me on this, -

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not what?

MR. WOODROW: He did not coach me on it, in fact, he did not ask me to say a word about it.

PREMIER MOORES: There is no doubt about it.

MR. WOODROW: Very good!

Now you have all heard today the statement from the Minister of Education saying that the government are going to pay \$1.6 million to offset the cost of insurance for all schools in our Province. I think this is really a good move. It is what you would call a constructive movement. It is not something we say, you know, something that is destructive. It is something that is going to help, to my mind, in a concrete way every child and every man and woman in Newfoundland. It is a well thought out thing. So I was really and truly delighted to hear that today from the Minister of Education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: We also heard, Mr. Chairman, yesterday about the Home Warranty Plan. I think this really is another step in the right direction. And as the minister yesterday was talking about this, I was wondering if this would be another financial burden on the person who is going to buy the home. And I learned, I think, last night that this would be absorbed into the building of the home, maybe it would average something like fifteen cents or twenty cents a month or something of that nature.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the estimates or money or supply, whatever you want to call it, to my mind should be of major importance to not only the ministers of the Crown, but to every member of the

Mr. Woodrow:

House including Opposition and as well backbenchers on the government side, That is the reason why I am talking. And I know everybody is making it important because every minister, or rather every member of the House on the Opposition side they are talking about this.

Now it is very easy as you know to criticize. I have often heard it said that some speakers are always at their best when they are telling people off. In fact, they would get 100 per cent marks for telling people off. The purpose of the Opposition is to criticize. But I would hasten to say that criticism should be just and constructive.

Mr. Woodrow.

Anybody can give destructive criticism, but destructive criticism, mind you, is a horse of a different colour. I furthermore feel - and I have said this before, I do not mind repeating it again, because really I am here because if I am convinced of what I am saying I furthermore feel that the members of the Progressive Conservative Government are thoughtful men and love Newfoundland and will -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: - do their utmost to guard the destiny of our Province.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the member repeat that again, please, because he does not mind repeating it, and I have waited so long to hear it.

MR. WOODROW: I certainly shall repeat it if you want to, Mr. Leader of the Opposition. I furthermore feel -

MR. ROBERTS: Is this the new morality?

MR. WOODROW: - that the members of the Progressive Conservative Government of Newfoundland and Labrador are thoughtful men and love Newfoundland and will do their very utmost to guard the destinies of our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Exactly as it is written. That is what I wanted to hear!

MR. WOODROW: In an effort to help this country develop - and if I got to be a bit critical I hope you will understand.

MR. ROBERTS: We will understand.

MR. WOODROW: I am sure you will.

In an effort to help this country develop the former Premier, and the only one before the present Premier since 1949, used the phrase - I hope I get it right - "Develop or Perish." In fact, I am getting up to something.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. Winsor): Order, please!

The hon. gentleman has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, if I may. I would like to hear what the hon. member has to say without interruption. He is a new member in the House. Let us give him a chance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Thank you very much.

I feel he was sincere, but how many of his industries were successful? I said, I felt he was sincere. The only industry paying in Newfoundland today - and I stand to be corrected on this if I am wrong - is the Newfoundland Liquor Commission. Revenue from that is something like \$22 million net profit a year. If I am wrong I stand to be corrected on it. All other industries have been subsidized by government, with some highly subsidized, such as the linerboard mill in Stephenville, which is subsidized to the tune of some \$25 million to \$28 million a year. What choice did the government have but to let the industries that had survived continue? Were they going to close down, for example, the linerboard mill, and others? But how many fell by the wayside as, for example, to just mention one, the rubber plant in Holyrood. Today this country is still paying the money of the taxpayers for these defunct industries.

MR. CARTER: Hear, hear! Defunct!

MR. WOODROW: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is easy to criticize. The whole of North America and no doubt most of the free world is suffering from inflation. It started to show in 1974. That is the year, I remember, I was a member of the city council in Corner Brook, and the only word I heard was inflation. At the end of the year we had to come to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and say, "For God's sake, help us!" I think the government has two choices in the present estimates in supplying money for the Province today. The government has two choices (a) continue to give normal services; (b) cut services. I think there are certain things that government should be doing, and should be considered as necessities of life.

MR. WOODROW:

Now I am going maybe to be a little bit critical. Well at least I am convinced that there are two things that should not fall under the sword of restriction. I refer to such matters as water and sewerage and building and paving of roads, and my two colleagues here help me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: What about hospitals -

MR. WOODROW: Well we will let that one go for the time being.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: Yes, very good. Okay. When they finish their words, Mr. Chairman, I will go back again.

AN HON. MEMBER: Continue.

MR. WOODROW: Very good. In certain parts of the Bay of Islands district, and I suppose in many other districts as well, it is impossible to find even a clear sample of water - a clear one, a clean one I guess is the word I should use. I feel that when restrictions were put on by Ottawa - and do not forget when the restrictions started, they started in Ottawa, they did not start in this Province, they started in Ottawa - water and sewerage and building and paving of roads should have been excluded. Now these things to my mind are necessities of life and you have to be a member of a rural district to realize it. I am not only a member of a rural district, but for most of my lifetime I lived in rural Newfoundland. I realize how hard it is for people when they have not even got a drop of water, when they have to drive over dusty, unpaved roads. How many of our people, of our Newfoundlanders in our rural districts have been eating dust for most of their lives from May until October!

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: We would have to spend less on health services if we had more clean water and paved roads. Now I know a lot has been done since 1972 and even before 1972. I do not want to be unfair with anybody. I am trying, as I said before in this House, I want to be an honest member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: I was sent here by the people of the Bay of Islands. I am going to do my best to be honest. The people expect that of me. I know a lot has been done since 1972 in the field of water and sewerage

MR. WOODROW:

and building and paving of roads. But a lot remains to be done and I know this government will try to do it. They will do more. We have again, Mr. Chairman, to bear in mind, and here is where I am trying to be honest, that there are fifty-one districts in Newfoundland and Labrador and the government has and does realize its obligation to all districts. Every district is of equal importance. That is the reason why I said to this House in my maiden speech that what is good for one district is not always good for the Province. I realize in fact what a responsibility, it is a terrible responsibility, placed upon a government when they are trying to be fair, trying to be fair with every district. It must cause a lot of sleepless nights for the Premier of the Province and for the members of the Cabinet as well.

Mr. Chairman I want to - I cannot continue can I?

AN HON. MEMBER: We adjourn the debate at five thirty.

MR. WOODROW: Adjourn, fine. I adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker, returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! The Chairman of Committees report they have considered matters to them referred, have made progress and request that they sit again. Does the House accept this motion? All in favour "aye", contrary "nay", carried.

As this is Thursday, five thirty of the clock, a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House, and in the order of the matters presented to me the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) wishes to discuss the matter that he brought up with the Minister of Justice concerning bonuses, etc.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, now that the dreadful, discriminatory and unscrupulous conduct in this Province by some brokers, legal firms and money lenders has been brought out into the open, that apparently it is common practice in the handling of financing and purchasing of homes in this Province, now, Sir, that it has been brought out into the open that the people of the Province are victims of this disgraceful situation, they expect their elected representatives on both sides of this hon. House to take action. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we all, including those members who are actively engaged in the practice of law on either side of the House, whether they are involved in practice of law personally or through their associates, they should now face up to the facts.

Whether or not, Sir, my revelations on Tuesday are a common practice as we were told by some of the speakers in the debate, are common practice among lawyers, brokers and money lenders is not the point. What is the point, Sir, is that this parasitic machinery that has apparently become the accepted practice in this Province for money lending is about the worst, has reached its worst level and has somehow or other, Sir, involved thousands upon thousands of dollars of homeowners in this Province with commission, finder's fees, bonuses and exorbitant interest rates from the poor people who can ill-afford to pay these extra charges and have enslaved these people, Sir, for a lifetime with a millstone around their necks.

Mr. Speaker, assurances from the Minister of Justice that we are getting around to presenting legislation to set some limits on this gouging of the public is not good enough. As I stated, Sir, a few moments ago we in this House must first face up to the fact that there is a rotten situation right in our midst and then take immediate action to remedy this situation. As a first step, Mr. Speaker, we must get to the root of the problem and in my opinion, Sir, this can only be done through the appointment by this hon. House of a royal commission fully empowered, Sir, to investigate the whole

MR. NEARY:

mortgage situation, the relationship between lawyers and the money lenders and their clients, and thereafter, Mr. Speaker, make recommendations as to the type of legislation, both civil and criminal, which will bring this cancerous situation in our Newfoundland society under control. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that any recommendations that would be made—although I would not want to anticipate what a royal commission might do — that any recommendations that it would make would provide for rebates to all those unfortunate Newfoundlanders who have been victimized in the last few years through these, although legal, highly immoral practices.

Mr. Speaker, judging by the number of telephone calls I have received from lawyers, managers of mortgage companies who are apparently doing business in this Province on the up and up and who will not have anything to do with bonusing or finder's fees, the industry itself, Sir, is supporting my recommendation for a royal commission. Mr. Speaker, you cannot tar the whole industry with the one brush. That is why they are supporting my recommendations, as my hon. colleague from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) indicated this afternoon, are supporting a royal commission. Some of them, Sir, are prepared to present briefs and give evidence to a properly established body. In my opinion, Sir, we would be doing the people of this Province a disservice, and in fact as I said earlier this afternoon the lawyers would be doing their profession a disservice, Sir, if they did not act on this matter without further delay.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN:

Mr. Speaker, if I may respond to the position put by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). In his few remarks he made certain statements, one that the activities of bonusing that he referred to, and I have to confess that double disbursement sheets are something that I had not heard of until the hon. gentleman raised it here two or three days ago, is legal and highly immoral and that action should be taken.

MR. NEARY: That part is highly illegal.

MR. HICKMAN: But, Mr. Speaker, I am in total agreement with the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and I say action should be taken and action should be taken now, and that is the very reason why there will be legislation coming before this House hopefully to curb this allegedly immoral, allegedly unethical practice. I am not prepared, as one member of this House or as a member of government, to wait for a year or two years for a royal commission to bring into government and subsequently table in the House, recommendations to try and curb this practice. As soon as it came to the attention of government - and I understand that this practice is not more than two or three years old. When I was fortunate enough to be actively engaged in the practice of law it was not on the go when this came to the attention of government about this time last year instructions were issued to the registrar of companies to examine the existing legislation, report to us on the need, and then a decision was made to prepare legislation for this session of the House. During this Spring sitting of the House legislation will come before the House for the approval of hon. members or otherwise.

The appointment of a royal commission would seem to be rather redundant then, Mr. Speaker, for this reason. Then let us assume that the royal commission finds, and it will find I suspect, that the double - and this is the point of the question, a point of this debate - the double disbursement sheets should not be permitted, or alternatively should be discouraged, or further in the alternative there

MR. HICKMAN:

should be absolute disclosure. Then they have to say -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. HICKMAN: I only have five minutes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If it would cause too much delay to have a royal commission, and if there is the strong desire to bring legislation in this session which could not be done if there was a royal commission, would the government consider setting up a select committee of this House to take evidence, to help shape the legislation, all to be done in the present session?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is and my advise that I get from the minister in the department concerned, namely the Department of Provincial Affairs and the Environment, that the data has now been collected, that there is sufficient evidence, sufficient information before the government to permit us to lay before this House meaningful legislation that will control and curb the kind of practice that has been referred to by the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary). Mr. Speaker, may I point out that in the legislation that is in force in the three provinces, I think -

MR. MURPHY: British Columbia.

MR. HICKMAN: Well I know of three, British Columbia, Ontario and Nova Scotia. That in all three the most they can do is compel any lending institution or mortgage broker to give complete and absolute disclosure. Once they do that, and then there is a cooling off period which allows a borrower to change his or her mind after two or three days, well what more can you do if they insist on borrowing?

But may I say this from what I have learned in the last couple of days on this mortgage broker thing, that I cannot for the life of me understand why people do not go, potential borrowers do not go direct to lending institutions, because I am told that the lending institutions frown on this so-called bonusing, that they are prepared to give the money direct to the borrower if they come to the conclusion

MR. HICKMAN:

that the borrower is a good risk, has the assets to put up as security. Now, you know, if there is anyone within the hearing of my voice, may I strongly urge potential borrowers in Newfoundland - and there is nothing wrong with borrowing money - who need money, go direct to a lending institution, because

MR. HICKMAN:

all a broker can do, as I have learned, is to take the application for the loan, take it to the credit lending institution and then collect a bonus.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I have to point out to the hon. minister that his time has expired, unless by leave.

MR. HICKMAN: I thought I had injury time, Mr. Speaker, for the half minute that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave.

MR. HICKMAN: I will not trespass for more than -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. HICKMAN: But I still will not trespass other than the time that was used up because I know there is another debate following.

Mr. Speaker, I can only implore any Newfoundlander who has to borrow money to go straight to any accredited lending institution because I am at a loss to find out - and I say this pleading guilty to the fact that I am not aware of the detailed services that these mortgage brokers deliver -

MR. NEARY: Who are you trying to con?

MR. HICKMAN: I am not. I am totally unaware of what service that they deliver. There may be a statement tomorrow saying, we deliver the following services, but to my knowledge there is no service delivered by a mortgage broker company that could not be given by the lending institutions direct.

MR. ROBERTS: The people do not realize that they are brokers.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right. That is a very good point, Mr. Speaker. People may not realize that these companies that are acting as mortgage brokers are indeed that, because I have seen an advertisement -

MR. ROBERTS: They obtain mortgages from the mortgagees and then assign them.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. I have seen advertisements in the paper advertising, mortgage money available and -

MR. NOLAN: And low interest rates.

MR. HICKMAN: - and this sort of advertisement, and I had assumed when I read it that it was a mortgage company. But I heard in the House yesterday an indication -

MR. NEARY: The minister is not that naive.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, I did.

MR. NEARY: Oh, my God! Well, that is why I am asking for your resignation.

MR. HICKMAN: I heard in the House yesterday, Mr. Speaker, a statement that one of these companies was not indeed a mortgage company -

MR. NEARY: You are Minister of Justice!

MR. HICKMAN: - but a mortgage brokerage company.

Mr. Speaker, may I remind this House that as far as the existing legislation is concerned wherever there has been a breach of the Real Estate Trading Act and sufficient evidence available, we have prosecuted. I see it that when the Mortgage Brokers Act comes into force and this new type of enterprise that apparently arrived in this Province within the last couple of years comes under control, that if there are any breaches of that control the responsibility is to prosecute for these breaches.

But a royal commission would simply find I suspect at the end of its hearings, "We find the following deficiencies in the system. We recommend the following legislation. P.S. we note this legislation is now law in the Province."

MR. NEARY: What about the people who have been cheated, how do they get back their money?

MR. HICKMAN: If they find cases of fraud, Mr. Speaker, or there is any indication of fraud - and let me repeat this, and I am not saying this for political points or anything else - if any hon. gentleman or any person in the Province of Newfoundland feels that he or she has been defrauded by any company, be it a mortgage broker company or anyone else, there is a very simple course of action to follow, the same course of action that is followed by any other Newfoundlander who feels that he or she has been the victim of a crime; you either

MR. HICKMAN:

report it to the police or you bring it to my department. It will be investigated quickly, vigorously, fearlessly. If the evidence indicates that there is indeed a breach of the Criminal Code of Canada the necessary charge will be laid and the necessary prosecution instituted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has indicated a wish to debate the matter of closing 200 acute care hospital beds. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On Monday afternoon I asked a question of the Minister of Health. He was not here at the time but I addressed it to one of his colleagues. The minister I know is aware of the details of this because he and I had a word outside the Chamber. The point of my question, Mr. Speaker, was with reference to the announcement made by the Finance Minister in the budget speech of Friday past to the effect that the government were about to close 200 hospital beds as an economic measure. There was no -

MR. ROBERTS:

and I want to underline that, Sir - there was no pretense, no claim at all made to the effect that these were being closed for health care reasons. And I think that is an important point. We should realize at the start that this decision was taken for financial or economic reason, and indeed the minister's speech on page eight or nine of what my colleague from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir has called "The On-The-Rocks" makes that quite clear.

Sir, I asked for a list of the beds which were to be closed or for an indication of the hospitals in which beds were to be closed. I believe the answer I got - again we do not have the verbatim reports - but the answer I got from the Minister without Portfolio, speaking for his colleague, was that his colleague at that point was meeting with, I believe, the Hospital Association and the Medical Association to go over the matter with them. Well, Sir, I again say to the minister that I think the people of this Province are entitled to know as quickly as possible exactly what is to be done, where beds are to be closed. Are we, for example, to see beds closed in the new Western Memorial Hospital at Corner Brook, which opens today, I believe? The first patients are being admitted there today, that magnificent new building which, as the CBC told us this morning, the construction of which was begun in 1971, which have been under construction for, in effect, four and one half years. Or where are we to see beds closed? Now I am not raising at this point, Mr. Speaker, the much more substantial question, which I intend to raise on the estimates, and my colleagues with me, of how a government can go around the Province during an election campaign promising to build hospitals here and hospitals there, and expansions here and expansions there, then after the election say they are going to close 200 beds, which is, I would point out, Mr. Speaker, 6 per cent of the beds in this Province. We have approximately 3,100 acute care beds in this Province, which is low on the national average now. That is about six beds per 1,000 of population. That is well below the national averages, and certainly not what is needed. On one

MR. ROBERTS:

hand the government promised beds, and on the other hand they tell us they are going to close beds. But that is not the point.

