



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

---

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 48

---

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

FRIDAY, APRIL 9, 1976

SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I informed the House of the decision by government to provide boats under leases to those bona fide fishermen who are unable to raise sufficient capital to buy them. I expressed the concern of government over the rising costs of buying new and used boats and the need for assistance by government if many of our fishermen were to continue operating their boats in the industry.

Today, I am again extremely happy to announce another new programme of assistance to our fishermen, this time to those who wish to build their own boats and to boatyards that want to increase their production to meet increased demands. This will be accomplished through payment of a new bounty on boats which do not qualify for the federal bounty.

Late in 1970, the government of the day began paying a bounty of from \$10 to \$12 per foot for boats ranging from 20 to 35 feet in length. Certainly, that may have been adequate in 1970 but today, more than five years later, it has become far from adequate.

In the latter half of 1970, one could build a 30 foot boat without engine for \$1,200 with a provincial bounty of \$12 per foot. Today, the same will cost more than \$3,000. In other words, the 1970 bounty, which represented approximately 25 per cent of the cost of the new boat, is now worth only 10 per cent of the cost.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, in many parts of our Province small boats are needed and fishermen can make a very good living in those boats. In regard to that fact it is our intention to now increase the bounty on small boats, from 20 to 35 feet, to 35 per cent of their construction cost;

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: This, Mr. Speaker, will bring the subsidy on small boats in line with that paid by the federal government on lingliners over 35 feet.

This new programme, Sir, will cost the government this year, an additional \$225,000 above and beyond the \$125,000 which would have been paid under the old subsidy programme. The total cost of the new subsidy programme will be \$350,000 providing that there is not a great increase in the number of small boats being built or in the cost of their construction.

I am very proud, Mr. Speaker, to have been able to announce two new programmes, yesterday and today, and I look forward to being able to reveal even more benefits to our fishermen in the near future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: I might point out to you, Mr. Speaker, when I say that there is a need for smaller boats, and the fact that many of our fishermen are getting back to small boats because of the increased cost of larger boats, that statistics show that in the entire fiscal year of 1974-75, bounties were paid on only 383 such boats; 383 bounties were paid on small boats. In the first eight months of the last fiscal year, bounties were paid on 406 such boats. So there is a substantial increase in the number of small boats being built, and, of course, the reasons are as I have pointed out, the increased cost of the larger boats.

Mr. Speaker, the government, Sir, recognizes the importance of our inshore fishermen and the vital role they are playing in the preservation of our Newfoundland way of life and their contribution to the future and social and economic well-being of the hundreds of communities that depend on the fisheries around our Province.

Our inshore fishermen, Sir, are an integral

MR. W. CARTER: part of our economy and I am determined that they will be given the same rights as those afforded other Newfoundlanders who are engaged in the professions or in other fields of endeavour, to assistance by the government to enable them to earn a decent living in their chosen vocation, the fisheries.

MR. NEARY: Send me over a copy, 'Walter'.

MR. W. CARTER: You have a copy.

MR. NEARY: Where?

MR. W. CARTER: On your desk.

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

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, needless to say, Sir, we on this side of the House, at the least the official Opposition, are very happy and I am sure the fishermen will be very grateful, especially those fishermen who are still using the small boats, and I suppose this applies to boats such as dories and all other types of boats up to thirty-five feet.

For a long time, Sir, the government has ignored these fishermen.

MR. W. CARTER: Not this government.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Yes, since 1970. The minister has made a statement in a statement that it has not been increased since 1970, Mr. Speaker. So it would indicate to me, Mr. Speaker, there are by-elections just around the corner and we can expect more announcements like this made the other day.

MR. MURPHY: Now, now!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

CAPTAIN WINSOR: However, Mr. Speaker, in line with what the hon. Minister of Fisheries, his announcement yesterday, I noticed in today's paper where there are two boats, similar to what the minister outlined yesterday that would be repossessed and hired to fishermen, are up for sale today, tenders for purchases to satisfy mortgages.

MR. W. CARTER: That has no bearing at all.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: It has a bearing on your yesterday's statement, Mr. Speaker, which you referred to today. So it is a recognized fact, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of constructing boats has gone up like all other construction, and like all other costs it is going up daily, and I say, Sir, it is long overdue that the government took note of that particular fisherman because we have an awful lot of fishermen who are operating from small boats, who have not just been able to replace their boats because the costs have been too high. And I am very happy today that the Minister of Fisheries recognized

CAPTAIN WINSOR: that fact and now he is making a move to help them. So, Sir, we certainly are grateful to him and I am sure we speak on behalf of all those fishermen who would be using that type of boat, that they will be very pleased and happy to hear the minister's statement. I congratulate him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

CAPTAIN WINSOR: He is doing a very good job, Mr. Speaker, very fine that those by-elections were coming up.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I too, I join with my hon. friend from Fogo, whose sincerity no man ever doubts, I think. I join with him in congratulating the minister and the administration on this additional announcement. We both did so yesterday and I think with good reason, and we do so again today.

I frankly do not care why the government are making these improvements. Even if one could honestly attribute the worst motives to the government, I still welcome them and I still congratulate them. Even if they have in mind by-elections in three constituencies, two of which are involved very much in the fisheries, even so, I am afraid, they still would not be establishing a precedent. I believe that that sort of thing has been known to occur to the minds of politicians before.

MR. MORGAN: Is that true?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, I have heard the rumour. Of course I never did that sort of thing myself, nor would I be associated with that sort of thing. I encourage the minister. He is a young minister. He is a young Newfoundlander. He was deported from Newfoundland for a number of years, living up in foreign territory, but now he is back home. I am sure, I am quite sure, that he is determined to do something more for the fisheries and thereby make a great name for himself, and I am all for him in that. And I can only - I am trying to think of a name, a word. The Minister of Mines and Energy evidently has a special kind of dictionary there, a

MR. SMALLWOOD: collection of unusual words, I wish he would look it up and help me to find a word to describe that group there sitting opposite me, the handsomest ministers in the government, and amongst the handsomest men in the House and energetic and ambitious and I would like to find a name, not Kiddies Corner.

MR. MURPHY: True Newfoundlanders.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What would you call it?

MR. MURPHY: True Newfoundlanders.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh well, they are all around us. We do not just have to look there to get true Newfoundlanders. I will think of a word to describe that band over there of energetic and ambitious young ministers, and when I think of it I will introduce it. I do congratulate the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is rising to speak with reference to the ministerial statement then he will not be able to do so.

The hon. Minister of Education.

HON. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, this is a statement regarding the High School Drama Festival. As indicated in the provincial budget, March 26, the department will continue to sponsor the annual provincial High School Drama Festival. Due to the uncertainty as to what projects would be affected as a result of announced restraints, the necessary preliminary regional festivals and administrative organization required for the final provincial festival was considerably delayed. In addition to this, the original plans for the festival this year called for it to take place in the new Arts and Culture Centre at Gander. For a number of reasons, this has been delayed. The opening of the Arts and Culture Centre has been delayed until July of this year.