The point I want to make now is that the people of this Province have a right to know where beds are to be closed, and when they are to be closed. That is why I put the question down on the late show, as we all it. I ask the minister if he will now give us a statement, an indication. I am not asking for him to say Western Memorial, two beds, and the James Paton in Gander, three beds, and the St. John's General, five or whatever the figures might be. But I do want to know the areas in which these beds will be closed. I want to know, Mr. Speaker, whether they will be closed in a number of hospitals, by which I mean eight or ten or fifteen of the large general hospitals or whether they will be closed in one or two. I want to know, as precisely as the minister can, whether they will be in one speciality or more than one speciality? Will they all be psychiatric beds, or general surgery beds? Just how do the government propose to do it?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wonder - well, before I come to that final point - when the minister addresses himself to the question of where beds are to be closed, I realize he may not at this time be in a position to tell us, but I want to know when we will know? When will the people of this Province know?

MR. CANNING: The cottage hospitals.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Canning) wants to know, and a good point, whether beds will be closed in cottage hospitals, most of which are very small now. And if we were to close one bed in each cottage hospital, we would have twenty or thirty beds closed, but it would have taken out maybe 10 per cent of the beds in our cottage hospitals.

MR. NOLAN: What is the national average?

MR. ROBERTS: The national average, I would think, and it varies, Mr. Speaker - my friend from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) has asked a question that cannot be answered quickly because it depends

Mr. Roberts:

on just what one takes into account. But Canada must have now on the average of about seven beds per 1,000, acute care general treatment beds, in which I would not included psychiatric beds or long term beds or what have you. But the figure will vary depending on the definitions of the beds which are counted as part of it. But the point is we are below the national average, We are now going to be a little lower still because we are talking of closing roughly six out of every one hundred beds that we now have.

My final point, Mr. Speaker, and I think I have about used up the time allotted to me under the rules at this point, my final point is this, Sir: Would the minister indicate to the House and to the people of this Province exactly how much is to be saved? A hospital bed, Sir, the cost of it is a quantifiable item. It varied in my time in the Health Ministry, which was four or five years ago, when they used to run from about \$40 a day, I think, up to about \$110 in one or two of the larger ones.

MR. COLLINS: The average is \$112.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, you know, the minister will have the chance to say, and as I say, my experience certainly is four or five years old now and I do not pretend to know as much about hospitals as whatever I knew then. But the point is it is a quantifiable cost. And also I want to know what the net saving will be, because of course we get a large amount of money from Ottawa roughly 55 per cent or 60 per cent of the money which we spend on hospitals comes from Ottawa through the Hospital Insurance Plan. That is the point of my question, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the minister to deal with those points, and not the other ones which I hope we will deal with on debate of the effect of Ottawa- you know, we all know what it was cutting back on hospital insurance, we all know what it was cutting back on Medicare. That is not - I hope the minister will not mention that today. I hope he will address himself to the questions of where the beds will be closed? What kind of beds will be closed? When they will be closed - and when we might expect an indication of it - and how much we will save?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition knows, because he just indicated to the House that when the question was asked on Monday or Tuesday I was not in my seat for the simple reason that I was meeting then with the Hospital Association and the Medical Association. We arranged that deliberately so that we would meet with them as soon as we could after the announcement was made in the Budget and of course for obvious reasons we could not approach them prior to the announcement in the Budget Speech.

It is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, for me to indicate to the House where the beds are going to be closed. And I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition or any hon. member in this House would want for me as Minister of Health, or for this government for that matter, to unilaterally say to the hospitals and the doctors, "You close ten here, and you close fifteen somewhere else, you close twenty in another place." That is one of the last things we want to do. We could do it of course but I do not think that that is the right approach to it. What we decided to do was to meet with the two professional groups, which I just mentioned, outline to them what we propose to do, and to try and get their co-operation; because without the co-operation of the hospital administrators and the boards and the doctors, particularly the doctors, Mr. Speaker, because after all it is the doctors, and this is no criticism of them, the doctors who generate the business in the hospital. It is the doctors after all who admit or cause to have patients admitted to the institution. It is the doctors who treat them when they are in the institution and it is the doctors who decide just how long the stay is and when they will be discharged. So if we are going to accomplish anything at all in this field then, as I said, we must have the co-operation of those two groups.

And I must say, Mr. Speaker, that those groups, I would not say they were happy with the proposal, but they appreciated the fact that this

MR. COLLINS: government, not unlike other governments across Canada, particularly our own federal government, are faced with the problem of having to find ways and means of making our dollars go farther and at the same time of course trying to not necessarily cut back, but to restrain or constrain expenditures. Most provinces, Ontario for instance has closed about 3,000 hospital beds. I believe there were about nine hospitals closed.

MR. ROBERTS: The hospitals are closing twenty beds each. They have not taken 500 beds off.

MR. COLLINS: Well, the hon. Leader of the Opposition and I have different figures on that. We will not get involved in numbers anyway, Mr. Speaker, and I do not intend to mislead the House with members. But all the Provinces, not all of the, some of them have closed beds, other are contemplating closing beds. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to bring about restraints, all government services must suffer and of course the Department of Health is no exception. Our total health cost this year has gone from \$170 million last year to \$194 million this year, so that is an

MR. H. COLLINS:

indication of the ever escalating costs in terms of health care. Now I have not answered all the questions which the Leader of the Opposition asked. After the meeting with the hospital administration, the hospital administrators, the hospital association, the doctors and others, it was agreed that there would be further meetings with the individual boards and those meetings will be commencing next week. And after having gone through that process of meeting with all of the individual boards then we will get the two groups, the Hospital Association and the Medical Association people together again and that could very well take three or four weeks, maybe five weeks, approximately a month.

Now I will not be in a position to say too much further than what I have said now until we have gone through the exercise of meeting with all of the individual hospitals and again meeting with the two groups referred to. We have indicated to all of the interested people that it is not our desire to do anything to impair the health care system, but it is our desire to try and find better ways through home care, through day surgery, or whatever, to find ways to close 200 hospital beds or come up with the equivalent savings.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned a figure, and we are looking somewhere in the vicinity of - I will not say approximately - but we are talking about a definite figure, \$2 million. That is the provincial portion -

AN HON. MEMBER: \$2 million net.

MR. COLLINS: \$2 million net, \$2 million Province. The hon. Leader mentioned that the cost was shared by the federal government. But what we are talking about is our own savings.

MR. ROBERTS: Then it is gross expenditure.

MR. COLLINS: Yes, a little over that really. It is a little over that.

MR. ROBERTS: Then it must be a large figure.

MR. COLLINS: Yes, that is right. I think it is pretty close to \$5 million

MR. ROBERTS: I take it that the Province now has it budgeted for, what the minister has mentioned?

MR. COLLINS: Yes, that is right. But the cost to the Province is in the order of about \$2 million.

Maybe we can find other ways to do it. I am sure it is going to mean closing some beds. Where it will be I cannot say, but just as soon as I am in a position to say so I will let the House know,

MR. ROBERTS: I realize we are beyond five minutes, but I think the House is interested, Mr. Speaker, in this and all we can do now is hope not to adjourn so we can come back at eight. The Minister of Justice has already gotten up once on that, and if that is the rule we do it.

Could the minister tell the House, Sir, if he would, what is the figure they use today in the Department of Health as the average cost of a bed per day? It was usually \$50 to \$60 in my day but that was a long time ago.

MR. COLLINS: The average cost, Mr. Speaker, is - I am pretty sure the figure is right, I can double check it and if it is not right I will bring back the right one - the average cost today is around \$112 per bed per day. There is a great disparity there. In a small collage hospital it might be down to thirty-five or forty dollars. In a hospital like the Grace it could very well be up to \$160 or \$165. I think it is \$112 is the average cost, \$112 per day.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the minister.

On motion that the House at its rising do now adjourn until until eight o'clock this evening.

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MP. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! Before we begin proceedings I would like to call the attention of the hon. members to the fact that the Town Council of Roberts Arm are in the galleries, Deputy Mayor Lloyd Colbourne and Councillors Harris, Locke and Rowsell. I am sure you would wish to give them a greeting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MP. WELLS: We have to go back on motion 5, Interim Supply.

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MP. WOODROW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just before I continue my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) for his kind remarks made this afternoon when he realized as a new member I was making my, not my maiden speech but second maiden one, if you want to have it that way, and it is nice to see a man of his calibre. I think he exercises not only a lot of justice towards his fellow man but a lot of charity as well. And I think that is something that we have to have in this House as well as outside the House.

I also have to say about the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), whilst I do not always agree with everything he says, at the same time he certainly has a knack of making new members feel at home in the House of Assembly. And I feel that all the members, all of us who are here, we were sent here to work primarily on behalf of the people who sent us and there is no need to be - we have nothing to fear. We really should in fact feel it is a great privilege and a great honour to be able to work primarily, primarily I suppose, on behalf of the Province and then of course on behalf of the people who sent us here to the House of Assembly.

MR. WOODROW: Now I was saying before I left off speaking that I considered such matters as water and sewerage and building and paving of roads to be of major importance to all of us, especially members in districts like my own, in rural districts where people in many cases are deprived of these necessities of life.

The member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) wondered if I considered such things as hospitals and schools important. I certainly do. But I would say this much that if our children cannot have a drop of water to wash themselves and a decent road to walk over it is going to be very hard for them to enjoy the beautiful schools that we have in the Province. So what I am saying is I think that in my opinion, and perhaps many members would agree with me, that water and sewerage and roads, paved roads especially, are very important to the people of Newfoundland, especially in the rural districts when in some cases they are lacking in them. I think these are some things that we should really consider.

Mr. Woodrow:

Another matter, Mr. Chairman, has come up in the House, and it has been spoken on quite a lot especially since 1976 and that is the need in Newfoundland for a search and rescue division, or whatever you want to call it. Already I believe there is a motion before the House, and I suppose in due course this will be debated. But we all know in fact, and we all lament the tragedies that have hit our Province in 1976. And perhaps a lot of those or some of them could have been avoided, and some lives could have been spared if a search and rescue centre had been established in Newfoundland. In fact when I spoke on Provincial Affairs the other night, last Friday night, this was one of the things that I mentioned. I hope that we as a government, in fact, as members, all members when it comes to debating issues such as this - and I understand we will have to go to Ottawa - we will go, we say, united, because united we stand. And I do not think there is anything more important and anything more non-political than a matter such as a search and rescue centre for our own Province.

I also wanted to say something, and it will have a bearing on the estimates, I wanted to say something about travel. A lot has been said about the necessity for travel, and whether we as members should travel hither, thither and yon. And what I feel is that the first place we have to travel is to the people who elected us. And really, you know, since I got elected I have tried under, say, a very heavy financial strain to get to my district every week, and I got there every week, and I realize - I do not care what side, in fact, the member is on - I think it is important for him to get to his district as often as he is able physically or financially or whatever the case may be, to do so and let his people know that he or she appreciates the confidence that they put into him or her, in this particular case, on September 16, 1975.

Now I would give a lot of leeway to ministers of the Crown, they have to travel, they have to travel not only to their own districts but they have to travel to the other districts as well

Mr. Woodrow:

and they have to travel, in fact, outside of the Province. And I would like at this particular time to thank the hon. Minister of Fisheries who took a weekend off, which he no doubt could have spent with his family and so on, and he came with me to my district and we, in fact, covered a lot of ground.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: And I am sure it did a lot of good. I am also going to ask the other ministers, and I realize how busy they are, in fact, they must be terribly busy with the many, many duties they have to perform, I am going to ask them within the boundaries of reason if they will also come out and visit my district as well.

MR. WOODROW: Now, I heard, Mr. Speaker, over the past couple of days a lot of allegations, and to say the least I, as a new member of the House do not mind saying - and I think I am thinking on my feet now - I was really a bit shocked. I have confidence, as I said, in this government, and I have confidence, in fact, in the members, especially the Minister of Justice and the Minister without Portfolio and the Minister of Mines and Energy, and that does not take away from any of the other Ministers of the Crown that are here. I certainly could say the same about all of them.

I also happen to know something about such things as mortgages. I know what a first mortgage is, I know what a second mortgage is and I also know what finder's fees are. I know what finance companies are, I know what trust companies are and I know what banks are. I would like, in fact, to ask at this particular time - I would like to suggest that if there needs to be any clearing of the air, I would like, in fact, to ask the government - I am not telling them to do so - but perhaps an investigation or a royal commission would not be a bad thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: After all, royal commissions and investigations and the like have been set up before. But we have nothing to fear. Well then, if we have nothing to fear - it almost rhymes - if we have nothing to fear, clear the air.

MR. NEARY: Come on over with us! Come on over with us!

MR. WOODROW: Oh no! No, you are wrong there, hon. member. I am also aware, Mr. Chairman, that we are living in a capitalistic system, and thank God we are. Therefore it is very hard for us to control profits. How can we control it? In fact, to my mind it is really beyond our control.

I have just about finished now all the remarks that I have to make, and I would like to say that as long as I am here a member of this hon. House I am going to try to do my best for the good of the Province and, naturally for the district in particular in which I - in fact, I almost lived there, which I am proud of also - the

MR. WOODROW: district that I represent. And by the same token we have to have the understanding - in fact, I would be very unwise and very unfair if I should expect everything to come to the Bay of Islands district. I am grateful for what is there already and I think, as the hon. member from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) said - he mentioned this concerning the hospital for Clarenville - we have to tell the people, we have to be honest. I have had to be honest with people. In my lifetime I have had to say, "I am sorry, you know, we just cannot have this." Actually it is amazing if you use what you have you will never be in want. If we, for example, had to survive like - I remember one time, in fact, it was during the Second World War

MR. WOODROW:

in Halifax people had to live on porridge only. It is amazing, you know. Somebody said, "How did you do it?". Well, in fact, they said, really, "If you use what you got you will never be in want". And I think, Sir, that we have to take, as the saying goes, we have to take the bull by the horns. I am going to try to be sincere. I am looking now at something written down here, and I do sort of hate to mention this but what I want to allude to concerns the Leader of the Opposition. You know he was going to find \$300,000 before their election and he was - I am sorry, \$300 million it was. He was going to find \$185 million to finish all the roads in Newfoundland in three years, and there was \$10 million for mothers allowances, I think, and \$11 million or \$12 million for school tax.

MR. WHITE: If you are going to quote people, quote them correctly.

MR. WOODROW: As they say, I have not got the figures exact.

MR. ROBERTS: That is obvious.

MR. WOODROW: Well, I know this but I think I have the last figure exact. The whole thing was \$300 million, all right. And I am happy to say, Mr. Chairman, that before I was elected - and I say this and I stand proudly and say it - that I made one promise to my people, and that promise I am keeping every day and that promise was, Mr. Chairman, it was to work to the best of my ability.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: I would like, if you want to see what I am doing - and I do not want to praise myself - but I would invite you to look at the phone calls that I made and the correspondence to examine for yourself.

MR. MORGAN: I was over there.

MR. WOODROW: Yes, of course you have been. I know. The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications was over to the district with me and as I said I am trying to get others over as well.

But in any case sometimes, you know, I say it is too bad we have to sit down, but there are many others who have many more things, many important things to say.

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave.

MR. WOODROW: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member wish to carry on?

MR. WOODROW: Well I would like to the hon. member that I have other things to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. WOODROW: All right. Very good. You know, we have only been elected for six months yet. You will be hearing a lot each day in the next four or five years, ah.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: So I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Chairman, I wish to comment very briefly on the situation surrounding the fire at Pleasantville last Fall and the subsequent investigation into the Fishing Gear Subsidy Programme that my learned friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) brought up earlier on today. I trust that you will bear with me since the notes and files that I kept on this situation I have left in Nain, at my home in Nain. Also not being used to the rules of the House I have to try and tread carefully and delicately.

In 1973 I became involved in a certain fishing operation in this Province which was facing near bankruptcy, it was almost belly up. I went in to try and save the situation there and try to do something with it. It was there that I came across certain situations operating within the Department of Fisheries that concerned me, and also within certain fishing companies and supply companies in Newfoundland. What I found was not - at least when I went there I had been told repeatedly that there was a system of kickbacks, a system of patronage, not the twenty percenters but the ten percenters, if you provided business to certain large companies supplying either fishing gear or equipment, I never found any direct evidence of it, although indirectly

April 1, 1976

Tape 1677

IB-3

MR. STRACHAN:

I had numbers of overtures made to me during the two and a half months I was there. But I did find a system at that time - and this was way before the discovery now of irregularities in the fishing gear programme - I did find

MR. STRACHAN: that fishermen were being encouraged to submit claims for gill net losses. In fact in many cases I also found that the forms that the fishermen had to fill out were being left totally blank, the affidavits. The fishermen were being asked to sign the name at the bottom and that later on the whole forms would be filled in.

MR. SIMMONS: Asked by whom?

MR. STRACHAN: I should say that the - if I can explain the situation, what I found happened in the case that I was involved in was that the fisherman lost ten gill nets, He then went to his local supplier and under the Gear Subsidy Programme he asked for a replacement of his nets. He was handed a form - and apparently this was general procedure or accepted procedure because the fishermen laughed at the situation - he was handed a form on which he signed his name and what happened was that this form, this affidavit stating that he had lost gill nets, but no quantity entered, was then submitted to the Department of Fisheries for payment as the local supplier would give them the nets.