In view of these factors and results of discussions with school boards around the Province and high schools, it has been decided to hold the festival in the Fall instead of the Spring. This year's Drama Festival, of course, will take place in November rather than in April. This will give schools adequate time to prepare for it. Another reason for us to be against holding it in April is the fact that the provincial Drama Festival was on at that time when a lot of the people involved in it could not give assistance to the schools. So that will take place now in November and in the next little while the department will be notifying all schools to that effect.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

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

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, just a word in response to the minister's statement. I certainly welcome the indication from government that this programme is going to continue. I think that is the gist of what the minister was saying, and the change of date this year, if I heard him correctly.



MR. SIMMONS:

This High School Drama Festival has played a fairly significant role in the so-called extra curricular activities of particularly the schools in Central Newfoundland. I am tempted to get into the area of discussion as my colleague from Fogo (Capt. Winsor) did by pointing out that the point of origin for this was Bishops Falls, which coincidentally is in the district of Exploits. But whatever the case, Mr. Speaker, the town of Bishops Falls and the high school in particular, has got a new name, English Memorial High School now I believe, but the central high school to which I went on one occasion for a month or so, was the originator of this particular High School Drama Festival. The late Doctor Helen Tuck some twelve or fourteen years ago actually began the festival. Then it spread to the immediate Central Newfoundland area, the Grand Falls-Springdale-Botwood area and eventually embraced Gander. Now I am glad to see it has become essentially a provincial phenomenon - yes, that is true. The minister indicates it is. I have not been following it that closely in recent years, but I know something of the contribution it has made to high school students' education. Some of my own family at Bishops Falls were involved during the initial years. I commend the minister and his department for insuring that this very valuable programme will continue.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I make one recommendation only to the minister, that he use his influence, throw his weight around, to see if he can enroll the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) in that high school drama festival. He may learn something.

MR. MURPHY: That from 'Roger' is a compliment.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

HON. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by the Labrador Inuit Association of a grave situation developing with reference to the annual caribou hunt in the Northern Zone. Recent gasoline shortages in the area prevented the use of snowmobiles normally used to transport hunters inland to where the caribou are wintering. As a result, very few of the eligible hunters in the zone have provided the needed supply of caribou meat for their families. This problem has been compounded by a recent mild spell which

MR. HICKEY:

rendered travel by machines almost impossible. Many hunters have had to leave their sleds loaded with caribou meat in the country, hoping to return for them when conditions improve. Caribou hunting season in the Northern zone is due to terminate on April 17. However, the Inuit Association has requested an extension of this season to April 30 in anticipation of colder weather, it will improve travelling conditions and allow the hunters to procure their needed meat supply. As a result of this representation by the Inuit Association, and I might add, Mr. Speaker, also representation by my colleague, the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Coudie) and my friend across the way, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), I am today forwarding the following telex to Mr. William Edmunds, President of the Labrador Inuit Association. "Considering the circumstances outlined in your telex with reference to caribou hunting in the Northern zone. I have no hesitation in granting the extension of the caribou season as per your request to April 30 and hope the conditions will improve to allow hunters in the area to fill their quotas. In granting this request we would appreciate your assistance in insuring that caribou regulations for the area are adhered to and good conservation measures are practiced."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. E. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, as we recall a few weeks ago I announced to the House the appointment of a Human Rights Commission to investigate certain allegations of discrimination in employment made by three residents of Labrador City. The three men, William Armstrong, Noel Seaward and Samuel J. Codner, were former employees of the Iron Ore Company of Canada.

Mr. Maynard.

In each case the men found employment with contractors operating in Labrador City and performing work for the Iron Ore Company. They alleged that the Iron Ore Company exerted pressure on their employer, the contractor, to terminate their services, because they had been dismissed previously from their employment with IOC. However, shortly after announcing the appointment of Mrs. Gertrude Keough as Chairman of the Commission, and Mrs. Keough has been permanent commissioner of the Human Rights Commission for some years, shortly after the announcement, a representative of the United Steel Workers Union made a statement to the press expressing displeasure with the appointment, because Mrs. Keough is allegedly related to a senior official of IOC. Some days later a letter arrived in my office outlining the same complaint. Initially after hearing the objections, I had no intention of changing the Chairman of the Commission, because I do consider Mrs. Keough to be a person of the highest integrity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MAYNARD: And I am confident that any relationship that may exist between her and any other person would not have impaired the impartially of the enquiry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MAYNARD: I also considered the possibility of cancelling the commission because of what was, in my view, an unwarranted and unjustified questioning of the character of the Human Rights Commissioner. However, considering the circumstances surrounding the termination of employment of the three people involved, I felt that they should have the opportunity of having their cases fully investigated regardless of the unnecessary interference of the union officials supposedly speaking on their behalf. But I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that neither one of the three people involved made any complaints to me, and I can only assume that the union

Mr. Maynard.

official took it upon himself to do it. However, shortly after the complaints were aired in the media, Mrs. Keough, for understandable reasons, contacted me to say that she would rather not act as Chairman of the Commission under these circumstances. But since I felt that a commission should be appointed in any case I therefore appointed as Chairman of the Commission Mr. Mike Monahan, a Corner Brook lawyer, with Mr. Fred Coates, director of the division, as a member. It is expected that the commission will begin its inquiry in Labrador City on April 27, 1976.

While I am up, Mr. Speaker, a short progress report on the Churchill Falls negotiations. Most members are aware by this time that two officials of my department, Mr. Blanchard, the deputy minister, and Mr. Noseworthy, the Director of Labour Relations, went into Churchill Falls yesterday and had meetings with the company and union officials during yesterday, last night, and meetings are continuing today in an attempt to mediate the dispute in that area. I would hope that they will have further reports to make on that later in the day.

MR. NEARY: If not, will they get an industrial enquiry?

MR. MAYNARD: I will make that decision later.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I first make a comment with respect to the minister's second statement, the Churchill Falls Labour-management dispute, or the negotiations. We all look forward with interest and eager anticipation to the further announcement, and hopefully that announcement will be that the dispute has been resolved on an amicable basis. It will obviously take a long time to restore the staff management relations

Mr. Roberts:

at Churchill Falls to the happy state they had reached before the strike started, and before the situation started to deteriorate. I do not want to say anything more now, expect to say that we all hope the strike is resolved quickly and on a fair and equitable basis.

With respect to the first announcement, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I think the minister has done the right thing in a very difficult situation. I was very glad to hear him reaffirm his faith in the integrity and the ability of Mrs. Keough. I know that every member of the House feels this way, that she is a lady admirably qualified for this work, and that there could be no possible question of any improper attitude being taken by her towards any matter on which she is asked to adjudicate or to give her opinion.