I have lost - my notes in Nain, and I have got to try and delicately pick my way through this. But what was happening was that the major supply companies in St. John's were supplying the local supplier with these nets, and rather than charging the local company on a thirty day or maybe the maximum of ninety day basis, he was taking the nets on a system of assignments from the government. What was happening was that the local supplier could not pay for the nets that the fishermen were needing because the fishermen were using a great quantity of nets, so what was happening was that the major supply companies were carrying the brunt of the load, that is, instead of the local supply company paying - what is it, let us get it right - rather than the local supply company submitting a claim to the government, what was happening was that the major gear supplier on a system of assignments was waiting for a period of six months to a year because the Department of Fisheries are very slow paying, and because they were slow paying he was assuming the

MR. STRACHAN: burden of supplying fishing gears to the fishermen.

Now the thing that concerned me at that time was that it sounded simple enough. But I wondered what the fishing gear companies were doing carrying very large loads, a very large amount of working capital being handed out in the course of a year, and sitting and waiting for something like \$500,000 or \$1 million or \$2 million or \$2,500,000 to come back in form of payments from the government? And I figured that no company, or no major company could have this kind of working capital and survive very long, because first of all he was not earning interest on that money and, secondly, the cost of the nets was rising so much that he must have been losing over the period of a year too. Because by the time they went to get a new supply of nets from Japan, or wherever else it was, the price of course was much higher one year later. So I could not understand this system.

I could not understand why they were being so benevolent and whether there was some form of payment being included somewhere to cover the interest or whatever it was, and I never did find out exactly that situation there. But what I did find out was that once the local suppliers got hooked in by a system of assignments, then the local suppliers could not move or shop around and they were tied into a monopoly situation in which you absolutely could not get away from the major gear suppliers you were dealing with. And I figured at that time that because one could not shop around the price of gear therefore went up and since the government was paying the programme anyway, nobody was hurting.

I also found that the fishermen were being encouraged. There was a drive, there was almost a hard sell by the companies and the local suppliers to get the fishermen to claim.

MR. STRACHAN:

I was concerned about this because I felt that when his statements came out I figured the fishermen would be getting the blame, That they were being told that they were being greedy or chasing to the government or wanting free equipment, cheating and various other things. But I found in this case here that they were being encouraged and I was told, or it was indicated to me that I should carry on the same kind of encouragement programme, that the money was available and the Department of Fisheries would pay it.

Now at that time I was too involved in running a company, a fishing operation, to be really interested in delving deeper into it. But I did find later on that, it was indicated to me, and I do not remember by whom, but it was indicated to me at that time that there was also in the Department of Fisheries a system of cross checking the invoices from the supply company against the gear that the fishermen had applied for to see that everything cross checked. But that it was controlled that if there were any mistakes, in other words the invoices did not balance the amount of gear out, what should happen in the department or within the people scurtinizing them, that they should not bring it up to any superiors but that they should phone the gear supply company immediately and have this verified.

So what was happening then was that the gear supply company was saying, "Fine, just wait a couple of days," and they would phone them back and make the correction, and they corrected them according to these. But only one in five hundred or one in four hundred was ever picked up this way. There were statements made, at least at that time I heard a great deal of indication this way.

The thing that concerned me most, however, was at that time I did think - and I returned to Nain shortly afterwards, and never became involved in it again - but I did think of trying to come and deal with the situation because I felt that either a monopoly's commission or some business practices within this Province or some controlling body should investigate the large gear supply companies because they were creating within this Province a monopoly situation, they were artificially driving prices up, and they were pushing for

Mr. Strachan:

business in manners which, if not illegal, certainly were slightly unethical or immoral, I might say.

What my big concern was when the story about the fire on the subsequent investigation in the department started last Fall, I was concerned that what would happen would be that everything would close in, and nothing would come out and the fishermen of this Province would be blamed for mismanagement of a programme which was enacted to help them, to be a benefit to them. And so I wanted to indicate some of these. I had extensive notes made at that time while I was running the business, and I found a great deal of inadequacies at that time, but I did not pursue them because immediately afterwards I left and went back to Nain, and I did not feel that I had sufficient evidence to warrant coming to anyone and asking for an investigation.

I believe the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is correct in some of his statements that he makes concerning this Fishing Gear Programme, this subsidy programme, and its misuse and abuse. And I felt that by this time the administration, the present administration, should have made available to the public and to the fishermen in this Province a clear situation, a presentation of the facts so that we know who was at fault and who was to blame in a programme which is now being, as I understand, wiped out, of which fishermen in this Province cannot take part in again or have any other further benefit.

That is the gist of what I have to say. I most certainly would, if the Minister of Fisheries wishes, I would certainly make available to him some of the pieces of information that I have as of that time, although I may add that I have gone through it carefully and none of it was definite in my mind, I did not have time to look into it and be investigative in that sense, because I was, of course, running a business at that time. But I would certainly give him the

MR. STRACHAN:

benefit of what I thought was happening and explain some of the situations to him. But I also feel that in a matter of this amount of money, \$7 million, of which there was a great deal of abuse, then I think the abuses should be laid at the correct source and that the fishermen in this Province should not be blamed totally for something at which they were encouraged to do.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, just one question. I have lost track. This form, this affidavit thing the member said was signed but left blank, did you come in afterwards and say that someone else filled it in for another amount? I lost track of that and wonder what happened to these forms.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes. I do not have my notes that I could have dealt or go through it.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, yes. No, I was just wondering -

MR. STRACHAN: What happened was that if a fisherman came then he had to fill out an affidavit stating that he did actually lose on such and such a date ten gill nets. But when I went in to take over the position I handed the form to the fisherman and asked him to fill it all out, etc., the dates and his number of nets and so on and he said, "No, I do not usually fill them out. You do that. All I do is I just sign my name." And he just signed his name. More and more people were coming in to me and saying, "No, you fill them out, or you do what you do with them." So I checked the office and the office said, "No, we do not generally fill them out. We just send them in to St. John's, or there is some arrangement made with the gear supply companies in filling out these affidavits." But the fishermen quite sincerely felt that - in fact, in many cases I do not think the fishermen even knew they were affidavits. It was just a piece of paper put in front of them in which he signed.

MR. MURPHY: And conceivably that ten could have been made twenty, do you think? Would that be the case?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, oh yes. Absolutely. That is the point I was trying to make, that the fishermen quite innocently were coming in and just

MR. STRACHAN:

signing the name and thinking that was the end of it. But it was creating within this Province a monopoly situation in the supply of fishing gear.

MR. SIMMONS: As the programme was designed, I would just like to ask a question about, to pursue the matter he is on now, the signing of the blank forms. To his knowledge, were the forms completed in the community concerned, and if so, by whom? I do not mean by name, but by the supplier or to his knowledge was the form sent in its blank state to a St. John's supplier? Does he know who ultimately completed the form? How far did the form go as a blank form?

MR. STRACHAN: I am not sure, because obviously I was a new fellow in the operation when I came into the operation. The gear supply companies were extremely suspicious of me and therefore -

MR. ROBERTS: Was it because they felt the hon. gentleman was too honest?

MR. STRACHAN: Well, I think that they felt that there would have to be a period of wooing before they could come to any kind of arrangement with me. They therefore felt that I would have to carry it through the proper procedure. So I never managed to check out who filled them out at what time and where, whether it was done in St. John's or whether it was done by the local agent, and what system there was of payments and so on. But what I did know was that this assignment arrangement was a very cumbersome method. It was also creating this monopoly situation and the fishermen were being encouraged to sign these forms.

MR. SIMMONS: Just for clarification, it was the local supplier, the local supplier that was advising the fishermen that he could sign a blank form, is that correct?

MR. STRACHAN: No. The local supplier was only supplying fishing gear from the major companies. In other words, if you phoned up the major company and said, "I want 200 gill nets tomorrow," 200 gill nets would be delivered. He would then hand them out to the fishermen. But the local supplier was merely acting as an agent in this case because he

MR. STRACHAN:

was not paying for the nets from the major supplier.

MR. SIMMONS: But who was it who was saying to the fishermen there is no need to have this form completed and sign it as a blank? Was it the local supplier?

MR. STRACHAN: No one. The point was that there was obviously an arrangement between, I felt, an arrangement between the major gear supplier and the local agent or the local suppliers.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Young): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to thank the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), Sir, for his support in my recommendation that a royal commission be -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Young): Order, please! Excuse me, I thought you were going to ask a question.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member for Eagle River finished?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, but I would like to say -

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I thought -

MR. NEARY: The member is finished.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, he yielded for a question from you.

MR. NEARY: Did you yield for a question? Are you finished?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, Sir.

MR. NEARY: The member -

MR. CHAIRMAN: He yielded for a question.

MR. STRACHAN: No, I -

MR. CHAIRMAN: He yielded for a question.

MR. STRACHAN: Not yet.

MR. NEARY: No, the member can have the floor, Sir, if he -

MR. F. ROWE: On a point of order. Just to straighten the matter out, I think my colleague, the member for Fogo (Capt. Winsor) was about to ask a question and he was yielding.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes.

MR. F. ROWE: So that question can be taken care of, he will be finished his speech and the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) can go on.

CAPT WINSOR. I would like to ask the hon. member, who obviously has a lot of knowledge of this gear programme, how fishermen went about filling in their applications, but the question I would like to ask him, who or did fishermen take the affidavit in front of? There must have been some one. Was it a fishery officer or a JP?

MR. STRACHAN: No, the affidavit was just filled out in the office of a local agent of the gear supply company.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, first of all, Sir, I want to thank the member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) for supporting my recommendation that a royal commission be appointed to investigate second mortgage companies, brokers, certain law firms who are engaging in bonuses and finders' fees, and I also want to thank the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) for supporting my recommendation, and I also want to thank the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) for his support on the gear subsidy programme.

I am not quite sure, Mr. Chairman, I believe I could claim in part the responsibility for the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) being living in Nain at the present time. When I was Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, the member was in the consulting business. The member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) at the time had set up his own consulting firm and he and I and the officials of my department talked about the establishment of a fish plant in Nain and another fish plant in Makkovik and I -

AN HON. MEMBER: A monopoly.

MR. NEARY: No, not a monopoly, and my department commissioned the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), if he remembers correctly, for just the paltry sum of \$5,000, I believe it was, to go to Nain to establish a fish plant for the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. And he did an absolutely magnificent job, Sir, outstanding job.

MR. NEARY: When I went down for the opening and saw all the people there dressed up in their white coats and hats and so forth, I could scarcely believe what I was seeing, absolutely fantastic. It is the first time in Northern Labrador that women worked and were paid equal pay for equal work with men, the first time.

PREMIER MOORES: You must be talking about Waterford.

MR. NEARY: I am talking about what?

PREMIER MOORES: Waterford.

MR. NEARY: Waterford. No, I get a letter from Waterford every day believe it or not. I pass them over to the Minister of Justice.

PREMIER MOORES: The white coat brigade!

MR. MORGAN: They are coming to take you away.

MR. NEARY: So I could partly claim the responsibility, I suppose, for the member being in this hon. House today because I believe when he went down to open up that fish plant he fell in love with Nain and he stayed there.

But, Mr. Chairman, the member has made a very valuable contribution to the debate that I started this afternoon in connection with the fishing gear programme. I laid out a case this afternoon that I thought was fairly substantial for the Minister of Justice to give the people of this Province an interim report on what is happening in connection with the investigation into the theft, I suppose you could call it, from the Fisheries Department.

Mr. Chairman, we have so little information.

MR. HICKMAN: If you sat down long enough you would have all you want.

MP. NEARY: Well, the minister had an opportunity to get up and has not gotten up, and I am going to try to see if I can provoke him into getting up because the people in this Province are entitled to an explanation, are entitled to know what is going on and why the government is dragging its heels on this investigation.

MR. HICKMAN: If you would sit down I would be able to tell you.

MP. NEARY: Well, Sir, the minister will get up before I am finished.

MR. MURPHY: He cannot get up before you are finished.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down. Sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this has all the appearances of a cover up, has all the appearances of a situation that is being swept under the rug. We do not know what police forces are investigating -

MR. HICKMAN: Well, sit down and I will tell you.

MR. NEARY: - what police forces are investigating this robbery in the Department of Fisheries. We do not know if it is the RCMP, the Newfoundland Constabulary, how many members of the fraud squad, how many members of the Newfoundland Constabulary, how many accountants, how many auditors. We do not know, Mr. Chairman, as members of this House, let alone the general public, we do not know, Sir, if the investigation is going on at all. If it is we certainly are not hearing very much about it. And, Mr. Chairman, we want to know why the Minister of Fisheries of that day, the present Minister of Mines and Energy, was not suspended from his portfolio for an indefinite period while this investigation on embezzlement in that department was being carried out. Not because the minister himself would be involved, I am not saying that, I am sure

MR. NEARY:

the minister was not, but the fact that the minister presided over a department, Sir, that had the biggest cash shortage in the history of Newfoundland, so we are told, and the minister is transferred nonchalantly over to another department. He should have been suspended. In any other province, in any other jurisdiction, a minister that presided over a department, Sir, where there was so much theft and embezzlement and thieving going on, a minister in any other jurisdiction would have been dropped, dumped, suspended from the cabinet for presiding over that, allowing his department to be run in such a sloppy way. This has not just been going on for one year, Sir. The Auditor General in his report as I indicated this afternoon, the 31st of March, 1974, two years ago yesterday, brought it to the attention of the government and to the attention of the House and he brought it to the attention of the government in 1972, the Auditor-General, a man who has no political affiliations, who is a servant of this House. Yet, Mr. Chairman, nothing was done about it.

Maybe the Minister of Mines and Energy, who was then the Minister of Fisheries was too preoccupied in trying to carry out his vendetta against the oil refinery in Come By Chance, against the Linerboard mill in Stephenville, kicking Brinco out of Newfoundland, maybe he was too preoccupied with the big financial wheeling and dealing that was going on to worry about his department. But, Sir, under our parliamentary system every minister, Mr. Chairman - does the House realize this? Maybe the new members do not - every minister is responsible.

MR. WELLS: A point of order. Speaking of our parliamentary system, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that it is forbidden to do is impute wrong motives to a minister or any member of this House. Now the hon. gentleman has imputed motives to the present Minister of Mines and Energy, who is not here at the moment, imputes motives to close up Come By Chance and to do two or three other things which if he was motivated that way would be serious allegations, and the fact that he

MR. WELLS:

was not motivated that way make them even more serious and it is completely against the rules of this House to allege these motives.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I have hurt the hon. minister's feelings -

MR. WELLS: You are not hurting the minister's feelings.

MR. NEARY: I just said the Minister of Mines and Energy may have been preoccupied with these things.

MR. WELLS: I think the record will show the hon. member said otherwise.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, just for the sake of the record - the hon. minister is so touchy this last twenty-four hours or so, Sir - but I withdraw if that will make him feel any better.

MR. WELLS: Is it withdrawn unconditionally?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman -

MR. WELLS: Is it withdrawn?

MR. NEARY: The minister is not the Chairman of this Committee. The Chairman of the Committee is sitting to the minister's left. The minister does not own the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I will ask the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) are these statements withdrawn?

MR. NEARY: Well, if Your Honour thinks it is unparliamentary I - does Your Honour think it is unparliamentary?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it appears to be so from the Chair.

MR. NEARY: I withdraw it, Sir, withdraw it.

MR. J. CARTER: Withdraw again.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw again and I withdraw again and I withdraw again. Does that make the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) who is trying to maintain his public image and his integrity, any happier? Well, if he was trying to maintain his integrity he better shift his seat over here pretty fast.

Mr. Chairman, under our parliamentary system, Sir, under our

MR. NEARY:

system of government, every minister is responsible for the actions of his department. It is inescapable. There is no way out. Every minister who occupies a portfolio today in that government, Sir, is responsible for every little detail of the running of that department. We have seen -

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. NEARY: The running of the department is the responsibility of the minister, not the civil servants. And the blame or the credit or the glory or the condemnation of any department, Sir, rests with the minister. In this particular case the minister presided over a department for a couple of years where all these things are

Mr. Neary:

alleged to have gone on, and that minister should have been suspended, He should have been put out to pasture, In any other jurisdiction it certainly would have happened. It happens up in Ottawa all of the time. We saw the example recently of dial-a-judge, Just because a minister called up a judge, he was forced to pass in his resignation. Here you have a situation here where you have, so we are told, the biggest cash shortage in the history of this Province. And if there is any investigation, Sir, it would appear the government is just accepting it as just a routine investigation. Just routine. Aw, the minister nods his head, Sir. I would say -

MR. HICKMAN: I shake my head sometimes.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. HICKMAN: Shake my head.

MR. NEARY: Shakes his head. Well, usually he is rubbing his hands and rolling his eyes heavenward. I have no doubt at all that the minister is going to get up shortly and tell us, Oh, how unpatrotic I am to be challenging the minister's authority, but, Sir, it is time for somebody to challenge the Administration of Justice in this Province. The minister told us this afternoon in connection with the royal commission that I requested, that the government are searching, scrapping now across Canada, digging up legislation to look over, to see if we can get a suitable piece of legislation in Newfoundland. But the minister did not tell us that if there were any cases of fraud involved in the double disbursement sheets that I spoke of yesterday that the money would be refunded to the people who were victimized. Mr. Chairman, does this House realize that in the case of welfare recipients who chisel a little bit to try to keep body and soul together, that the department goes back beyond the seven year period, goes back sometimes ten years and drags - my hon. friend is shaking his head - because I know it to be a fact. It is true.