I think it is very much to be regretted that - not that an objection was taken, I think any person has the right to take an objection to the appointment of an arbitrator or any person in mediation or a middle role, in an adjudicator role, but I think it is most unfortunate that the objection was taken publicly before it was communicated to the minister. I think that could only have the effect of embarrassing Mrs. Keough, and I am sure the person who took the objection did not intent to embarrass Mrs. Keough in any way, but it could only have had the effect. So it is very much to be regretted. I think the minister has handled it in the right way. I think Mrs. Keough has shown once again her integrity and her dignity and her sense of the right and proper thing by coming to the minister and saying, "I feel I should not act. I would ask you please to appoint somebody else to act in this case."

So I think it is a happy resolution to what was a very difficult problem. Mr. Monahan, a lawyer in Corner Brook with the firm of Barry and Wells, I believe, or the present firm of Barry and Wells, it may not be too long that firm, but an associate in law of Mr. Barry and Mr. Wells, and they are partners, I am sure will

Mr. Roberts:

bring knowledge and skill to bear and whatever the result of the procedure will be the equitable one on the facts and the evidence that is presented.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

HON. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the members that this is not political. I was assured that anything new that came up I would ask that it be brought to the House before I would put it to the press. This is more of an interest note. Members of the House will recall that the current teachers collective agreement make provision for the awarding of special educational leave to teachers, or sabbatical leave. Leave is granted on recommendation of a committee appointed with representation from the NTA, the Federation of School Boards and the Department of Education. And it has been decided that two teachers will be granted leave during the Fall semester, and this leave will include two-thirds of their salary that they will earn in the discharge of their duties, and, of course, the regular fringe benefits that go with the salaries.

So I am very pleased to announce that upon the recommendation of the Committee I just referred to, and with the concurrence of the school boards concerned, leave will be granted next year to two teachers in Newfoundland, Mr. Wilfred Rumbolt and Mrs. Monica Moriarity. My department wishes to congratulate these two teachers on the award of their special leave and the honour attached to it, since this is the first time that it has happened. Mr. Speaker, we wish them both continued success in their efforts to improve their teaching qualifications.

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

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am very delighted to respond to the announcement made by the Minister of Education. Many sitting within the hearing of his voice this morning may not get the full significance of what has been said, because it is something that is in some respects a bit jargonistic, a bit involved in the profession of education particularly, but something nevertheless that educators

MR. SIMMONS:

for a long time, teachers throughout this Province have not only worked hard for, but have deserved to have available to them, It is a practice that has long been the case in many other parts of North America, indeed I believe we must be one of the last jurisdictions to officially inaugurate this leave taking arrangement.

During my time with the Newfoundland Teachers Association it is one of the items that we were able to get agreement in principle on from government and I am glad to see now that after some time has elapsed, two or three years since then, since my involvement there, that the principle has been put into practice and I know the minister's involvement in another arena, when he was very active with the Newfoundland Teachers Association, that he had no small part in helping formulate that particular policy of the NTA, with which policy he is now wearing another hat, he is able to announce and be a party to.

I congratulate him and I believe I expressed the sentiments of certainly all Newfoundland teachers when I say that I believe it is a good thing. It is a step in the right direction. It is true there are only two, but like all new things they must grow from small beginnings. I believe the minister and his department have made a good beginning here, and on behalf of me and my colleagues I would like to congratulate him and his officials for taking this step.



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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I know that the President and certain officers of the St. John's Board of Trade are in the gallery, I thought it might be a good time to report that we have received a communication from them containing a complaint about the way the DOT and the Canadian Government are operating the St. John's Airport, and their discrimination against St. John's Airport by their refusal to permit charter flights to leave from St. John's Airport even though St. John's Airport is designated, as are other airports such as London, Ontario, as suitable for charter flights, international and otherwise.

I see no reason, Mr. Speaker, why this attitude should be taken with respect to St. John's Airport. This is not the same issue as whether or not St. John's Airport should be an international airport, whether there should be more than one international airport in Newfoundland. This is a question of whether or not charter flights that originate with groups from the City of St. John's should be permitted to leave from St. John's Airport, or whether they should have to go to Gander to leave from there and return to Gander. There are two particular cases, one involving a naval reunion in the United Kingdom this summer, June, I believe it is, where although they are originating from St. John's, they have got to go to Gander to get a charter flight, although there is no reason whatsoever, no valid reason, for their not being able to leave St. John's Airport, and involving one of the high schools in the city where they now have to bus all the children to Gander Airport to take a charter flight to the UK, and this is really, Mr. Speaker, intolerable and the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs will be taking this matter up with the authorities in Ottawa to see if we can get some change in that respect.

MR. SIMMONS: Could the minister before he sits down indicate why is it that he indicated why the flight has to originate from St. John's, Gander, the charter flight?

MR. CROSBIE: They will not permit these flights to originate from St. John's.

AN HON. MEMBER: It must be regulations.

MR. SIMMONS: It is a new policy, really.



MR. CROSBIE: It is not because of the regulations, but they have discretionary powers to permit it, and they seem to be determined to exercise their discretion so that they are not permitted, with feeble excuses about custom clearance and the like.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the minister be kind enough to give us a little something by way of a definition of the difference between an airport that is an international airport, that has the status of an international airport - and of course we are all familiar with that argument and that dispute - and one which, though not an international airport nevertheless is the point of origin of international flights? It is important, because if that can be established on a reasonable basis then in God's name why should not a crowd of youngsters - I had two grandsons in one group, and there have been lots of groups that have flown over to Europe, but they had to go to Gander - why could they not get aboard an aircraft here or any other group that may be got up in a special charter flight, not a regular scheduled airline flight but special occasions, would the minister tell us what is really technically the difference between the two?

MR. SIMONS: I would like to have a word before the minister responds, and perhaps he can respond to the point I want to raise, too. I must admit I was not following the minister closely, but I am puzzled by the gist of what I am getting, because I know that on a number of occasions in the past two or three years there have been charter flights. Indeed I was involved in one about three or four years ago which went directly from here to London. Indeed that night, I believe, there were four or five left. I remember on the return we were in the airport when we were one of seven flights coming in the same day.

MR. H. COLLINS: There is no problem on a day in the year when there is no fog in.

MR. SIMONS: Yes, well that was to be my -

MR. H. COLLINS: There is no problem when the fog is out.

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering really - and this is to be my question to the minister - I am wondering if there is some new policy that has come into being since the time I am referring to, because at that time charter flights particularly, for the students to which the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) referred, was very much in vogue and there were literally dozens of these flights - I do not know about dozens, but certainly a dozen or so during the calendar year 1972 and also 1973 for example. I cannot seem to see what the problem is and I plead ignorance on this particular point. It is quite a distinction, as the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) has mentioned, the distinction of having charter flights originate on the one hand and having it declared as an international airport for normal commercial purposes.

But I got from the minister's statement that he was referring to charter flights, and I gather from what he has said that there was some reason why they were obliged to originate from Gander as opposed to St. John's. I wonder would he just clarify that.

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, well there is a considerable difference.

MR. CROSBIE:

If you are recognized as an international airport, then regular scheduled flights or charter flights could land and take off from St. John's and it would be wide open then as an international airport. That is one situation. But that is not -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Internationally that is recognized all around the world, as an international airport.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, right. And then anyone originating a flight from Europe, say, to North America could land at St. John's airport as an international airport rather than Gander. You know, they will have the full powers as an international airport. But that is not the issue in this case.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. CROSBIE: This is a case where St. John's Airport as, say, the airport in London, Ontario, there is nothing that prevents them originating charter flights. It is not a question of being recognized as an international airport, charter flights that originate from St. John's itself or the area around it. And there have been such flights permitted in the past. But there seems to be someone in Ottawa who is determined that the customs department and the DOT will use their discretion wherever possible to prevent any charter flights originating from the City of St. John's, presumably because they think this is of some assistance to Gander. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people in Gander or the member for Gander (Mr. H. Collins) and so on, has no objection whatsoever to a few charter flights a year originating out of St. John's and going to the U.K. or wherever.

So the excuse is being used there, for example, that they have not got the customs facilities or they would not have the customs facilities in June, and various excuses like this are being used. First it is agreed, but as it goes up the line then that decision gets reversed. This is discrimination for no good reason whatsoever against St. John's and the people involved in these charter flights who are put to the extra cost of having to bus themselves out to Gander,

MR. COSBIE:

and extra time and trouble. But it is just not reasonable. And we are looking into this, Mr. Speaker, and we intend to protest to Ottawa as the St. John's Board of Trade already has done. So it is not a question of us asking for St. John's to be an international airport, just that St. John's be treated the same as other airports in its category across Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have another statement. During the past number of years officials of my Historic Resources Division have been actively engaged in the acquisition of wide-range historic objects having a close association with the province's social and cultural development. Due mainly to insufficient exhibition space and other factors, many of these very important historic objects have never been viewed by our people but rather have been placed in various storage areas within the Historic Resources Division.

MR. HICKEY: Recently a decision was made to rectify this situation. The result is the development of a temporary exhibition which is scheduled to open at the Duckworth Street Museum on Monday, April 12, at 9:00 A.M. The exhibit will be open to the general public during normal museum hours for approximately the next two months. Those who visit the exhibit will, I am sure, find it both interesting and stimulating. By means of an imaginary street scene the attempt has been made to exhibit the various historic objects and a scene that hopefully helps to recapture the atmosphere of the times.

In addition to an almost fully equipped general store, the exhibit includes appropriately decorated store fronts displaying ships, instruments, period time pieces, antique china, millinery goods, period lighting fixtures, as well as a small early twentieth century film theatre in which silent films are shown.

It is our hope that if the exhibit is well received to initiate similar projects involving additional artifacts in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I extend an invitation to the general public to visit the exhibition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does that include us?

MR. HICKEY: Everybody.

MR. NEARY: We are the historic objects.

MR. HICKEY: That is right.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I have the report of the Workmen's Compensation Board, the year 1975, to table. I would suggest hon. members should read the report. There are some very interesting statistics and comments in it and I think it relates to every person in this hon. House, so it should be given some attention. Possibly

MR. MAYNARD: members could learn the work of the Workmen's Compensation Board and the important role they play in the provincial structure.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question No. 472 on the Order Paper of April 2nd., asked by the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. McNeil). I gave the answer verbally, a part of it, a few days ago but anyway the answer is here in writing, with some copies.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in reply to a question that was asked by my colleague the Minister of Public Works yesterday regarding a tender that was awarded to a company in Ottawa in January for the supply of vehicles which was for the use by our department, Transportation and Communications, the tenders were called in the Fall of 1975 for the supply of thirty-six trucks. Now these trucks were for the use of our snow plowing operations and winter maintenance operations around the Province, so therefore there was a deadline set on the tender call for the supply of these vehicles. The vehicles were to be supplied by the 15th. day of January and because the local dealers in the Province could not supply the vehicles on that date, unfortunately, and I say unfortunately, we had to go outside the Province and award the tender call for seventeen of these thirty-six trucks to a company called MacKenzie Mercury in Ottawa. And I would like to point out one thing, that although we went outside the Province to buy these seventeen vehicles because of the deadline date, that the price paid for these seventeen vehicles was less than the cost and the price paid for these vehicles in the Province.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Justice, Sir, I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Assistant Assistant Deputy Premier, if the minister would tell the House what steps the government have taken to plug the loopholes in the Provincial Companies Act, to bar certain lawyers from using their secretaries on the share list of the company when they register the company in the Registry office.

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, no steps are being taken because there is no need for any steps to be taken. It is the same situation in every country in the Western World. The law firm incorporates a company, and usually the lawyers involved and the secretaries are the first directors, or the incorporating directors. There is nothing sinister about it. There is nothing unusual about it. There is no great plot involved in it. And under The Companies Act at the end of their first year of incorporation, another return has to be filed and by that time the shares are usually transferred to whoever actually owns the company. So there is no suggestion, we have no suggestion, we have not considered making any change in this matter. There is no reason why there should be any change. In addition to which, Mr. Speaker, the law permits persons to hold shares in trust for other persons and they do not have to reveal it. This is not required in any jurisdiction I know of.

So the hon. gentleman should set himself at rest. It is not under consideration and there is not going to be any change.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister tell the House if in his opinion it is not good policy for the government not to refuse to do business with these companies who do not reveal the real owners, set the good example?

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, when this government is doing business with anyone and wants to find out who the owner of the company is, it will find out simply by asking who the owner is, or you know who you are dealing with. The company is known as ABC Construction Company, and the three incorporators are lawyers or their secretaries. They are not the ones who will be in dealing with the government or making a bid, it will be whoever is running and operating the companies. So there



MR. CROSBIE: Is no difficulty in finding out who owns a company that has recently been incorporated if you are doing business with them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am dissatisfied with the minister's answer and I wish to debate the matter next Thursday during the late show.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my very good friend, the Minister of Health, I wonder would he indicate whether the cardiovascular unit and kidney unit at the St. John's General Hospital have been closed, and if so, can he indicate the reasons why this may have been done?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: I will certainly take that question under notice and get the answer for the hon. gentleman.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. SIMMONS: For the minister's information, it is my information that this has been done though I would certainly like him to confirm it. But my supplementary is would he indicate to the House at the same time what the implications may be in terms of health care, I am thinking particularly of open-heart patients? It is my understanding that as a result of the closure, if that is the case, that no hospital in Newfoundland may now be able to treat open-heart cases, may be able to operate because they have no post-operative facilities to look after them during the recovery period. I wonder would he take that question under advisement as well?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I would like to ask the Minister of Health, Sir, what steps the government have taken to provide dialysis machines, that is kidney machines, in various strategic regions of Newfoundland where the government has hospitals? Has the minister taken any steps to provide these badly needed machines in areas outside of St. John's?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the whole programme of renal dialysis is being reviewed, most recently in light of the fact that there has been two, possibly three kidney transplant operations performed at the General Hospital.