MR. HICKMAN: Are you referring to me, now?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not. - and drag welfare recipients into court for overpayments that are ten years old. And bringing in

Mr. Neary:

a piece of legislation now to control loan-sharking and finder's fees and bonuses and exorbitant interest rates is not going to cure all the people that have been victimized over the last two or three years, is it? Does the minister think that is justice?

Mr. Chairman, what about Mrs. Sandra Butt? The minister is always so concerned about peoples reputations, and personalities. What happened when this lady was arrested and put in jail, and then took the lie detector test and was allowed to go free?

MR. MORGAN: When was this?

MR. NEARY: Oh, do not tell me the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications does not know about that case?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The Curtis Academy fire?

MR. MORGAN: Oh, yes!

MR. NEARY: I did not hear the minister come out then and say, "We are sorry, Other charges may be laid, The investigation is going on. We were wrong. We apologize. We will have to make up for destroying the lady's reputation somehow or other." No, Mr. Chairman, you did not hear any of that. Do you know why? Because these people I am talking about are not a part of the establishment, they are not a part of the clique, they are not a part of the power base that runs this Province. That is why, Sir, I am challenging the Minister of Justice under Interim Supply. It is about time we got rid of the double standards in this Province. It is about time, Sir, that we had one law for the rich and one for the poor - or the same law for the poor, not a law for the rich and a law for the poor as we have at the present time.

And, Mr. Chairman, one other thing I want to challenge the minister on, and that is that appearance of a scandal involved in the Summer Games, especially, Sir, in that land transaction.

MR. NEARY: After asking - if the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) would just get out of my way so I could see the expression on the minister's face? I want to see how much his blood pressure is going up.

When I cross-examined the government on whether or not they were going to investigate -

MR. MORCAN: You must think you are awfully effective. You must think you are.

MR. NEARY: I am pretty effective, pretty effective. I got that crowd over there frightened out of their shoes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MURPHY: Remember what Judge Mifflin had to say!

MR. NEARY: Listen to old filth and dirt over there himself. Listen to him! Listen to the bigot!

MR. MURPHY: Sit down! Go on!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Chairman!

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WELLS: The point of order is very clear. The word bigot, the member called the minister a bigot.

PREMIER MOORES: Whichever one. Anyone.

MR. WELLS: Yes, which is absolutely unparliamentary and should be ordered to be withdrawn immediately.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order, Sir. It is perfectly in order in my opinion to call the gentleman a political bigot, perfectly in order.

MR. WELLS: The word 'political' was not used, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MURPHY: There is nothing wrong with that.

MR. NEARY: Well my hon. friend accepts it, Sir. There is not a thing wrong with it.

MR. MURPHY: The best expression all day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The Chair did not hear the word 'political' before bigot and therefore -

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, when you are referring to -

MR. CHAIRMAN: - would ask the member for LaPoile to withdraw it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I will rephrase my -

PREMIER MOORES: Withdraw!

MR. CHAIRMAN: withdraw and rephrase. I withdraw and rephrase
Sir. The member is a political bigot. When you refer to hon.
members in this House, Mr. Chairman, you refer to their politics -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Do not be so cheap!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if I was the hon. Acting Minister of Public
Works and Services I would keep a close watch on Scrivener Project over
there at Memorial University.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Do not worry about -

MR. MURPHY: There must be someone else you do not have any straws
on. Are there not yellow pages in the telephone book?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I told the House this afternoon, do I have
to repeat it again, when I was sitting out there in that gallery with
my two little children, ten and eleven years of age, sitting up with
the Girl Guides I heard that -

MR. MURPHY: Go ahead! Go ahead!

MR. NEARY: What I am about to say may be unparliamentary, Sir, but
I heard that hon. member.

MR. MURPHY: I will tell you what I said.

MR. NEARY: Yes I heard what the hon. member said.

MR. MURPHY: - such slime in my life.

MR. NEARY: That is right. That is what the hon. member said. Well,
I could not get in here to defend myself when I was put out of this
House by brute force, by the government majority.

MR. MURPHY: Then say it now.

MR. NEARY: You talk about cowardly.

MR. MURPHY: Say it now!

MR. NEARY: You talk about cowardly, Sir, and Mr. Chairman, that member
got the gall to sit down there and talk about scandals, this whole -
no, I cannot say it. Well, look there has been more scandals uncovered
since 1972 than you could shake a stick at.

AN HON. MEMBER: One big one.

PREMIER MOORES: The most identifiable one.

MR. NEARY: Oh the hon. Premier is going to get his two cents worth in. The hon. Premier might remember a year or two ago in this hon. House where he got a little bit personal with me and he stood up man-fashion and withdrew his statement. But he has given a bad example to some of his ministers because they have been at their dirt and their filth over the last couple of days and I guarantee this, I am going to issue the warning now, that I am not going to take it much longer. I guarantee you if we want to start mud slinging and muckraking in this House, and you want to get personal, I am just the boy who can fling it out too.

MR. MURPHY: You are telling me.

MR. NEARY: You are darn right I can.

MR. MORGAN: It is cleaner.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we should stay away from personalities in this hon. House, as the hon. Premier has learned. We should stay away from personalities. The hon. Premier learned that lesson a couple of years ago when he made the slip in the House and got up and apologized to me for it.

PREMIER MOORES: Stay away from personalities, what about you?

MR. NEARY: Well that is what I am doing. Where are the personalities? I just heard the dirt and the filth coming out of the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) and the present Minister of Mines and Energy, he should be in the Guinness Book of World Records for his character assassinations of the past.

MR. CROSBIE: Bunkum!

MR. NEARY: I finally got him back in his seat, Sir. I will have him up on his feet now I suppose when I sit down.

MR. CROSBIE: That is what you will not.

MR. NEARY:

The minister should have been suspended for presiding over a department where all this embezzlement was going on. The minister has to accept the responsibility for the running of that department.

But I was coming to the MacPherson property, Sir. In the case of welfare recipients, the Minister of Justice does not write a welfare recipient a letter and say, "Would you mind explaining why you did this?" Well, that is what is happening in the case of the Summer Games Committee. After I put a number of questions to the Minister without Portfolio, the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), the government House Leader, about the Summer games and the minister got up and answering me one day - I think it was during the Late Show - told me that I should be ashamed of myself attacking this fine crowd of Newfoundlanders, that I was unpatriotic, I should be ashamed of myself. The next day I picked up The Evening Telegram and, lo and behold! here was the hon. the Premier, the hon. member's leader, coming out and saying that he thought it was very unwise the way they handled the tendering procedure and the way they were handling the Summer games. If that is not twisting, Sir, or turning!

Then what happened? Does the minister want me to tell the House what happened then?

MR. WELLS: The people concerned here - and I am not going to mention any names - will have an opportunity to reply.

MR. NEARY: The people on welfare, Sir, who chisel a few loaves of bread or who go down and steal a pair of eyeglasses down to Woolco are not asked for an explanation. Dear God, they drag them into court and they throw the book at them! That is what the minister's department does.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nonsense!

MR. NEARY: Well you cannot make chalk of one, Sir, and cheese of the other. What should have happened was that this land transaction involved in the Summer games should have been investigated the same as you would investigate a welfare recipient.

MR. NEARY: I do not care where it is. It is probably in the minister's own district or it may be on Shea Heights or it may be in Mundy Pond. If the hon. Premier just keeps sticking his little darts in, he is going to get one back pretty soon that he will not like. He will get one back that he will not like if he keeps getting his little snarkey, personal remarks in.

PREMIER MOORES: It was not personal.

MR. NEARY: It was not personal?

PREMIER MOORES: All I mentioned was the favor to the Province unless you can take full responsibility for it.

MR. NEARY: I will take responsibility for it. If the Premier wants to start that kind of a debate just say the word, that is all the has got to do.

Mr. Chairman, you do not write a welfare recipient and ask him for an explanation, and you do not write somebody who was shoplifting and ask them for an explanation, you do not write somebody who went down and smashed out a window of a store downtown, you do not write them and ask them for an explanation. But you write Mr. Morgan and Mr. MacPherson and Mr. Andy Crosbie and ask them for an explanation. Why? Why not investigate? Why not send the police in? Why not appoint a judicial enquiry? Why not? It is not the first time it has been done.

I understand, Mr. Chairman - and I am checking this out - I understand that the land in question was supposed to be given to the church. I want the Minister of Justice to go to the records of the St. John's Housing Corporation and the St. John's Housing Authority. When all that land over there was expropriated my understanding was that the MacPherson property was left out because Mr. Harold MacPherson, I believe it is, the late Harold MacPherson who lived there at the time, said the property was going to be donated to the church. So it was left out. It was not expropriated by the St. John's Housing Corporation or by the St. John's Housing Authority.

April 1, 1976

Tape 1685

IB-3

MR. NEARY:

When the Pippy Park was set up, the boundaries of the Pippy Park almost go right into that property. But that was carved out. It was left out because it was church property,

Mr. Neary:

so I am told, and that is why I want the minister to check it out.

MR. HICKMAN: It is not so.

MR. NEARY: It is not so? Well one thing is so, Sir, one thing is so, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that somebody made about \$250,000 or \$300,000 for about a one day transaction in that whole land deal, a middleman. Then the government have the gall to tell us they are going to write the Summer Games Committee. Going to write them. Well in the future if that is the kind of precedents you are going to establish, you are going to have to write everybody in this Province who gouges a few dollars out of the Public Treasury. Why make chalk of one and cheese of the other? Why not take the bull by the horns and let us not be jelly fish about this, because it has all the appearances of a scandal. Have it investigated!

Aw, you get an explanation back. Oh, Dear Mr. Crosbie, would you please explain why Mr. Morgan got \$100,000 as a middleman in a one day legal transaction, would you mind explaining that? Mr. Crosbie says, Dear Mr. Wells, the Minister without Portfolio, yes, we are very happy to explain this, Sir, blah, blah, blah. In he comes with the letter into the House. Here we got the explanation. Who is going to judge whether or not the explanation is justifiable or is valid? Is the minister going to judge? Is the government going to judge? Will the reply be laid upon the table of this House? Mr. Chairman, it is time now that we took a good hard look at the administration of justice in this Province. We have had a law now for the rich and a law for the poor in this Province long enough.

I started to get into today, Sir, this article here about "The buck being passed in the car wreck programme." Here is a beauty. "Remember the one dollar paid last year by Newfoundlanders in the government's campaign to rid the Province of car wrecks? Well it appears that that buck is literally being passed from one Provincial department to another. In 1975 the Province received about \$200,000 from a one dollar charge placed on motor vehicle registrations. But an attempt yesterday by a Telegram reporter to seek information on how the money was used and how successful the campaign was produced a startling

Mr. Neary:

revelation, namely; that no one in either the Department of Transportation and Communications or the Department of Provincial Affairs and Environment is taking any responsibility for the administration of the car wreck disposal programme, nor was anyone prepared to comment on the utilization of the levied funds. Each minister and deputy or assistant deputy minister is shrugging responsibility, claiming it is the jurisdiction of the other department. However, in December 1974 when the campaign was announced both department ministers had a hand in the plans to dispose of the car wrecks.

Joe Rousseau who was then Minister of Transportation had entered into a contract to get rid of the wrecks. At the same time he said it would be his department's role to gather the wrecks and have them delivered to a central area where a steel crushing company could dispose of the cars."

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Chairman, on a point of personal privilege.

I have never at any point in time ever stated that I entered into a contract, if that is what the hon. members says, he is either quoting something that is mistaken or he is mistaken, one of the two. It was never suggested -

MR. NEARY: I am reading from the Evening Telegram story.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Okay, good! Whichever indication is, I never suggested, to my knowledge that the government ever entered into a contract with the Department of Transportation and Communications. I might have said, the government were considering it, and originally it was determined to be in the Department of Transportation and Communications. If the member is reading that article correctly, which I have not bothered to read by the way, and the amazement of all amazements I got my name in the Evening Telegram. How about that!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, are you going to rule on that point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN (DR. WINSOR): The Chair would consider this not a point of order, but as an explanation of one member to another. Would the hon. member for LaPoile, please continue.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. member was not in his seat so I will read it again.

It says, "Joe Rousseau who was then Minister of Transportation said government had entered into a contract to get rid of the wrecks. At the time he said it would be his department's role to gather the wrecks and have them delivered to a central area where a steel crushing company could dispose of the cars. A contract with Affiliated Marine Metals Limited, AMM, owned by a Toronto businessman, Mr. R.W. Smith was then entered into by Provincial Affairs Minister Gordon Dawe. When questioned on the programme, assistant Deputy Minister of the Environment, Cyril Downey, explained that the whole thing was in the hands of the Department of Transportation and Communications. "Do not pay any attention if they send you back to Environment. They are just ducking the issue," he said. "You are trying to find out about the extra dollar on the registration", he asked the reporter. "I would like to know about it too." Well, Sir, all of us in this House would like to know about it. Mr. Downey said -

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I believe that the hon. gentleman is reading something he read earlier this afternoon and therefore he is violating the rule of repetition. I would like a ruling on that, please.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order. I am reading this for the first time.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order. Mr. Chairman, the rule is against needless repetition and I submit that even if the gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is reading the extract from The Telegram a second time, I would not think that is at all needless. But the rule is needless repetition, nothing to do with tedious. You can be as tedious as you want as long as you are not needlessly repeating it. And I would submit the hon. gentleman if he is repeating it, he is not doing it needlessly. Indeed I think what he is saying now is perhaps the most useful thing he has said in about three days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

As far as the Chair is concerned, I do not think that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is using the article from the Telegram repetitiously. And would he please continue.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the members on the other side, Sir, can harass me all they like. We are into Committee and I can speak on the Interim Supply Bill as often as I want to and the more they harass me, the longer it is going to take me to make my case. So it is up to them.

"As far as he knew, he said, the arrangements with AMM were still in effect although they are not as active as we had hoped. That assistant deputy estimated that the company had piled up about 16,000 wrecks in the past year but had only crushed a small percentage of the cars. The Deputy Minister of Transportation and Communications, J.A.G. MacDonald, however, had a different story to tell. He maintained the programme for disposing of car wrecks was administered and co-ordinated by the Department of Environmental Affairs." The Minister of Provincial and Consumer Affairs who was always anxious to get his little needles in, now is his opportunity to get up and straighten this matter out for us.

"Mr. MacDonald said last year a sum of \$250,000 was estimated to the Department of Transportation for abandoned vehicle disposal but that the administration of the disposal was not his department's concern. When informed of Mr. Downey's remarks, Mr. MacDonald replied, 'Everybody is passing the buck around.' - This is the buck they are collecting off of the licenses - "Since his department was voted the money in 1975 estimates, Mr. MacDonald noted that 'we just pay the bills' but administration of the programme he insisted was the Environment Department's affair."

"Asked how much money was paid to AMM, Mr. MacDonald said, "We got \$250,000 in our vote. I assume we paid most or all of that." "I assume", he said. "He again stated the details of the contract signed with AMM could be obtained from Provincial Affairs officials." Well, why does not the minister give us the details? The minister

MR. NEARY:

refused to answer my question last week.

MR. MURPHY: What questions did you ask me?

MR. NEARY: I asked the questions, Sir, in keeping with the rules of this House.

Mr. Neary:

I was not ruled out of order. " Seeking further clarification on the matter the reporter again received conflicting statements from the minister of each department concerned." Now the ministers are involved. "Transportation Minister Jim Morgan, emphatically stated that his department was the source of the collection of the revenue for the disposal of abandoned vehicles, but the funds collected on the motor vehicle registrations were passed to the Department of Provincial Affairs and Environment. 'Mr. Downey should know bloody better than to say it is our responsibility when he is aware it is the responsibility of his department,' Mr. Morgan said, angrily. 'I am sick and tired of Provincial Affairs denying anything to do with Affiliated Metals.'" -Is this true? Is the minister denying or refusing to have anything to do with Affiliated Metals? Well that is what his colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications stated publicly in the Evening Telegram of March 31. "The Provincial Affairs Department is the one responsible," added Mr. Morgan, referring to the fact that in the 1976 Budget estimates brought down Friday, a sum of \$150,000 for abandoned vehicle disposal has been allotted to the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment. 'It is their ball game. And I take strong exception to a civil servant who is fully aware of the situation to say that it is not his responsibility.' Mr. Morgan agreed with his deputy that the Department of Transportation paid the bills for the disposal, but he noted payment was made from invoices sent to the Department of the Environment. 'They are the ones who have the details.'" And I am asking the minister now to produce these details. "Provincial Affairs and Environment Minister Ank Murphy, however, contradicted these remarks. Questioned on the disposal programme he stated flatly that that would be the Department of Transportation and Communications." Did the minister make such a statement? Are the ministers speaking to one another, or are they at loggerheads? " This department pays the bills for disposal of wrecks he continued although the invoices were first approved by an engineer in the

Mr. Neary:

Provincial Affairs Department. The agreement with AMM was signed by former Environment Minister Dawe, he said, 'but every cent is expended by Transportation and Communications. They have a record of every penny spent.'

But, Mr. Chairman, just listen to this. Here is the most serious part of this statement. "As for the estimate of \$150,000 budgeted to his department for abandoned vehicle disposal, Mr. Murphy said it was a mistake." Mr. Murphy said, it was a mistake! "He added that the Treasury Board had been notified that the sum was not in his department's requested estimates. 'Why it is there,' he said, 'I do not know!'"

Now, Sir, I believe this is a situation that has to be straightened out. This is a matter, Sir, that has to be clarified before we pass the Interim Supply Bill. Once we allow Interim Supply to go through this House, Sir, it will probably go through before eleven o'clock tonight, once we allow it to go through then it will be a couple of months, and maybe never, before we get around to questioning these things again. Because as the minister knows and the members of the House know we only have seventy-five hours on Interim Supply and to go into the estimates in detail. That is not enough time. So, therefore, we will only be able to do maybe two or three department. We did not make these rules. It was the government who made the rules. And the time used in Interim Supply should have never been deducted from the time spent on the estimates. But, Sir, there it is. It is there. The government forced the rules through the House. I objected to it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the only opportunity we have to get these questions answered is here and now. So I am putting the question to either minister, I do not care which minister wants to take the honour and glory of picking up these car wrecks and stockpiling them down here at the Octagon, down at the old former Steel Plant. I want to know if the company is paying rent or have leased the property down there? Or are they been given the property free of charge? And I want to know what other considerations this company got, apart from the dollar they collected on the licence fees, what other considerations

MR. NEARY: do they get? Why does either minister refuse to table the contract? What do the government have to hide? Put it on the table of the House and let us all take a look at it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is the contract not tabled?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I believe we have been two years trying to get it tabled. But I might say something else too, Mr. Chairman, Before I came into this House this afternoon I went down to the Registry Office, I am spending so much time down there lately I will soon have to move my bed down there. And Affiliated Marine Metal Salvage Company was supposed to have their share of this filed as of yesterday, the 31st. of March. They have not filed their share list yet. So I would presume now that the procedure, the long-dragged-out, drawn-out legal procedure to strike the company from the records, from the companies records will now commence. I hope it will. And I might also tell the Acting Minister of Public Works and Services who was snarkey with me there a few moments ago that Comanec had until yesterday to register their share list and they have not done it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who?

MR. NEARY: Comanec, Construction Management and Economics, the one that is moving in to take over the university. They have not registered their share list. They were supposed to have it in yesterday. That is two companies the government are doing business with. We do not know who the real owners are. That was up to two o'clock this afternoon. He should not get snarkey with me. He should get snarkey with the people who are getting the administration in hot water. I do my homework, Sir, and I guarantee you I do it well. When I come into this hon. House to lay out a case I lay out the facts. All these questions have to be answered before I will agree to allow interim supply to go through holus-bolus to give the government a blank cheque. It is about time they were brought up short to give us an explanation for some of these things that we have been trying to get answers to for so long, especially the fisheries scandal, and why that minister was

MR. NEARY: not suspended I will never know. If it was some little ordinary fellow, if it was not a big shot, it was just a little fellow like myself or the little fellow up in Gambo or the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), or the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White), all of us who are not a part of the establishment, if we presided over a department that had the biggest cash shortage in the history of Newfoundland and probably the history of Canada, we would be suspended. Not only would you be suspended from the Cabinet, you would probably be booted right out of the House. And I would like to hear the Premier explain why he did not take disciplinary action against a minister who was so lax and so negligent and so irresponsible in his duties towards that department, and incompetent and inept, and that is unlike the Minister of Mines and Energy who ususally does his homework, and he cannot claim one bit of credit for breaking this scandal. It was the fire. If there had not been a fire we would have never known about it.

Commissioner Frank Ryan and the CID deserve a medal for going in and discovering the scandal. We would not have known a thing about it. They only went in to investigate to see if there was arson, and in the process of investigating arson discovered embezzlement. And this poor little fellow who I mentioned this afternoon, who had nothing at all to do with it, nothing to do with the gear, the fishing gear scandal, dragged into court, everybody thinks that he is the one, the culprit, and the minister sits back and lets the poor fellow take the rap.

Mr. Chairman, as I said this afternoon, I will venture a bet with anybody in this hon. House right now that that report will not be finished while the House is open, because they will slow it down until the House is closed. Because, Mr. Chairman, there will probably be enough in the report to defeat the government,

MR. NEARY:

and bring them to their knees. The present Minister of Fisheries should thank his lucky stars. So, Sir, we are entitled to at least an interim report from the Minister of Justice on all these matters that I have raised.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: The hon. member tonight is talking about the great embezzlement that has taken place in the Department of Fisheries. It certainly is not my intention to condone any wrongdoing on the part of members of the staff of that department, if indeed there is wrongdoing, or the people involved in the industry. But I do not think it is fair to cast that kind of reflection on a large number of our fellow Newfoundlanders, all pretty decent, God-fearing, family people, and to suggest that there has been a mass case of embezzlement in that department where in fact there have been no charges laid to date. The police are investigating on the basis of suspicions that have been aroused by the fire and other things. But certainly in fairness to the staff of that department I do not think the member should be referring to that as he said, to quote him, "The embezzlement that has taken place in the Department of Fisheries." I do not think he means to do that. I do not think it is fair for him to do it.

MR. NEARY: Well let me set the minister's mind at ease. The minister knows full well that it is not the staff of his department that I am talking about.

MR. W. CARTER: Listening to you I could not know.

MR. NEARY: Well in case the reporters are not getting me straight, let me make it abundantly clear now that I am not referring to the staff of the department. I mentioned that this afternoon, as a matter of fact.

Now, Sir, if I have time I would like to spend just a moment or two on the Shirley Blanche and the information that was tossed out so nonchalantly last night by the Minister of Justice on this particular matter. The minister who is so concerned about people's character, who is so concerned about character assassination and

MR. NEARY:

personalities, the minister who never stoops to the personal attack, who used this line of defense when he was countering my arguments on the loan sharks and the bonusing and the finders fees, the minister stooped to the personal attack which is no defense, which is very weak and sick. Then, Sir, later on the minister gets up and almost paints the two gentlemen who were involved in the Shirley Blanche affair, almost made them look like criminals.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I asked the Editor of Debates if I could get a transcript of the minister's speech. I am told, Sir, half an hour ago before I stood to speak that they are still working on it and when they get it finished that I should get a copy in due course. Well, I pointed out to the Editor of Debates this afternoon that I wanted it for this debate. I realize that the girls in that department, Sir, are overworked and probably underpaid and I believe it is about time that we put a few more girls on the staff in that department because we are sending for transcripts fairly regular and members should have the information at their fingertips when they come into the House. But I have to trust to my memory about a couple of things that the hon. minister said.

One thing that the hon. minister said was that his department did not become involved in the Shirley Blanche affair, he said the Crown did not become involved until January, 1975.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I would like to inform the hon. member that his time of forty-five minutes has expired.

MR. NEARY: When the minister replies I will have to come back to it again in a few minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I think it is probably obvious now to all members of the House and probably to a good many members of the general public that this House has ceased to function. It no longer works as a House of Assembly. Mr. Chairman, this is not your fault. It is not the fault of the Chair. It is not the fault of Beauchesne.

MR. J. CARTER:

Because a Chairman or Beauchesne or any rule book presumes at least some good will or at least some rationality or some sanity, and these are certainly all lacking in the person of the former member for Bell Island (Mr. Neary) and in his -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to raise a point of order. Usually I just ignore the gentleman, Sir, but I believe when a member's sanity is questioned in this hon. House that it is unparliamentary and the hon. member should retract.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. member for St. John's North to withdraw that.

MR. J. CARTER: I withdraw that, Mr. Chairman, if you feel it is unparliamentary.

MR. NEARY: Usually I ignore him, Sir, because -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER: However I do not think

Mr. J. Carter:

that anyone will seriously question the fact, the events of the last few days have shown that this House is not functioning.

Now a quick look at the estimates under the heading of the Legislature, and a very rapid calculation will show that this House is costing the people of Newfoundland about a dollar a second, and based on that yardstick I would say that the member for LaPoile's (Mr. Neary) bill that he owes the people of Newfoundland must be many thousands of dollars.

Now I firmly believe -

MR. NEARY: Very funny!

MR. J. CARTER: - the financial condition of this Province is very grave, very, very grave. And in fact this was why I refused any increase in my salary and will continue to do so. And I might add, Mr. Chairman, that I am not the only one. However, although I have plenty of criticisms of the former administration and some of the present administration I did not stand on my feet primarily to criticize. I have some concrete proposals to make and will, Mr. Chairman, with your indulgence, make them.

In the first place, if we wish to look at the estimates and consider them sensibly we should seriously consider a reform in the way which the estimates are handled. And since nothing can be considered that is not a proposal, I have submitted the following proposal, that for this year only that the following procedure be adopted for the consideration of the estimates: (1) That the Committee of the Whole on Supply be divided into as many sub-committees as there are departments of Government under consideration. Each member serving on several committees, and that most of the seventy-five hours allocated to estimates be debated by these sub-committees which will sit in the present Legislative Chamber at times to be determined having full use of that Chamber, that is to say, Hansard, Press and admission to the public; (2) That notwithstanding the make up of any sub-committee proportional to the standings in the House the only ones who may vote in the sub-committee would be the members of that committee. However, all members of the House may attend and

MR. J. CARTER:

speak, however, deferring to the members of that sub-committee. The deliberations of that body to be chaired by the head of that particular sub-committee; (3) That the main debate on the budget be limited to, for argument sake, say, twenty-five hours during which time members may speak for only twenty minutes each, the Minister of Finance, the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition forty minutes each; (4) That the sub-committee so formed will sit up to an equal number of hours each and will report back to the House at a time deemed convenient, such report to be limited to a factual account made by the Chairman, and strictly limited; (5) That the minister of each department concerned be permitted to bring into Chamber such officials as he deems necessary and that they be permitted to answer such questions as are put to them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not expect these proposals to be adopted exactly as I have made them, or even partially, but I do suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is a beginning and we could perhaps discuss in private the possibility of reforming the rules of this House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have a few more concrete proposals to make. The Budget does place some very severe limitations upon the discretionary powers of government, but we can always do a little bit better. And I have a number of proposals that I would like to make, they are not in any particular order, that is to say, they are not especially in an order of importance. However, I do feel that if they were implemented or something like them were implemented that we would be somewhat better off.

Now to begin with I feel that we must keep traffic moving. It is difficult to estimate the cost of hundred of highly paid people stalled in heavy traffic, but it must be considerable. You only have to look out here between the hours of 4:30 P.M. and 5:30 P.M. all along the parkway and to see the hundreds of cars stalled, stopped, waiting for traffic lights, waiting to get through and these are all highly paid people waiting to get home or in the morning waiting to get to work, and if you were to add up the total

April 1, 1976

Tape 1691

PK - 3

Mr. J. Carter:

cost of wages that these people are losing or the hours that they are wasting in traffic it would certainly be considerable.

MR. J. CARTER:

The cost of moving goods across town as well as the cost of deliveries must also be considered under these conditions. This must be a significant factor in inflation. One answer is the substitution of rotaries for stoplights. I like to think of the intersection here by the Holiday Inn that cost, I believe, some hundreds of thousands of dollars whereas a simple rotary could have been installed for some tens of thousands of dollars.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is a rotary, "John"?

MR. J. CARTER: A rotary is just a complete circle, paved, that allows for two lanes of traffic and it has a post something in the centre.

PREMIER MOORES: A roundabout.

MR. CARTER: There are some things called roundabouts, two in Halifax, but they are not true rotaries in that the roads that lead into them are one way. A true rotary has -

MR. MORGAN: The Micmac rotary.

MR. CARTER: No, it is not. The Minister of Highways was quoting the Micmac rotary. That is not a true rotary in that many of the roads that lead into it are one way. A proper rotary as used in Europe allows for traffic to exist as well as enter into the rotary at any point.

MR. MORGAN: That cannot work.

MR. J. CARTER: Oh, yes. Yes, sure! I have been through enough of them. Anyway the cost of them is much lower than complicated intersections and the effect of them is to keep the traffic moving. Practically all the roads in Great Britain, all the major intersections, have rotaries. The point is the traffic does keep moving. You do not have to wait to get through. Traffic is slowed but never stopped. They appear to work well wherever three or more roads intersect.

Now another point that should be considered is the immediate twinning of certain roads in and around St. John's. The most important ones are Prince Philip Driveway, which is already under consideration, the Kenmount Road or part thereof because it is only doubled half way out, and of course the Topsail Road.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER: I suggest that this would go a long, long way to unclogging traffic in St. John's. Now this may seem like a minor proposal but I think if these things were brought about we would all be a lot better off. Certainly we would be able to move around a lot more easily. While on the matter of traffic I would like to mention car wrecks. I do not suppose they cost anything to have around but there is no greater indication of poverty. The automobile is an omnipresent factor both in life and in death, as the many car wrecks attest. I think it makes people believe all those Newfie jokes when they come down here and see all the car wrecks around. Anyone who has ever looked out of the window of an aircraft as he is landing or approaching St. John's can see the entire country side is littered by many thousands of wrecks. This, gentlemen, I believe, is a scandal and something should be done. I know something is being done. But I suggest that we improve our efforts and just get rid of the darn things.

Now we are at the extreme Eastern tip of Canada and the Canadian National Services are a constant reminder of that fact. The ferries, and bus service and non-existent train service are constant reminders of that. If you do not travel by air or private car these days you are a second class citizen. Even our air services are not properly rationalized. With apologies to the member for Gander (Mr. Collins) there can be no reason

MR. J. CARTER:

other than political considerations - and here I am suggesting political considerations by Ottawa, not by Newfoundland - why St. John's cannot have an international terminal.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nonsense, nonsense!

MR. J. CARTER: Okay. Let the debate begin.

The individual is too small to protest effectively. Yet if you listen, transportation and its ills is a steady topic of conversation. St. John's bus service, of course, operates at a deficit of over \$1 million a year. The bus schedules are erratic, the buses monsters, empty and a hindrance to traffic. Either do away with them or give out private franchises or feature smaller vehicles. I think we all agree that the present system is wasteful and inefficient.

To get off transportation, Mr. Chairman, much of our wealth resides in our forests. It is one of the renewable resources that we can be sure of. And yet what do we do with it? We allow people or corporations to cut under license taking what they want and leaving the woods to grow back as best it can. Anyone who has observed cut-over areas will agree that the destruction rivals a forest fire. The new growth is so thick that it tangles with the uncleared slash and an impenetrable jungle results in a few years, and trees that will die long before they reach maturity except for the few surviving whips.

No wonder our woods are prone to pests and disease. These pests and disease seldom threaten healthy forests where the species are varied and trees have room to grow. I think the answer lies in the ownership of the woods. What encouragement is there for a woodsman to carry out proper management procedures? It should be possible for individuals or companies to buy woodland to hold in perpetuity under strict controls and conditions. A well managed woodlot will give an increased perpetual yield as time goes by. There is no better investment that I can think of that can provide

MR. J. CARTER:

employment and income all the year around.

You see, Mr. Chairman, I believe it should be possible for an individual or a corporation to buy several square miles of forest in Newfoundland under careful consideration, under very strict supervision and not at a giveaway price. I suggest that it should be possible for an individual or a corporation to be able to buy several square miles of woodland at a fair, reasonable market price, not at a giveaway price or a throwaway price, and when they own it, to carry out under strict supervision proper management techniques so as to give a perpetual yield or yield in perpetuity. This could of course be combined with some agricultural effort, but I think that if it were possible to purchase such a strip of land it would not be very long before you would have some, what I call, real millionaires in Newfoundland, millionaires who became wealthy as a result of their own efforts and increasing the wealth of Newfoundland at the same time.

With the change in the tenure of our forests comes the possibility of improving our stock. Newfoundland was heavily covered with white pine when our national anthem was written. The stunted fir and spruce are largely a recent development. There are varieties of trees that will far outperform these two varieties and should be introduced right away. I suggest a provincial experimental farm should be established as soon as possible, one that would fund itself.

MR. ROUSSEAU: What is wrong with the one we have now?

MR. J. CARTER: The kind of experimental farm I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, is rather more extensive than the one that is presently being thought of. There are all sorts of exciting developments in strains of trees and vegetables and it could be exploited to our great economic advantage and I do not want to take up the time of the Committee going on about one of my favorite hobbyhorses but at some later date perhaps I will.

MR. J. CARTER:

Another suggestion, and here I apologize for jumping around, but again I do not want to hog the time of the Committee, everyone is wondering what is wrong with education, why are we paying so much for so relatively little. I realize that we are getting a great deal of education in Newfoundland, but we are also paying an awful lot for it. The current theory suggests that more vocational education is the answer, and this may or may not be partially true, but this much is certain, our citizens must be taught to read and to write and to calculate if we are to compete in this modern world. And I am not satisfied that this is happening. Our schools are becoming too large and impersonal. Everything is thought of but the student, many of them complain of feeling lost and forgotten. Surely we have done away with the community schools our peril. Who in the community cares about the big central high school that may not even be located in the community, and there are a great many schools around this Island, Mr. Chairman, that are no longer located in a community, and I suggest that this is a tragic error.

The continuing loss of - again to jump around, the continuing loss of farmland is to be avoided at all costs. One of the problems is that government are not aware of the value of farmland or the fact that it is a continually renewable resource. There are still fields in England that are mentioned in the Domesday Book and they are still bringing in a living. Land banking is one answer, another is the enforcement of green belt regulations. However, this requires courage as there will always be a supporter, a political supporter, who would like for you to make a special exception just for him.