MR. NEARY: There was one the other night.

MR. COLLINS: Because of this we have to have a close look at the whole programme, not only as it relates to the General but as it relates, as the hon. member indicated, to all of the Province and as time goes on I am going to be making a statement concerning that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it a supplementary?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Then I recognize the hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism. Would the minister tell the House the nature of the so-called renewed public awareness with respect to a provincial flag? Where does this renewed public awareness originate?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat dumbfounded to say the least. I have no idea. If that phrase, or that statement is attributed to me I certainly wish to disassociate myself from it. What I said to a member of the news media when asked about the provincial flag was that there was renewed interest in the fact that the Province does not have a distinctive flag at the moment, and there was a great deal of interest and concern that there should be one in time for the Summer Games, and of course a great number of people feel there should be one anyway. Basically that is what I said.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. WHITE: Could the minister tell the House

Mr. White:

whether or not the government are still considering the design that was unveiled by a former Minister of Tourism a couple of years ago, the white one, with the Coat of Arms on the back of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are still looking at it. They are still considering that one.

MR. WHITE: Or thinking about others.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. T. HICKEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have not made a decision not to go with the flag. But I suppose it is fair to say that as long as we do not have a distinctive flag, and as long as that particular one has not been passed by the House, then certainly the question is open, I suppose one could consider the question is still open. But certainly we are looking at that, and we will be making a decision shortly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This wild outburst of public enthusiasm for a new separate flag, does this consist of three or four people phoning to open line? Or what other mad outburst of enthusiasm does the minister see? I watch around and I do not see anything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have not noticed any wild demonstrations or anything of that nature. But very seriously, Mr. Speaker, I, you know, think, one can jostle and joke about this subject, but I happen to be a red-blooded Newfoundlander, and I do not really entertain too many jokes about a flag because I think the flag is an intricate part of any country or any province. And I do not think indeed that the sports people that lead this Province and travel abroad, and travel to other provinces, are over-enthusiastic when they fly the Union Jack and find that when the Governor General comes along that that flag has to be lowered. I do not think they get

MR. HICKEY: over enthusiastic about that at all. So while I have not noticed any violent demonstrations or demonstrations bordering on violence demanding a distinctive flag, I can assure my hon. friend from Twillingate that the letters have continued for the last number of years, and that suggestions have continued to come in. And when I said to the media that there has been renewed interest or increased interest I simply was indicating to the media that for the last couple of months there have been more requests, more telephone calls, more letters asking what the situation is about the proposed flag.

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

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary; Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) has been less than overwhelmed by the wild public support that I have seen, so I wonder if the minister would lay upon the table of the House each and every one of the letters he has received, or any of his colleagues have received, say in the last twelve months, requesting a new flag for Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to do that. I do not know if that is in order or not. But certainly I really -

MR. ROBERTS: It is in order.

MR. HICKEY: - have no objections to doing so.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear! Let us see them.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile and then the hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put - I can help the hon. minister, I can give him a few letters I have by the way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I would like to put a question to the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir. Would the minister tell us now the situation concerning the build-up of inventory at the linerboard

Mr. Neary:

mill in Stephenville, if the inventory is now moving, if weather conditions are good and what are the prospects for full employment at the Linerboard Mill for the coming year, for the year ahead?

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I have not gotten any recent reports, and the mill is opened up again now because the ice cleared away and permitted ships to come in and load linerboard. As far as I can remember there is a shut-down plan for something like the end of April or sometime in May, in order to do work on a ventilation system, otherwise matters seem to be going along all right. But I will have it checked Monday and get a more accurate up to date report.

MR. NEARY: And bring it to the House on Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this question is to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. As the minister well knows the detour on the Trans-Canada Highway is now closed, and the Trans-Canada is carrying traffic, the washed out section. Would the minister advise the House as to number (1), when reconstruction on the Trans-Canada will start? Number (2), whether the work will be done through a tender call or by his department? And number (3), will steps be taken to upgrade the detour prior to the closing of the Trans-Canada for reconstruction?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the section of road that was damaged by the raising of the water level on the Exploits River, and by the ice conditions this past Winter, will be repaired. Tenders will be called in the not too distant future. It will be announced accordingly. But it cannot all be done at one time. We are now making arrangements for the calling of tenders in various road projects. But I can give the hon. member my assurances that the road will be repaired or upgraded, raised, the Trans-Canada section, and the shoulders repaired. And while that work is being carried out, if the Trans-Canada has to be closed during that period of time, that the detour will be kept in passable condition.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Then the minister is not yet in a position to say whether the work will be done by his department or by tender? Is that right?

MR. MORGAN: I just said tender calls.

MR. FLIGHT: Oh, for that road?

MR. MORGAN: No, for the Trans-Canada.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have a supplementary?

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: All right.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if he is still optimistic in getting assistance from the Government of Canada to a proposal put forward to the Government of Canada by the Atlantic Provinces recently for upgrading, twinning and repaving of the Trans-Canada Highway? And if the minister is not optimistic, does he intend now to put the half-load limit on the Trans-Canada Highway, especially for tractor trailers, before it is reduced to the status of a cowpath?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on March 10 the ministers responsible for highways in the Atlantic Region, the four provinces, met with the Federal Minister of Transport, the hon. Otto Lang, and we put forward to him a submission based on the needs for the reconstruction for the upgrading, for the parallelling of some sections of our Trans-Canada, in other words, four lanes, and that amounted to in Newfoundland to \$216 million over a ten year programme.

MR. NEARY: A ten year period.

MR. MORGAN: At our meeting with Mr. Lang - the total needs by the way came to \$960 million, I am sorry, the total for the ten year programme for the Atlantic region - and in Newfoundland the Trans-Canada Highway is our only primary road, and when I say our only primary road it is the only road accepted and qualified and approved by the Federal level of government as a primary road, whereas in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick there are other road other than the Trans-Canada Highway which is listed and approved by the Federal Government as primary roads as well.

The Federal Minister indicated to us that he will then -

MR. SMALLWOOD: They do not get any help from Ottawa.

MR. MORGAN: No, no, no.

The Federal Minister at the time indicated to us that he would take our proposal to his colleagues in Cabinet as a major decision to make, that type of expenditure, but we quite fortunately told him at that time, and we still stand by this, it is a unified agreement with the Atlantic region, that there will be no uniform

Mr. Morgan:

system of gross weights on our Trans-Canada Highways, on our primary highways in the Atlantic region, until we get funds from Ottawa to carry out this major reconstruction work.

The situation is now that the weight system, the gross weights, for example, is different in Nova Scotia than they are in Newfoundland, different in New Brunswick than what they are in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. In other words, all four provinces have different gross weights with regards to the axle weights and the gross weights. They are all different. And we quite clearly told the Federal Minister that there will be no uniform system adopted in the Atlantic Region unless we get assistance from Ottawa to carry out the upgrading of our Trans-Canada, and our primary road system.