Now while we are on that point, Mr. Chairman, a man may have a private house on a corner lot and he does not feel ill-used if he cannot sell out to a service station. He does not feel that his rights are being trampled on. Now by the same yardstick I am suggesting that a man may have a farm and he should not feel ill-used if he cannot sell out to a housing development. My own view of agricultural land is that it is far more valuable than a housing

Mr. J. Carter:

development. But the unfortunate truth is that developers come along and they offer many thousands of dollars for a few acres of choice farmland, and the farmer is probably on the point of retiring, his children are either grown up and not interested in farming, or perhaps he does not have any, and he gives in to the inevitable temptation, the farm is sold and he has made a good profit. In the meanwhile his neighbour up the road thinks, well, why can I not do the same. Now I am suggesting that there is something wrong with our thinking when we feel that farmland can or should be done away with. I think it is a great mistake, and I think it is to our loss, to our perpetual loss because once it is gone, it is very hard to recapture, to bring back.

MR. WOODROW: Could I ask you a question, please? Are you saying the land should be brought by the government?

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I will acknowledge the question and try to answer it as best I can. I am suggesting that if the can afford to they should land bank, but if they cannot afford to I am suggesting that the individuals should not feel ill-used or put upon. Because just as an owner of a private house cannot sell out and make a department store on his land, so the farmer should not have to feel that he may be able to sell out.

MR. WOODROW: May I ask a question?

MR. J. CARTER: I thought I answered it.

MR. WOODROW: But I was not quite finished, I was going to say that probably the hon. gentleman is thinking of some - I have seen this happen, for example, up in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, you know, where a lot of valuable land has been sold to people for building houses and so on. So you are more or less saying that the government should purchase this land?

MR. J. CARTER: I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that farmland should not be done away with, and if the government can afford to land bank that is grand, but if it cannot afford to land bank then still it should enforce by regulation or protect by means of regulation, the

Mr. J. Carter:

instruction of such a valuable asset.

The housing situation in St. John's is not going to be eased until we change over from the rental rate to the mil. rate. At the present time 30 per cent of all rents have to be paid to the city in taxes. Privately owned homes, although still subject to the 30 per cent are assessed at a much lower rate. The effect of this

MR. CARTER: situation is to make it uneconomical for people to invest their money in rental units. No one will go into the business out of choice. It can be argued that this is entirely the jurisdiction of the City Council, but when they show such poor judgement is the Province merely to stand by and watch?

Now I happen to know, Mr. Chairman, from some public meetings that St. John's members have held with the City Council, that they recognize the problem and are anxious to change over to the mill rate. Still they are dragging their feet and I suggest that the Provincial Government would be doing St. John's a great service if it could help to expedite this change-over. Because until this change-over is in effect no person in his right mind is going to invest money in rental housing.

I think it should be thought of very, very carefully because the present situation is intollerable and it is going to get worse.

Now a great deal of this budget is not going to be debated under any heading. This includes all Crown corporations and to some extent Memorial University which receives all its money under one heading. Every year this argument arises, and the excuse given is that to debate the MUN budget in detail would interfere with academic freedom. While all of us are proud to have our own university, and many of us are graduates of that institution, we are at a loss to understand why there should be such secrecy, especially is this so when our aid is sought to increase the university's allotment. It is perhaps not up to us to set Memorial's priorities but we may be excused for asking why there was not a stronger plea for a library when the new engineering building was being sought. I do not see how free and open debate can hurt an institution that sets such store on critical discussion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to close I would like to reaffirm my faith in Newfoundland. I do not think that it is a Province that is going

MR. J. CARTER: down the plug. But I would like to suggest that unless we take hold and try and do a little better than we are doing, that such may be our faith. And although I am required under the regulations to address Your Honour as Chairman, I have a few remarks that I would like to address to Peter Riley of The Fifth Estate. And there was a disgraceful programme. It was a competent knife job on Newfoundland. I would like to refute some of his conclusions, by mentioning a few conclusions of my own that I think will have the concurrence of all hon. members.

He listed our liabilities. Well here are a few of our assets. Clear unpolluted air so that we can open our windows at night. That does not exist in all parts of the world. I may suggest. Highways largely unclogged with traffic in spite of my remarks about the highways in and around St. John's, so that one may drive to a favourite fishing spot within minutes. An invigorating climate that has developed a spirit of adventure even in the least of us. There is hardly a part of the world where a Newfoundlander has not made good. Vistas that stagger the imagination. Also the fact that we contribute more to Canada than we take, for argument sake Churchill power, foreign exchange and a legacy of the Continental Shelf that we brought into Confederation; and furthermore that we are dissatisfied with our failures, that we have thrown out the Doyles and the Smallwoods and we still have some more on our list.

MR. NEARY: You should be ashamed of yourself.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman who just sat down and I have at least three things in common. Number one, we do feel the need for some reform in the way this House is conducting itself and doing or not doing its business. I think we would disagree as to just how that reform would be brought about. Another, a second thing we have in common is that both of us, in somewhat different ways, are keenly interested in agriculture; and the third thing that we have in common is each his own particular devotion, and I am sure in his case a very deep devotion and I flatter myself that mine is somewhat deep too, devotion to each his own political principles.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

I am a lifelong Liberal. If I ever tended to deviate from pure Liberalism it was always in the direction a little somewhat to the left of Liberalism. I think the hon. gentleman has been throughout his life deeply devoted to Toryism and he may be the only Tory in this House. Philosophically and temperamentally I believe the hon. gentleman is a very, very genuine and a very, very sincere Tory. So we have those three things in common. That may be all. There is one striking difference between us. I like him but he does not like me, or if he does he has been very successful in concealing his deep regard for me. "I do not like thee, Doctor Fell/ The reason why I cannot tell/ But this I know and know full well/ I do not like thee Doctor Fell." I am Doctor Fell and the hon. gentleman is the one who does not like.

Now with regard to his statement that this House is not functioning, I incline half a dozen times here every day to share that feeling. Emotionally I grow very, very impatient and bored almost to tears, yet as was the case for twenty-three years seeing where the hon. the Premier is sitting at this moment or in the equivalent spot in Colonial Building, in twenty-three years I found myself to be absolutely incapable of absenting myself from the Chamber. I would come in here at three o'clock and I would leave at six and never stir outside these four walls. I would walk up and down and smoke a cigarette, when I used to smoke, behind the Speaker's Chair, or up and down these galleries but never left the Chamber. That is the way I still am. I cannot leave this Chamber. I want to hear every word that is spoken here. God in Heaven, why should I want to hear all the words that are spoken? But I do and I cannot help myself. As I grow terribly bored by the inconsequential chatter, meaningless, purposeless, senseless and useless chatter, I grow to be terribly bored and terribly discouraged. But my head tells me that is rather stupid. What do I want, what do I expect, that every hon. member elected to this House is going to be a veteran parliamentarian completely conversant with the rules, with the precedents, the procedures, parliamentary practice? Not even in the Mother of Parliaments at

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Westminister is it like that, and still less in Ottawa. What do I expect, that every hon. gentleman elected to this House, whether for the seventh or eighth time or the sixth or the fifth time or the fourth or the third or the second or the first time, that every hon. member of this House is going to be thoroughly well-acquainted with all the problems and acquainted in detail with the problems of the Province, that each hon. member is going to have the right **perspective** putting first things first, or to use the current chatter, the right priority, which is only a fancy way of saying putting first things first, and which puts second things second and third things third, as the new chatter is to say infrastructure when we have always said throughout our lives the public services. Now we call them infrastructure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one thing with which I agree with the hon. gentleman - more than one - one thing in particular with the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I think that one of the most **scandalous** things that the hon. the Premier has done since he became Premier of our Province is to agree and if he had not agreed it would not have been done, it could not have been done, not if he had remained as Premier - for him to agree to limit the time of debate on the heart and soul and essence of government and of parliamentary life.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

the power of the purse, limit that to seventy-five hours. Change that and change it quickly. Let not the hon. gentleman go down in history as the man who put a limit on parliament's time right to debate the public purse, the government spending. Seventy-five hours is not enough. It is absolutely shocking by all the precedents and principles of parliamentary government, it is shocking that the debate on Interim Supply should be included within that seventy-five hour limit because the introduction of Interim Supply or of supply, either, is the occasion always - well, has been for many, many long years indeed, many decades - the occasion whereon the members of the legislature or of parliament have the opportunity to ventilate, to complain, to expose and to condemn.

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has occupied - I do not know - three or four hours perhaps altogether since this motion came before the Committee of Supply, the motion of the Minister of Finance, that supply to this amount be advanced to the government, that the government be authorized to spend \$134 million, or whatever is the amount. He has occupied two or three hours of that time. I do not think he is going to occupy that much more time because I believe he is hoping, as we all hope, that before eleven o'clock tonight the motion will carry. I have heard him express privately and I have heard him here tonight openly express the hope that it would pass tonight, that means by eleven o'clock.

That the debate in this chamber on that motion - suppose it took two or three or four days, five days - that that time should be deducted from the seventy-five hours is a scandal. It is a parliamentary scandal. If I were the Premier of this Province, number one, I never would have allowed it to be brought in here. And I was harassed and hounded and tormented by the Opposition of that day and the Opposition of that day during those twenty-three years was not a patch on the present Opposition. The most they ever numbered was - what - five or six men?

AN HON. MEMBER: Seven.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Seven men for one short time. But the last time, the last five years I was Premier, the Opposition consisted of three men, men elected from the East end of St. John's, three men out of forty-two.

AN HON. MEMBER: Forty-one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, forty-two it was, and it was thirty-nine to three.

MR. MURPHY: The public vote was thirty-eight and three.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, indeed. I know that a Premier, that cabinet ministers, especially this Premier, who, let us face it, is not, by all the signs, is not in love with that Chair he is sitting in, not in love with these four walls, not in love with sitting here in this chamber. He is not. That is his temperament. That is the kind of hon. gentleman he is.

PREMIER MOORES: I have an earache.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well earache or heartache or stomachache or cramps or boredom or what, the hon. gentleman - but let him not - now that this thing has been done let him be the one to undo it. Unless the Premier decides it will not be done. We will be stuck with this seventy-five hour rule. He can change it. He has the power to do it. If he says in cabinet, gentlemen in my opinion we must change this and make it a limit of 100 hours, that is it. I know the office of Premier. I know the position of Premier. I know the authority of premiers everywhere, wherever there are premiers I am well aware

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am well aware of how it is done. Let me tell the hon. the Premier what several ministers in the Government of - the man who built the bridge across Halifax -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: MacDonald.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, he had -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is called after MacDonald.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, MacDonald, what was his name? Angus L. MacDonald's Cabinet. Here is the way he ran his Cabinet. A minister would come up and see him and his office and say, "Premier, I would like to do this." Maybe his Deputy Minister, his staff have talked the minister into this idea so the minister drops in to see the Premier. And the Premier listens and Angus L. nods and says, "Now that is interesting. Leave that to me will you?" And at every Cabinet meeting, there were no Cabinet papers, none, the Premier would turn to this minister and say, "You wanted to bring something forward. Would you go ahead now?" And he would bring it forward and he would explain it. "Well, thank you very much. And you had something you wanted," and so he would go around and there would be three or four or five ministers and they would express the thing they wanted done. The Premier would say, "Thank you. Thank you very much." The meeting ends. Nobody knows what has been decided until they hear from the Premier and the Premier, Angus L., a week or two or three weeks or a month later or a day later or a few hours later, at his option he would announce what the decision was.

Now every Premier does that. You do not take a vote around a Cabinet. The Premier is supposed to sum up and make the pronouncement, and if the Premier, the present Premier says, "Look, Joey is right. I do not want to go down in history as the man responsible for limiting the time of debate."

MR. MORGAN: I do not disagree.

MR. SMALLWOOD: "I do not want to go down in history with that tagged to me." If he does that we will have the rule changed and there will be ample time to debate. Now whether hon. -

MR. MORGAN: It is wasted now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not wasted.

MR. MORGAN: It has been so far.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. No, it has not been. If nothing had happened in this House since the minister brought in the motion and the House went into Committee of Supply, if nothing had happened from that moment to this moment but what this hon. gentleman has done and said in this House, there you would have the very heart, the very essence of parliamentary government. There you had the very essence -

MR. MORGAN: You said that three times.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does not matter. Sometimes you have to say it ten times.

MR. NEARY: — I got you to say it a dozen times and you are still here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is the very essence of democratic parliamentary government, because if you do not have that kind of thing, if you do not have expose and hammering and nailing and riveting it home, if you do not have that then truly this is a useless institution.

Now I agree that this business of coming in here at three o'clock and by five o'clock in a three hour sitting, two hours taken up asking questions, presenting petitions, two-thirds of every sitting taken up, and one hour to do the business of the Province, that is madness. That is the quickest way to bring this House into utter disrepute. That is the quickest and most efficient way to make the people despise this House and have nothing but contempt for it. That is the easiest and the quickest way to make this House immaterial, irrelevant, of no importance, of no consequence.

Now another way to bring this House into contempt is to shout across 'Frank', 'Bill', "Aw shut up, Walter", "Hold your tongue 'Sam," across the floor, across the floor, grown up men, grown up men. I do not know what citizens sitting in the galleries will think of the parliamentarians, the law makers. We were elected to make the laws. We were the law makers and do

MR. SMALLWOOD:

not think for one moment that the laws we make are going to be respected if we are not respected. If the law making body forfeits respect of the public, do not expect the public then to be very respectful of the laws that we make. The whole trend in Canada and the United States and in Western Europe, the whole trend is for authority to sink ever lower, authority in courts, churches, parliamentary bodies, all institutions that have authority are forfeiting respect, partly by their own fault, partly by the fact that the young crowd that have grown up in the last ten, twenty, thirty years have lost their respect for authority and for respectability and for rules and regulations and for discipline. So that makes it terribly easy for a parliamentary body that costs half a million dollars of public money to get us elected, and perhaps a couple of million dollars of private money to get us in here and we having got here is now costing the public - how much did the hon. gentleman say, how much a second?

AN HON. MEMBER: A dollar a second.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A dollar a second. Sixty dollars a minute this House is costing the people of Newfoundland.

MR. MORGAN: And it is still going up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And it is going to grow. But look, while I agree very fervently with what the hon. gentleman said about the House ceasing to function, and what he did not say but what I say is that we are losing the respect of the people, in spite of that I say put no gag, no limit on the one great occasion in every parliamentary body. The hon. Minister for Industrial and Rural Development and the hon. the Minister of Fisheries sat, and the Premier himself - well he did not sit much but he was a member of parliament. He was just as unhappy sitting in the House of Commons Chamber as he is sitting here - but these two -

PREMIER MOORES: It was not quite the same.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

PREMIER MOORES: There is a lot of difference.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And that is saying a lot. If he was even -

PREMIER MOORES: I was on a different side.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. These two hon. ministers there will confirm what I am saying, that the Opposition looks forward every year to that great opportunity to raise grievances, this opportunity we have now when supply is asked, when the government comes before the people's House, the representatives of the people including the hon. gentleman from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. W. Marshall), the hon. gentleman sitting behind the Premier there, including not only the members over here but the members over there who are not members of the government, this is their opportunity too, a golden opportunity, a priceless opportunity.

Now the Opposition when I was Premier did not make the best use of that. The present Opposition are not making the best use of it either, not nearly as good a use as they could. The hon. gentleman who has made a lot of use of it, carrying out the great tradition, the redress of grievances, the redress of grievances which you bring about, if you do bring it about, you bring about by exposing the grievances, by expressing them. You may do it crudely. You may do it that the occasional member will win. I have winced more than once inwardly listening to the hon. gentleman. Even when I was full of admiration for the fearlessness and the spirit with which he has done it, there were times when I rather winced. I wish he just had not said quite that or wish he had not expressed quite that or wish he had not quite brought in this name or that name which I felt did not strengthen his case. His case was very powerful as it was.

Now finally to come back to the hon. gentleman who just sat down, reform

Mr. Smallwood:

reforming the way we handle supply, reforming the way we handle the estimates, well, I am for that. I am all for that if it is genuine reform, and if the reform is such as to get good results. -But not the good results that a Hitler got, that a Dictator got because the great argument for dictatorship is that it is efficient. You know, Mussolini made the trains run on time. Democracy, what do you mean? Do not give me any nonsense like that! Mussolini made the trains run on time. Hitler put an end to the talk shop. What was the talk shop? The Reichstag, the Parliament of Germany. He put an end to the talk shop. So dictatorship is more efficient. But that is a price that we are not willing to pay for efficiency. And if this system of handling the estimates is poorly done, if it is inefficient, if the cure for it is any form of, you know, over-discipline or anything tending in the direction of dictatorship or the absence of democracy, the absence of freedom to speak, freedom to argue according to conscience, then that is a price too much to pay. That would be the downfall altogether of the Democratic system.

Now let me say finally that I am between two minds as to whether I will stay in this House or not. I am seriously of two minds. If the House goes on as it has gone on, I do not think I could stand it. Newfoundland is in a desperately serious condition. Newfoundland is so close to bankruptcy that it is frightening, and it still has not dawned on the people of Newfoundland, it still has not dawned on this House. Last year in December, when was the Fall Budget brought down?