Newfoundland's position, we also indicated and we still stand by it. It is that unless we get assistance from Ottawa to carry out this work on the Trans-Canada, there is a strong possibility that we are going to have to reduce our gross maximum weights we now have and reduce our gross axle weights. Now this could possibly mean, if we do this, it could possibly mean the removal of the CNR buses off our Trans-Canada Highway,

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: -and we told him this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: We have to take the measure of reducing our gross weights, -

MR. NEARY: But it will soon be too late.

MR. MORGAN: - and gross axle weights. Now that was March 10.

MR. NEARY: Yes.



MR. MORGAN: I was quite surprised yesterday to hear from one of the local media that they had a reliable source in Ottawa who indicated to them, in fact it was station CJON, that the federal government had rejected totally our proposal. So upon hearing that news, through the local media, I contacted my counterparts in the other provinces and their officials and none of us has received any official correspondence or any kind of correspondence of any type from the federal minister or his officials since that date, March 10th. However, we are now again asking the minister to give us as early as possible a decision on our proposal, and if the answer is negative - we certainly hope it will not be - but if it is negative in any way or form, we will be, I can assure this House of Assembly, we will be - and when I say we, the ministers in the Atlantic region - will be back to Ottawa in the very near future and commencing our, I would use the term pressure, on Ottawa to get some funds for this kind of a programme.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary to the Minister of Transportation and Communications in connection with the question asked by my colleague, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) and it has got to do with the destruction of the Trans-Canada Highway west of Grand Falls this winter. Now it is generally conceded in Newfoundland that it is the fault of Price, and I am getting concerned that Price Newfoundland is going to get off the hook on this one. Will the minister tell the House what he is doing in connection with having Price admit some of the responsibility for that destruction?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, shortly after the flooding occurred the officials of my department held meetings with Price based on the fact that we were assuming, and we had no concrete evidence at the

MR. MORGAN: time, we were assuming that the raising of the water level was due to the fact that the Price (Nfld.) Limited did raise their dam by six feet last year, and that was having an effect on the water level in the Exploits River. The construction of the dam was done without any consultation with our department, but I understand it was done with consultation with one of my colleagues in his department, the Minister of the Environment, his officials were consulted on the raising of the dam.

But at that meeting the company refused to accept any liability at all for the damage to the Trans-Canada Highway. So I have asked my engineering staff, in fact the officials of the department, to gather as much evidence as possible and some concrete, tangible evidence that this dam, the raising of this dam, did cause the damage to the Trans-Canada Highway, and once this is done and the evidence gathered we will again commence negotiations and talks with Price (Nfld.) Limited.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize one further supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: To the Minister of Transportation and Communications again, I am wondering, Mr. Minister, if after the reconstruction, the raising of the level of the highroad by six or eight feet, is there any consideration being given to taking action to offset any more flooding in that area? Because I have watched that flooding this past four months, and there is no reason to believe that that river will not flood again. There were times when the water was one foot over the pavement level. Now with the raising of the roadbed, will steps be taken to make sure that the river itself, that that type of flooding does not occur, that if indeed it is the Price dam that caused the flooding, will the Price dam be lowered? Will some of the natural banks that were taken away from the river be replaced? Or will there be any steps taken to prevent that type of flooding? Or will the type of construction that is going to be used to raise the level of the road be the type that that flooding will not

MR. FLIGHT: effect anyway?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, every step will be taken in carrying out the reconstruction work this summer to assure that this will not reoccur again. There is another factor that ties into the possible cause, and that is the fact there is a pit known as Goodyear's Barrow Pit in the immediate area. They have been taking fill away from that area for the last number of years and this has caused - the water is now flowing over that property as well, more easily than before. So we will probably have to use fill to fill in that area that has been excavated over the past number of years. But I give my assurances that every step will be taken, every measure taken to assure that this will not reoccur again after this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo and then the hon. member for Bellevue.

CAPT. WINSOE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Fisheries. In light of the minister's statement yesterday, can he give any explanation why today there are two similar boats, so he indicated yesterday, would be repossessed or refitted and chartered to fishermen? Those two boats are advertised for sale to satisfy a mortgage. Perhaps while the minister is on his feet he might have the answer to a question I asked him the other day re two boats that were advertised in the Daily News.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTEP: Mr. Speaker, the appearance of the ads in the paper this morning calling for tenders on two longliner certainly is not related in any way to the announcement I made yesterday, or the one I made this morning. Nor, Mr. Speaker, are the announcements related to the fact that there are three impending by-elections, two of which concern fishing areas. Because the record will show, Mr. Speaker, that both policies were conceived last October and were held in abeyance pending the new fiscal year. So certainly there is no attempt on my part to use both of these announcements for political gains.

With respect to the later part of his question, Mr. Speaker, the ads again to which he refers on the sale of boats, there was an ad appearing in the paper calling for public tenders for the purchase of three or four boats. The reason being that these boats were offered for sale to fishermen, as is required, and ads appeared in the Newfoundland press I believe for two weeks, I think it was, and we had no takers. There were not, obviously, any fishermen willing or able to purchase the boats. Consequently we had to, as again is required, to advertise the boats and provide, and at least request, tenders from private individuals who might want to purchase them.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question, I think, for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. It has to do with the former mink ranches in the Blaketown, Whitbourne area. Now in view of the fact that there are many residents in that area who have applications in for lease or grant of some of that land, and in view of the fact that

MR. CALLAN:

the Trinity-Fiacentia stadium commission put in an application back in 1971 and we have not gotten any satisfaction yet, I would like to ask the minister, what is the status of this land where the former mink ranches were, and how soon can we expect the problem to be solved?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: If the hon. member had mentioned this before I came up to the House I could have had it this morning for him.

Actually the decision was made on how to dispose of these, what ones would be disposed of as a result of a tender called some time back, I forget what it is, but the decision has been made within the past couple of weeks by government, and on Monday I will be able to come in and if the hon. member would like it privately, I am prepared to release the names in each instance because it was done as a result of public tendering in all instances. The highest tender in all instances was accepted. I do not think there was disposal of all of them because in certain areas the bid was not appropriate. Somebody bid a price that we did not think was appropriate. It only went for agricultural land, by the way, in most instances. It was bid on for that. So on Monday I will get the details for the hon. member either privately, if he wants them, or in the House. Either way I will let you know where the disposal went on each of these.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications. The minister remembers of course that Price (Nfld) in Grand Falls has changed its method, or is changing its method of delivering wood to Botwood. Can the minister assure the House that the government is assured that there will be no destruction to the highway going to Botwood, and that indeed the highway may be changed and a new route out there specifically for the trucks that are going to be taking wood to the boats in Botwood?

MR. MORGAN: Assurances that there be no -?

MR. WHITE: That there be no disruption of the highway or that Price will put their own road there or whatever. 'Rousseau' knows all about it.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I take that question as notice.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the minister is going to take the question under notice because it is a very big concern in that particular area and one that the people are looking for some answers on.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile and then the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Industrial and Rural Development, Sir, who is very excited about the possibility of getting a contract from Guinea to build boats at Marystown. Could the minister tell us whether or not the minister's department has been successful? Has the contract yet been awarded? What are the prospects?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have not got an answer, I am sorry. I would have liked to have had an answer today. I expected to have heard back on Wednesday of this week past. We have not got a definitive answer. When we approached the project in Guinea we expected that we had about a twenty-five per cent chance to get some work. We put together a good bid, combined with the financial arrangements with the Export Development Corporation, also an offer from the Fisheries College, from the president, which we are very delighted about, to offer a training component to the bid as well, and we know that our chances have increased, But I am still not optimistic enough to be able to say that we have a firm foot in the door. But we will know sometime this coming week.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Will the minister consider following up his proposal now with a telex or a telephone call to see if he can confirm the contract?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will take that advice and do that this afternoon.

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. I understand the serious concern over the severe over-cutting of the woods area on the north side of the river in Goose Bay operated by Labrador Linerboard. I understand

Mr. Strachan.

that they are removing far more cords of wood than the sustainable yield will permit, and also there is little management of the resource and no reforestation programme. I wonder if the minister is aware of this, and if so, what he intends to do about it?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: I will have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker. I will certainly check into it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate. I should point out that this shall be the last question and last answer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, would the Government House Leader tell me if he can, if I may hope before the session ends, to get answers to a hundred or a couple of hundred questions of which I gave notice some four to five months ago? May I still hope, after four or five months, that in the next month or two I may get some answers?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: The hon. gentleman put, I think, as I recall it, 450 questions on the Order Paper. I believe that some 200 odd have now been answered. There is a lot of work, and a lot of research to answer these questions and people are working on them, and they will be answered in due course.

MR. CROSBIE: \$120,000 it has cost so far to answer them, \$120,000!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Government House Leader if he is not aware that a great many of these questions could be answered instantly with a simple yes or no, or a simple number or a simple answer, a very large number of them. For instance, as an example, the Minister of Justice was asked has he authorized the bugging of any telephones? And if he has, how many and over what period? Now I have been waiting for over four months for that one?

MR. CROSBIE: All you have to do is pick up the telephone.



SOME NON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not funny.

MR. CROSBIE: I think it is amusing.

MR. WELLS: If I may, Mr. Speaker. I was wrong when I said 400. The total number of questions asked was 742. The number answered to date has been 317, which is a percentage of forty-two-point-something, and we are still working on the answers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, before the House Leader calls Committee of Supply, could we call Motion No. 3 that a committee be appointed pursuant to Standing Order 84 in order that you can announce the names of the members of the committee?

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I undertook today

MR. WELLS: to call motion (3) to be under the Standing Order 84(a), and accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move the appointment of the hon. member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) to be Chairman of the Committee, the hon. member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor) to be a member, the hon. member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) to be a member, the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) and the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I presume this is a debatable motion.

MR. SPEAKER: This is a debatable motion, yes.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, once again I want to lash out at the Government House Leader, Sir, who seems to be too busy to bother to consult with all the groups on this particular side of the House, Sir, before making these kind of pronouncements. I want to tell the House that the minister did not have the courtesy to approach me. I believe the minister approached the Leader of the official Opposition, the Leader of the Liberal Reform Party, but did not have the courtesy to approach me to let me know in advance, as he did with the other two groups, I believe in fact, Sir, took recommendations from the other two gentlemen, did not have the courtesy to approach me to let me know, or to let me have any involvement in the appointment of this Committee that will select committees of the House.

Sir, I want to point out to the hon. minister, who seems to be too busy to come around and let me know about these things, that the hon. Leader of the old-line Liberal Party and the Liberal Reform Party do not speak for me in this hon. House.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: This is not the first time this has happened, Sir. I asked Your Honour, I believe, a couple of weeks ago if I could get a copy of the Order-in-Council on the increases for members and ministers. Your Honour told me it did not come under him - and I agree - and recommended I approach

MR. NEARY:

the Government House Leader, which I did. Up to this moment I still do not have the information. I approached the Minister of Finance. I am entitled as a member of the House, Sir, to have this information. The minister may not think that I represent a group in this hon. House. But, Sir, I think it is a matter of courtesy that all three leaders on this side of the House - maybe the hon. minister does not want to recognize me as a leader of a group. Maybe the hon. minister does not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think if you are going to get these committees to function properly, if you are going to get these committees, Sir, to function properly, I believe it is incumbent upon the minister to take the time, make the time, if he does not have it now, if he is too busy to look after the running of the House, we should somehow or other make the time to consult with all the leaders on this side of the House. I would hope in future that the minister will somehow or other be able to find the time to have prior consultation before he comes into the House and announces the names of a committee that is going, or any other committee, that is going to operate in this hon. House.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member speaks now, he closes the debate.

The Hon. Minister without Portfolio.

HON. R. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have hurt the hon. member's feelings, Mr. Speaker, by not consulting him. I consulted the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the official Opposition who is the Leader of a recognized group or party in this House. I then consulted the Leader of the Liberal Reform Party, which is a recognized group or party in this House. The hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), he is not in my view - and I may be wrong and I will certainly take direction from the House on this - not the leader of a group but one independent member, the same as any other member in the House, but not a leader of a group. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I did not consult him because he, having no group that I know of, would not be able to recommend a member of that group to be a member of this committee. Now if the House directs me on matters of that sort to

MR. WELLS:

consult with the hon. member -

MR. NEARY: When am I going to get -

MR. WELLS: If the House -

MR. CROSBIE: Just relax. Just relax, boy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. WELLS: If the House wishes me and directs me to consult with the hon. member on matters of this sort, of course I will be happy to do so.

MR. NEARY: When am I going to get the memorandum?

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour "aye", contrary "nay", motion carried.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Head XVI, Rural Development:

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

MR. STPACHAN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to conclude a few remarks that I set out last night and if possible maybe the minister would respond to them. I was not getting into the nitty-gritty of the department but what I was trying to look for was the overall philosophy, the overall policy of the department. I believe that, as I said last night, the Deputy Minister and his staff have done an excellent job but I still feel that the overall policy, the direction, the feeling must come obviously from the minister and from the administration on that side. I am a little concerned by the fact that the Department of Rural Development, as I said, has been bulked in with the Department of Industrial Development and this sounds contradictory.

I am also a little concerned because a number of people who have been involved with Regional Development Associations feel a little dejected because of this grouping of the departments. They feel that maybe now they are in the process of being either relegated, or maybe over possibly a period of a year being wiped out altogether.