AN HON. MEMBER: In November.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - In November, in that debate I got up and I skated very close to the wind, saying how serious our situation is. I was followed by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who to my delight, and I may say, surprise, in his own way, polished and suave echoed what I had said, and showed the same alarm. And on the following day the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) got up and did precisely the same thing. Well, I had heard rumours that those two hon. gentlemen were not too happy with things in general. But the great surprise came when the hon. Minister of

Mr. Smallwood:

Mines and Energy got up and delivered a speech which was one of the most remarkable ever to come from the front benches of any government, ever, anywhere.

Sir William Lloyd when he was Premier of Newfoundland seconded a motion that was made across the floor of lack of confidence in the government. It was moved by the Opposition, and seconded by the Premier, and it was put and voted on and carried, and the government fell, and Sir William Lloyd resigned as Premier on a motion of lack of confidence of which he was the seconder. But here we have a minister of the Crown who made a speech here last November which I would highly recommend to all hon. members to read, read carefully and study. And then, surprise of surprises, the following day, I think it was, the hon. the Premier himself got up and admitted that we are indeed in deep trouble. And still do you suppose, Mr. Chairman, that all hon. gentlemen in this House really are seized of this knowledge, are really vividly conscious of the fact that Newfoundland is in dire danger, let alone the people, let alone the newspapers, let alone the radio stations, let alone the television stations, most of this House. And further more I wonder if all the government do, and now I am wondering if the Premier himself realizes it? Because if he did he would not agree to a budget a quarter of a billion dollars

MR. SMALLWOOD:

some \$250 million in one year jump over last year. This is the first day of the year, is it? This is the first day in this year. The Premier through his Minister of Finance is asking the House to give him \$250 million to spend more than was spent in the year that ended last night. That was \$1 billion. Now he wants a jump in one year of \$250 million. Now I know it is unparliamentary to say the hon. gentleman is gone out of his mind. That would be very unparliamentary, and it would not be literally true anyhow. He has not gone out of his mind but he must have lost his sense of judgement. Or is it - and I fear to ask this for fear the answer might be in the affirmative.

There was a budget of \$1 billion brought down here last Spring and there was an election in the Fall. Now this Spring there is a budget of \$1,250,000,000, \$250 million more, and there is a miniature general election coming up, three by-elections which if the government lose them it may bring about their fall. Let the government have three fewer members than they have, and with other absences through sickness or what have you, the government may not be able to carry on. But let me tell the Premier that the way to win those three by-elections is not to increase the budget by \$250 million, that is not the way. It cannot be done. I do not know if it can be done in any way. But that is one way it cannot be done.

Well, I ask myself, am I, you know, spitting against the wind? Is it all futile? Is it useless? Must I see this little Province, for helping to create which I must bear some guilt, am I to see this little Province go down the drain? Would I be just cowardly to go out and say, it is an uphill fight, it is a useless fight? One man cannot do it. If I am surrounded, if that one man is surrounded by hon. members who are demanding this and demanding that and demanding something else to be spent in their respective constituencies, surrounded by hon. gentlemen who are taking the hide off the ministers because they do not do this and they do not do that and they do not do the other, and if the government are insensitive and I am surrounded

MR. SMALLWOOD:

by insensitivity, except by one hon. gentleman who just spoke who does not like me anyway, and I would think privately hates to find that I have some of the same ideas that he has, I dare say he is beginning to think he must be wrong. If 'Joey' agrees with him, then probably 'John' must be wrong.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The hon. member now, come on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right, the hon. member. I said 'Joe' and 'John'.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is still out of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, okay. I do not know. I am betwixt and between. I am in doubt as to whether it is worth the candle. Now mind you, I do appreciate the higher pay because I need it. I need it and I make no bones about that. I lost my pension. I cannot draw a pension, the pension that it took me twenty-three years to earn, \$9,000 a year, a few odd hundreds, as Premier twenty-three years, minister of the Crown twenty-three years, member of the House twenty-three years and I got a handsome pension of \$9,000 some odd hundred. Now when I got elected I lost that but I am getting double that, so I am told, and I need it. I would have to give it up. Like the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) and I understand St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) on principle I would not hesitate a moment to give it up. I do not mean stay in here and give it up. If I am in here I want to be paid - well no I do not want to be paid as well as an electrician or as well as a plumber is. I do not think that the law makers of this Province should be as well paid as good competent skilled mechanics. I hope it is noticed that I am saying that with a smile. I do not think that we are overpaid in here, not

MR. SMALLWOOD: for a moment. But I would give it up cheerfully if I come to the conclusion that I am wasting my time in here in this House. I would go out of it with the deepest sorrow and deepest regret. But I will go out, I will resign my seat in this House as member for Twillingate district if I come to the conclusion that I am wasting my breath in here, that it is a voice crying in the wilderness, that I am joined by one hon. gentleman who has no difficulty concealing and controlling his feelings toward me and another hon. gentleman who, I would say, is not quite a vehement but is generally in that same direction. If that is the limit of agreement I have in this Chamber, now what am I doing here? It is worth thinking about.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Rural and Industrial Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all the hon. gentleman who just spoke seemed to have contradicted himself towards the end of his remarks. He wants to increase the number of hours on estimates from seventy-five to 100 hours, then he proceeds towards the end of his remarks and he is indicating that if he thought he was wasting his time, that he was just spitting against the wind, if it were just a lot of sound signifying nothing and all these kind of comments, he would consider resigning his seat.

I know what he is talking about, but I am not sure that it came across clearly. I am looking at a friend of mine in front of me, perhaps Canada's greatest parliamentarian at the federal level, without any disrespect to any present parliamentarians -

MR. SMALLWOOD: A former minister, a former clergyman, Stanley Knowles. Or is he talking about Senator Eugene Forsey?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I am talking about one of the greatest debaters I have ever seen in my day, one of the greatest parliamentarians, the person who had the greatest feeling in the pit of his stomach for parliament, the parliamentary process, the democratic process, the Right Honourable gentleman from Prince Albert.

I am looking at him here now pictured in the Evening Telegram of today celebrating his thirty-sixth year in the Parliament of

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Canada. Now I believe if the hon. gentleman from were sitting here tonight he would have understood clearly what the hon. member from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) was saying. But I am not sure that it is a message that is understood by everybody. I feel a little bit about the hon. gentleman and it does not have anything to do with the number of hours on estimates, the seventy-five hours. I was six years in the House of Commons - not as long as my friend the Minister of Fisheries - and I never participated at any given time in any debate on the estimates or on Supply Motion in the House of Commons, at no point.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Others did.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: If others did they certainly - there is never any debate on Supply in the House of Commons except the Budget Speech. But when it came down to estimates -

MR. SMALLWOOD: There was never Supply introduced without a debate.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Let me just go on and explain my statement. The fact of the matter was that there was a budget brought down. Then the fundamental right of Parliament, which is the right of Parliament to vote Supply, give the government of the day the right to spend money -

PREMIER MOORES: Or withhold it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - also the right to collect taxes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or the right to withhold it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Or the right to withhold money. That right was debated in a general budget debate. When it came around to Supply the hon. gentleman's great friend and compatriot, the present Prime Minister, changed the rules in 1968, or maybe it was 1969, and moved Supply out into a committee system. The committee system was similar to what was recommended here today. It was a very efficient system but efficient was the word. All the debate, no matter how late the budget came down, all the debate had to take place, the Motion had to be referred back to the House from the Committee not later than, I believe, the 31st. of May. We got maybe a couple of weeks in

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Committee. The Committee was made up of roughly twenty members chaired by a member of the governing party of the day. And officials would be called before the Committee - the minister and his officials, never did you see a minister going in on his own. The ministers in the federal system are not one-tenth as conversant with the details of the department as you will see the ministers in a provincial legislature.

MR. MURPHY: Would that be in the Chamber as such?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Outside the Chamber in another room, when the House was not sitting, open to the public, open to the press. You would have a system of rules that were unbelievable. First of all, no member could spend longer than ten minutes in raising either a statement or a question, and that ten minutes was limited and given only to the lead-off speaker for his particular group. For example, we were the Tories members, we would have six or seven members and we would spend six or seven minutes, maybe three or four minutes. The lead-off speaker was given ten minutes. Other members, like if I were down the row four or five speakers, if I went longer than three minutes there would be war back and forth across the floor among members about abusing

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

the rights of the Committee and so on. You would have all of your experts but you never get involved in speeches and long, detailed commentary and that sort of thing. You had the right to do that in parliament on the limited number of days - I believe eight days we were given, eight days we were given for the budget debate. You had the right to do that but the limitations -

MR. SMALLWOOD: You could not get it until the Address in Reply was concluded.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The limitations even there were tremendous. Twenty minutes was the maximum speech allowed except for the people who have special privileges, the Leader of the Opposition and the like.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You had two hundred and sixty-odd members.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Twenty minutes was the maximum you could speak in parliament and still only eight days for the limit. There was a tremendous restriction but there was quite a difference. I have sat in the gallery. The first time I have been here when estimates have been up, I have sat in the gallery like last year and I watched the procedure and in my opinion we are blessed on the one hand and damned on the other hand but having perhaps the best politicians that I have ever seen in Canada - I have been in every provincial legislature. I have sat - I am like the hon. member, I love parliament. I love the parliamentary process, the interaction that takes place, the exchange of views, the healthiness of debate and so on. I love it. Cannot stay away from it.

Perhaps I was influenced a bit by a person that - well one of those days I will even write a few little private words about someone I sat for an hour with every week for six consecutive years, and perhaps this is where some of us fellows have a little bit of respect for the parliamentary process as well. But unfortunately on the other hand we are blessed with the best politicians that I have ever seen, but that is to a large extent where it ends, great politicians.

The hon. Minister of Finance, to change the topic for a minute, the other day when the hon. member was speaking he said, one flew

MR. LUNDGREN:

out of the cuckoo nest and that was not a bad comment because the hon. gentleman should have gotten an award as one of the greatest performers I have ever seen, one of the greatest performers, a great debater, works hard, understands what he is about, knows politics, got it down to a science. I have to have down deep inside a bit of admiration for that skill but I have got to say that the way that skill is used and implemented, the surgical knife that he uses is really not doing anybody any good in the Province of Newfoundland. I would like to see him one of those days gets off his negative kick, use his energies to the advantage of the people, be a bit constructive, try to reinforce the good things that are happening in this Province.

If I were not a Newfoundlander and I came and sat in the gallery I would say get the heck out of Newfoundland. This is not the place to be. There is nothing going right in Newfoundland. Everything is on the rocks in Newfoundland, unemployment, corruption, deterioration, everything is going downhill, no place to invest in Newfoundland. We go out and we make our films and we send our brochures all over the world and we send our delegations all over the world and we try to tell the people that this is a great place to live, a great spot to live, a place that you can raise your children, and all of the scenery and the beauty and so on.

We quote from the hon. the former Premier who in 1931 said that this has to be one of the greatest - and someone passed me an Oxfam pamphlet a few days ago written by some young person a couple of years ago quoting the hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) in 1931 telling about the land of opportunity. He was right then and he is right now. This is a land of opportunity, of great challenge, of great hope, of great expectations, great resources. I do not know if hon. members realize that we do have the last great frontier, the last great frontier of undeveloped resources in the Western World, perhaps even in the world. I believe

MR. LUNDRIAN:

that. The first time I heard anyone say that, except some hon. members around me, was Alvin Hamilton talking in the House of Commons. I was just starting to get the drift of it and I tried to realize what he said and I believe I -

MR. SMALLWOOD: One of the best minister who ever sat there.

MR. LUNDRIAN: One of the best ministers, and I remember hearing this and I have come to believe that as a fact. Now the development is not going to take place today or tomorrow morning or next year. It might not even be in five years. It might be great grandchildren of ours that will be able to stand ten feet tall in Canada and be one the great 'have' provinces. We are the 'have' province today in terms of potential. We are not the have Province in terms of developed potential, and it makes me sick and aggravated and discouraged and despondent to come in the House day after day and see Newfoundlanders committing a form of political treason, in my opinion, with the sledge hammers out banging away at it.

Everything is dastardly. Everything is disaster. Everything is degrading. Everything is downhill. Everything is negative. You have got to have the confidence of Houdini to be able to

Mr. Lundrigan:

survive in a place like the House of Assembly in Newfoundland for any length of time. Now I get on my high horses, I am one of those hot-headed Irish men, I make no apologies for it. I am not going to change one iota. I get aggravated. I do not always communicate all of the placidity, and all of the calm, and the quiescence that you should if you are a well contained and controlled politician. I make no apologies for that, because I believe that needs to be a quality you have to have in this Province today. I think hon. members do not need rule changes, I do not think hon. members need a hundred hours in order to convey to us their grievances, the concerns. Sure there is mismanagement. Sure there is failure. Sure there is - there might even be if you take a spy glass and use the micro system they all talk about, there might even be areas of wrongdoing within the system. Has there been a political system in the history of the world that did not have elements of it, that needed adaptation, adjustment, correction, redirection? Everybody knows that. I am throwing a challenge to hon. members here; do not ignore your responsibility to the people of Newfoundland in your eagerness to hold a responsibility to your political party? One can be the same as the other. There is a misdirection across the House that is very serious. I made the statement two weeks ago. I think I am going to have to make it a dozen times before the estimates are through and before I finish with the House in whenever they finish May or June, that hon. members have a tendency to be too political in the most blatant sense of the word. We were up there long on the Federal scene, I do not know if anybody followed our course of our behaviour.

AN HON. MEMBER: You were more political.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Everything - yes, we were darn political, in favour of the Province of Newfoundland. The cause we took up first was the railway. The next cause, perhaps, even the first one was the fisheries, and the two gentlemen flanking me here who were colleagues of mine, we went at it with a vengeance. We backed down from nothing. We did not say there was a scandal, that the Minister of Fisheries had something wrong in his department. We said, there is a great resource out there,

Mr. Lundrigan:

it belongs to us. We grew up by the sea, and we harvested the resource. We want control. We want to manage, we want to develop it. And we had a positiveness about what we were doing, and we sold it and we went around the world. We were overseas to Iceland, and all over the world trying to tell the people what we had back in old Terra Neuve, and we came back and went across the country of Canada. What is happening today in Canada in the fisheries did not happen, because Mr. Leblanc or Mr. Jack Davis, great friends of ours by the way, as great as we were in political debate, as tough as we were, we were friends. The thing that happened across Canada and it has now come to a head - do you think it happened by accident?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Gus Etchegary.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Gus Etchegary deserves every bit of credit, and Gus Etchegary and ourselves worked closely on all these matters came to Ottawa, he went before our committees, we helped each other and all together with all the hon. gentlemen who were involved we sold our case to Canada. That was one little small contribution we might have made in our effort at the Federal level. I do not see much evidence of that sort of thing in the Chamber. And I would like to see television brought in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Somebody said the other day, I really would like to see television brought into the Chamber. I will guarantee you there would be some hon. members, and I am looking right across the way, would have one heck of a lot of trouble getting re-elected.

MR. ROBERTS: Let us bring it in.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Because in order to be a good member the first thing you have to have is a feeling in your stomach for the people you represent.

AN HON. MEMBER: We do not have it?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You have to have a level of sincerity - I am sure there are a lot of hon. members, I would like to name them across the way - a feeling of respect for the people and for the people here in the Chamber as well.

Mr. Lundrigan:

Now hon. members have gotten up and talked about the decorum. You are not going to have the same level of decorum here as you have in the Mother of Parliament in London. It has got the tradition of - I was going to say, a thousand years, but I know the difference, because I do know the history of the Parliamentary development in England. You are not going to have the same as you got in Ottawa, for that reason plus the fact it is a bigger Chamber, people are not in the Chamber as long, the House is opened for a longer period, and you do not get on each others nerves. I have never sat in the House of Commons for more than - the House opens from 2:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M. and from 8:00 P.M. until 10:30 P.M., more than say three hours in a full day on the average. There is committee work. You have got committees that sometimes sit and all the rest of it, you do not get on each others nerves. Here is a little small Chamber, it is much more confined, everybody is under a bit more pressure, and especially my colleagues in Cabinet, although I am saying this now as a newcomer, where you have to do both things, you have to be here pretty well all of the time and you have the responsibility of governing and running a department in a Province which is a major challenge. It is a major challenge

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

here in this Province at all times. It is going to be a major challenge in Newfoundland for the next twenty-five years. Some of us fellows here who are running departments will be dead and gone when the same type of problem will exist in Newfoundland to a certain extent as we have today. It is a long developmental, evolutionary thing that will resolve the problems of our Province. It is going to take an uphill fight but it is going to take a House of Assembly that provides - now forget the Premier for a moment, forget the cabinet, forget the government - it is going to take a House that provides a lift and sets an example and paints horizons and expresses a level of political integrity.

Now do I understand it correct from hon. members who are older than I was, when the war was on that the great Winston Churchill used the parliamentary process as maybe the greatest tool in trying to win the war? Do I understand that to be a fact? The parliament, the sitting of parliament, the speeches, the attitude and the way that the democratic system could be emphasized and reinforced by the parliamentary process, do I understand that to be a fact? That is what I have read.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was one of the great tools, yes.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: One of the great tools. Well, I say this is a great institution to be able to give the people of our Province a lift in a day and age when they need the lift. I think that is something that is lacking a bit. I think we are all a little bit responsible for the lack of performance of the House. I think it will continue. But for goodness sake when we have a Province where there is the challenge on the one hand, the potential on the other other, I do believe that it is incumbent on all of us to manifest the level of maturity that I do not see from day to day in the House of Assembly. I am perhaps the most guilty, or as guilty, I will be the first to say, as any hon. member. But I am making the comments because I believe that the hon. gentlemen right on the eve now - we have only just

MR. LUNDRIKAN:

started the estimates and I am certainly not backing away or begging not to be examined and put under a microscope in my estimates because I love a fight, I would rather fight than eat when it comes to the give and take in the House. But I do believe it is the time for us to examine our procedures, how we handle the system, what we do. And if you gave 500 hours for debate it is not going to improve the system unless the members examine the way that they engage in the process in the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, if I remember correctly I was the first to speak in Committee on the Interim Supply motion and at that particular time on behalf of my colleagues I said that it was not our intention to at all prolong the proceeding because we were fully aware that there would be ample opportunity when the regular estimates, the full year's estimates came before the Committee. I would still hope that we could follow that procedure and get quickly on with it, but I am not sure having followed the debate for the last day or so, exactly what is going on. I did not talk personally to the House Leader for the government, but I would have expected that our position in it would have been to serve his purpose in expediting the business of the House and at the same time I did not feel that I was in any way compromising my position in that I was reserving, obviously, not only reserving but had before me the full opportunity to debate in Committee when the full estimates came in and we are after all dealing with the same time period.

But after watching what has happened in the last day or so either the government House Leader has very little discipline with his group or else it is a deliberate filibuster to which we have been sucked into. We - not on this side, not in the official Opposition, that is for sure, and I do not at all suggest we should deny the right of anybody to speak, but if we are going to have our budget speech debate now, let us have it but give us notice Mr. Chairman, because

MR. SIMMONS:

we would all like to get into it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I say, I had not intended to speak and I shall make my comments just as brief as I can because I would like to see the Interim Supply resolution being dealt with. It is a new fiscal year and I do not think it is helping the Province's image, particularly within the Province, that we are in a situation where technically we cannot spend a cent. I repeat just for emphasis that there was no reason why we ought to be in this situation. We would not be if government did not wait until three sitting days before the end of the fiscal year to bring in that resolution. Indeed we could have had the resolution two to three weeks ago. There is not reason why the government House Leader could not have arranged to have it introduced at that time. But we are where we are. We are at the first of April, the new fiscal year and the government has no spending authority.

MR. ROBERTS: There are going to be no bills not paid.

MR. SIMMONS: I am sorry?

MR. ROBERTS: There is no harm done.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, I am aware of that. It is only in a technical sense. I am aware of that, and that nobody is going

Mr. Simmons:

to take the government to court for defaulting on payment of that kind, I am aware that is a situation, But I am saying that technically we are in a new year, and there are at least image implications for the government in the sense that it has no spending authority into a new fiscal year. It has never happened before since Confederation, and had there been some leadership by the government it would not have happened this time, of course. But, you know, what is past past.

Mr. Chairman, it is very hard to sit here and listen to someone who mouths off in a way that the Minister of Industrial Development has tonight. It is a bit awkward really, because one hesitates to go back at it, as it were, because I would like to see the business of the committee expedited. But I could not help, Mr. Chairman, as I listened to, what in words must be one of the finer speeches I have heard, in words. There is nothing wrong. I take no exception at all, Mr. Chairman, to his thesis. He puts it well. It is well founded and he states it very well, and I agree with him. But, Mr. Chairman, as I recall, and I say this because there are people here, I do not think anybody on the floor of the House is going to get particularly carried away with the minister's comments, but there are people in the gallery who may not have been here this afternoon, Mr. Chairman. Had they been they would have witnessed a situation where I, for example, among others, but I will talk about my own situation here, where I stood in my place to present petitions on behalf of a number of people throughout this Province, to exercise for them one of the most basic democratic rights which the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) has referred to, the opportunity for redress of grievance. And in their case not being members their only direct way to this House is through a petition.

And, Mr. Chairman, you will recall that while I attempted to do that I did it with innumerable interruptions from the very same member who has just piously lectured us on decorum once again for the nth time. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is hard to take. And I say to that gentleman, I invite him charitably, to practice what he preaches,

Mr. Simmons:

and we will not have the problems that he has been talking about. It is very, very difficult, Mr. Chairman, to take seriously what he says when he himself insist on taking it so unseriously in his practice here in the House from day to day. And I am fed up, Mr. Chairman, to the teeth, sitting here and listening to these pious lectures from people who are the worst offenders themselves. And I dare, Mr. Chairman, any member in this House tonight to stand up and contradict me on that particular point insofar as the minister's performance was concerned this afternoon. Hansard will show that I was subjected to all kinds of interruptions from that particular minister. He makes a habit of it. He tells us about his great performance in Ottawa. I hope for him and for Newfoundland it was a great performance. But if I remember the press reports, the one press report, Mr. Chairman,

MR. MORGAN: What has that got to do with it?

MR. SIMMONS: The one press report that stands out.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I wonder if the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications would allow the hon. gentleman to continue with his attack, I am enjoying it. As long as he pronounces my district name correct and my name correct I am quite happy about it.

MR. SIMMONS: Listen to the personal attack again.

MR. ROBERTS: You have got a hair out of place, 'Jim' boy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member for Burgeo-LaPoile please continue.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Transportation has demonstrated again for the people in the gallery, the kind of thing I was talking about that took place this afternoon, except it took place with much more frequency this afternoon, not only by him, but the Minister of Industrial Development as well.

Now I was about to say that the one item that stands out, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the press coverage during that member's period

Mr. Simmons:

in Ottawa was an example of the very kind of thing he has attempted to condemn us for today. He has attempted to point the finger for it. As I remember his most famous contribution to Parliamentary history was when he, by his constant interruptions, provoked the Prime Minister of this Country into either saying or allegedly saying some vulgar expression as I heard it through the media. Now, Mr. Chairman, if that is the best example that we have of his performance in the House of Commons, I say he should be the last person in this House to look over here and tell us how it is done.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr.Chairman, enough said! I get a little hot under the collar on this one because it is hard to take. It is very hard to take, Mr.Chairman, when the minister concerned is being such a blatant offender in this respect.

Well, enough said! I do not think, Mr.Chairman -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Tell us more.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr.Chairman, I do not have any more on that particular subject. I think there are many better things to do and I hope, Mr.Chairman -

MR. MORGAN: Then let us get on with them.

MR. SIMMONS: I do not expect, Mr.Chairman, that the Minister of Transportation will be interested or will be pleased to hear what I have to say, not at all.

One other point the minister mentioned which galls me as a member - I do not mind a member standing up and stating his opinion and that kind of thing and giving us his view. And as Voltaire or somebody said back there a long time ago, "I may not agree with all you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it." That is one thing but, Mr.Chairman, when a member gets up and not only tells us what he thinks, but also tells us that we have no concern, well his research capability is a lot more complete than mine. I cannot stand and look him in the eye and tell him he has no concern. I believe he does. I hope for the sake of the Province he does and his department. I am sure he does, but to get up and tar us all with the one brush and to tell us that we have no concern, and we are being political! Mr. Speaker, I came here for a number of very good reasons. I hope that among them is because of a fairly genuine concern for the people I represent. But if that is not even the case, if that be not the case, for example, Mr.Chairman, it is not the right of the hon. minister to get up and tell the world that I have no concern, or that my colleagues on this side of the House have no concern.

Mr.Chairman, I would like to respond - I do not think it is the appropriate time - I would like to respond to some of the words that the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) had to say. I always have listened to him with particular interest before I became

MR. SIMMONS: a member. During the years when he was a member and I was here in town attending college I used to sit up in the gallery many days and listened to him with a lot of enthusiasm and a lot of interest. I have a great respect for his ideas. Some of them I do not agree with, naturally, but I have an awful lot of respect for them. In many respects he is a legend in his time and I use every opportunity I can to give ear to what he is saying.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to some of the words of the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) because I listened very carefully to him tonight and I do not share - he is going to have to talk some more or do some more convincing - but I do not share his gloom and doom approach to the financial affairs of this Province. I am no expert on the financial affairs, but I do not share, Mr. Chairman, the member for Twillingate's gloom and doom version. I feel we are in fairly desperate times and I think that we need new hands at the reins in that kind of thing. But for us to be preaching this doom and gloom, this edge of the precipice type sermon that we have been hearing in this House in the last few days is not only a misrepresentation of what is the case, Mr. Chairman, but it is irresponsible. It is irresponsible in terms of the credit position of this Province. It is irresponsible in terms of the confidence of the Newfoundland people in themselves and in government. But, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it being (1) a misrepresentation of what is the case; and (2) an irresponsible position, I would appeal to the member for Twillingate - if he believes it genuinely by all means say it, it is his right - but I would appeal to him in all earnestness to examine his thinking on the subject to make sure

MR. STICONS:

that he is really saying what he means. I hope that if it has to be said - I do not agree with it - but if it has to be said I hope it is the honest conviction of that gentleman. At the same time I would be very saddened to know that he thinks that down deep inside, because I respect his views on government. I respect his analysis and far be it from me to point the finger and say, you are wrong. But on this one, Mr. Chairman, I hope he is wrong and I believe he is. I sincerely hope he is for the sake of all of us.

Mr. Chairman, there will be opportunity I am sure later when the estimates come in, and in the interest of trying to expedite I would quit saying the things I would like to be saying right now and hope that we could pass this resolution and get on fairly soon to the estimates themselves.

Head 1, consolidated funds services, \$50,000.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I have only one brief question and I wish to ask it. Could the minister - the Minister of Finance is not here - perhaps the government House Leader tell us when will we get the salary -

AN HON. MEMBER: The acting minister.

MR. ROBERTS: Who is the acting minister, I am sorry?

MR. CROSBIE: I am the acting minister.

MR. ROBERTS: I apologize, Sir, to the Minister of Mines and Energy. I shall direct the question - I did not realize he was the acting minister. I shall humbly crave his pardon. He seems to be in a very bad mood tonight. But let me humbly ask him a humble question, Sir. All I want to know is when will we get the salary appendix. It is really impossible to debate the estimates as such without details of the salary votes and we have no details. I know there is a book prepared. When will we get it?

MR. F. ROWE: Good question.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I just got a copy myself today, so I presume

MR. CROSBIE:

that they will be available tomorrow.

MR. ROBERTS: Will they be tabled tomorrow?

MR. CROSBIE: Well since I got a book myself that came around today they must be available. So I will check and see that they are distributed tomorrow.

- Head 1, Consolidated Fund Services, \$50,000, carried.
- Head 2, Legislative, \$300,000, carried.
- Head 3, Executive Council, \$600,000, carried.
- Head 4, Finance, \$4,500,000, carried.
- Head 5, Manpower and Industrial Relations, \$500,000, carried.
- Head 6, Education, \$40 million, carried.
- Head 7, Justice, \$2,450,000, carried.
- Head 8, Social Services, \$10 million, carried.
- Head 9, Rehabilitation and Recreation, \$5 million, carried.
- Head 10, Health, \$36 million, carried.
- Head 11, Mines and Energy, \$3,700,000, carried.
- Head 12, Forestry and Agriculture, \$2,950,000, carried.
- Head 13, Tourism, \$2,400,000, carried.
- Head 14, Fisheries, \$1,950,000, carried.
- Head 15, Industrial Development, \$600,000, carried.
- Head 16, Rural Development, \$750,000, carried.
- Head 17, Transportation and Communications, \$11,200,000, carried.
- Head 18, Public Works and Services, \$7 million, carried.
- Head 19, Municipal Affairs and Housing, \$7,450,000, carried.
- Head 20, Provincial Affairs and Environment, carried.

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Seventy-Seven And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service."

On motion, clauses 1 through 3, carried.

On motion, title carried.

RESOLUTION

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1977, the initial sum of one hundred and thirty-four million five hundred thousand dollars (\$134,500,000).

On motion Resolution carried without amendment.

On motion that the Committee rise and report having passed the Resolution without amendment and recommend that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report that they have adopted a certain Resolution and recommend that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of the Supply reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have directed him to report they have adopted a certain Resolution and recommend that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion Resolution read a first and second time.

Motion that a bill to give effect to the Resolution be read a first time, carried.

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Seventy-Seven And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service," read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.

April 1, 1976, Tape 1709, Page 2 -- apb

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I do move that this House now adjourn until tomorrow Friday at ten o'clock in the forenoon.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Friday, April 2, 1976 at 10:00 a.m.

C O N T E N T S

April 1, 1976	Page
<u>PRIVILEGE</u>	
Mr. Simmons raised privilege on a newspaper report of remarks made by Mr. Crosbie.	4371
Spoken to by:	
Mr. Wells	4372
Mr. Simmons	4372
Mr. Crosbie	4373
Mr. Speaker ruled that a prima facie case for breach of privilege had not been established.	4375
Mr. Wells gave notice that he would raise an issue of privilege when a transcript of the proceedings of the House for March 30 becomes available.	4375
<u>STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS</u>	
By Mr. Maynard, concerning additional funds for Manpower training.	4377
By Mr. House, concerning the Government's new policy to assume full responsibility for the payment of insurance premiums on all school buildings.	4380
Commented on by:	
Mr. Rowe	4382
Mr. Smallwood	4383
<u>PRESENTING PETITIONS</u>	
By Mr. Woodrow in behalf of the Local Improvement District of Mount Moriah and 227 residents of the community objecting to increases in the electrical rates.	4385
Spoken to by:	
Mr. Neary	4386
Mr. Nolan	4387
By Mr. Simmons in behalf of 20 residents of Bonavista objecting to increases in electrical rates.	4388
Spoken to by:	
Mr. Neary	4393
Mr. Roberts	4394
By Mr. Nolan in behalf of residents of Branch objecting to increases in electrical rates.	4396
Spoken to by:	
Mr. W. Carter	4399
Mr. Roberts	4399
Mr. Crosbie	4401
Mr. Patterson	4402
Mr. Rousseau	4403
By Mr. Simmons in behalf of residents of Harbour Le Cou objecting to increases in electrical rates.	4403
Spoken to by Mr. Crosbie	4410

C O N T E N T S - 2

<u>PETITIONS (continued)</u>	Page
By Mr. Simmons in behalf of residents of LaPoile district objecting to increases in electrical rates.	4410
By Mr. White in behalf of 266 residents of Durrells, 130 residents of Embree, 296 residents of Comfort Cove and Newstead, 300 residents of Change Island, and 81 residents of Lewisporte, all five petitions objecting to increases in electrical rates.	4413
By Mr. Canning in behalf of the Burin Peninsula Integrated School Board objecting to any increases in electrical rates.	4414
By Capt. Winsor in behalf of 84 residents of Tilting and 106 residents of Carmanville, both petitions objecting to increases in electrical rates.	4418
By Mr. Hodder in behalf of 133 residents of Piccadilly and Ship Cove objecting to increases in electrical rates.	4419
By Mrs. McIsaac in behalf of 116 residents of Codroy Valley and 274 residents of Port aux Basques, both petitions objecting to increases in electrical rates.	4420
By Mr. J. Winsor in behalf of the Community Council of Recontre East objecting to increases in electrical rates.	4421
Spoken to by Mr. Flight.	4421
By Mr. Rowe, nine petitions from various regions and groups objecting to increases in electrical rates.	4424
By Mr. Roberts, four petitions from communities on the Great Northern Peninsula objecting to increases in electrical rates.	4425
Spoken to by Mr. Collins.	4430
<u>ORAL QUESTIONS</u>	
RCMP constables at Churchill Falls. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickman.	4431
The situation at Churchill Falls. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Maynard.	4431
Re-directed in part. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Crosbie.	4432
Industrial enquiry at Churchill Falls. Mr. Neary, Mr. Maynard.	4440
Committee to name members of committees. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Wells.	4444
Query as to whether the Department of Justice has been asked to investigate certain transactions of the Winter Carnival Community at Memorial University. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickman.	4444
Gas stations supplying unleaded gasoline. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Murphy.	4445
Community pasture at Victoria. Mr. R. Moores, Mr. Rousseau.	4445
Accommodation of horses in that pasture. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Rousseau.	4446
Area served by the pasture. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Rousseau.	4448
Licencing of motor vehicles. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Morgan.	4449

C O N T E N T S - 3

<u>ORAL QUESTIONS (continued)</u>	Page
Pilferage at Nfld. Farm Products Corp. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	4450
<u>ORDERS OF THE DAY</u>	
Committee of Supply (Interim Supply)	
Mr. Neary	4451
Mr. Nolan	4474
Mr. Woodrow	4477
Mr. Woodrow adjourned the debate.	4484
Debate on the Adjournment	
Bonusing, finders' fees etc.	
Mr. Neary	4484
Mr. Hickman	4487
Closing of hospital beds.	
Mr. Roberts	4492
Mr. Collins	4492
The House rose at 6:00 p.m.	4499
The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.	4500
Committee of Supply (Interim Supply)	
Mr. Woodrow (continued)	4500
Mr. Strachan	4507
Mr. Neary	4516
Mr. J. Carter	4540
Mr. Smallwood	4553
Mr. Lundrigan	4566
Mr. Simmons	4576
On motion, the resolution passed Committee, and a bill to give effect to the same was introduced.	4585
The bill was read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title to be as on the Order Paper.	4585
ADJOURNMENT	4586