I am also interested in the policy of the administration in the long-term on regionalization. Because, as I understand it, the Regional Development Associations were created with the idea of giving them a certain amount of economy, a certain amount of feeling of being able to do something within their own region. I have been particularly involved, as I said, in Labrador. In 1972 we thought the thing through and tried to look ahead a number of years. I chaired the first meeting in Northern Labrador of the combined councils, that is the councils from Rigolet, Postville, Makkovik, Hopedale, Davis Inlet and Nain. Every year since then these combined councils have met once a year. They travel there on their own expenses. They give up a week of work, travel, get together. The meetings are held and translated into three languages, English, Naskaupi Indian and

MR. STRACHAN:

Inuktitut. And they are now feeling or now looking for a direction in which to head.

I was very much interested in the regional policy and whether Rural Development has developed anything along these lines. It was interesting that the first year when we started the councils felt that their job was to almost nail everyone who came within reach of them. So the first one, two, or three years they called government people into the combined councils meeting and asked them questions almost always in a negative sense. But now they are growing up and maturing and the council is looking ahead now and wants to get into more positive things. They want to take part in more programmes. They want to develop policies for the region. There is a community of interest. So I am very much interested in where the department is heading that way and whether there has been a long-term regional policy developed in Rural Development.

Mr. Strachan:

One other point that I was concerned about one time was sometimes the only method of getting funding for community projects was to have a Development Association formed, that unless you had a Development Association formed you could not get funding. I can think of situation, for instance, in Labrador South, which is different because it is extremely unorganized, they are only now starting to pull together, where a number of projects that the minister's department has carried out, I will swear, could be implemented and carried out. The only way we can usually do that is in the guise of a pilot project to try it out. But I think there are a number of things there which could be funded under this department, but they cannot be because under the terms they must form a Regional Development Association. And we are faced with an extremely region in which the method of travel is by aircraft, and then it becomes extremely expensive and local people have a very great difficulty organizing. It is very easy to drive to a hall some place and hold a meeting, but on the Labrador Coast it is almost impossible. It costs at least each person \$100 to travel, so you can only have one or possibly two meetings per year. And I feel that this kind of punishes the people who want to get into the department, to apply for loans or projects or move because they do not have a Development Association formed.

I also brought up the question, and I am deeply interested in it, and the emphasis on assistance, promotion and training, and I would like to see this emphasized more with groups, as I stated, and associations or regions in which no one else has gone into. I think within this Province one tends to start something up, such as the Fogo situation, and keep on with it, when in essence one should be prepared to drop it after four or five or six years and go on to other areas which are then less sophisticated, got less expertise, less ability, and, I think, this is the feeling that I have that the department should get into areas of this Province where very few other agencies are.

Mr. Strachan:

We suffer in the North now, in Northern Labrador, from over organization almost. Because once it opened up we now have all kinds of government agencies coming in, all different groups coming in, a great deal of organization at different levels, in fact it is very difficult now to know which committee and which association and which council one is dealing with. And I think there is a danger in many other areas of over organization. Then we look at other areas in which there is very, very little organization. Nothing being done. No one in there. At one time the Extension Service used to get into area like that, but now it has kind of backed out of that, and I think that the leadership, in the rural development sense, is now, I believe, firmly placed in your department's hands, and it is out of the agencies such as Extension Service and other groups, in which I was involved.

So I wonder if the minister could reply to some of these points. I know this is more philosophy and policy than hard facts, but I also believe that it is very important because in the long term this is where rural Newfoundland and rural Labrador is going to head, and these people want some kind of direction, sense of direction, and that cannot come from the Deputy Minister and his staff because he needs that direction from this administration and from the minister. Good and excellent as they are, they still require emphasis, and I wonder if the minister could put this same kind of energy in to that kind of thing as he obviously exhibited so far.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development.

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, just to have a brief response, because I know of other hon. members who want to participate, I believe I am really fortunate as a minister to have in the House three representatives from Labrador who continuously advise and suggest and recommend, The hon. member who just spoke, along with my good colleague who is a constant adviser and a constant prodder and reminder to me of the uniqueness of some of the problems in Labrador, certainly have made very numerous and many constructive



Mr. Lundrigan:

suggestions. I have got to say to the hon. member, I do not know how long he is going to maintain and retain the attitude that he has exemplified in the House so far, I hope that the political system, the party system never gets so much control of him that he loses the attitude he has which is one of a constructive nature. The attitude which he has shown today will, I will say is very, very fundamentally, effect some of the directions we will take in rural development.

Last evening as he spoke the Deputy Minister, of course, who is in the building and in the office next door, made notes on the speech, and I can say to him that in our planning, and in our constant assessment in the department the attitudes the recommendations, the suggestions he made will be taken into consideration. As a matter of fact what I will indicate as well is that in our planning for other long-term agreements, which we are going to enter into hopefully at the termination or before the termination of the present agreement, the Federal-Provincial agreement which has two years gone down the road, we have started our planning already,

Mr. Lundrigan.

we have had a lot of work done in looking down the road at a new long-term agreement with the federal government for rural development, that the attitudes that have been suggested and the general policy recommendations will be taken into consideration, that we will make the recommendations part of our planning process. There were seven or eight points the member mentioned. I will not go into details, because I will do this in summing up. Other hon. members undoubtedly will want to expand on some of them. I was very happy to hear the emphasis that the member placed on promotion and training. I believe myself that this is one area that is overlooked to a large extent by government because it is not a hard measurable kind of quantitative job for the department that usually gets government support, good government support when you are in periods of restraint. And it is a difficult thing to sell. I do not mind admitting that I find it difficult lot of times to sell to my colleagues some of the emphases that we need placed on programmes which are not quantitative, and which, in my opinion, perhaps are much more valuable than some of the other programmes that we can measure. This kind of attitude reinforces my belief that we have to expand the role of the department and the division as it relates to that particular process.

The business of the Rural Development Association being an impediment to an area because of the fact that certain projects have to be funded through the association, they is a very vital question, and a very important one. First of all I would want to say that the reason that we encourage projects, community projects, funding through associations, is to reinforce the role and the importance of the association. I can say that it is a difficult thing in a lot of our towns, in a lot of our communities, in a lot of our regions that we define as rural development regions, to get a lot of participation. It is a difficult thing to do. I do not know exactly all the reasons for it.

Mr. Lundrigan.

I do not know if we know in the department the reasons for it. One of the reasons is that I tend to believe that our people have backed away generally speaking from the decision making process, because of a strong tendency over the last number of years in centralization of decision making. That has been the tendency which has been national, international, perhaps, but certainly it has been dramatic in this Province - has it not? - you know, where communities one time, every little community had its own framework of decision making. It had its own structures, every little community. And there has been the tendency to move away from that, a very dramatic one, and the Minister of Education responding to the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) sort of touched on this a few days ago. I have got very, very serious and strong reservations about that kind of a tendency. Having said that, I think I am really putting my finger on one of the reasons why people have tended to let George do it.

Now in our eagerness and our effort to try and reinforce the role of the Regional Development Association, we have tried to make it an expectation that community project funding go through the Rural Development Association. because to a large extent the whole concept of setting up a corporation to assume the responsibility for the funding of a project is based on it going through the association. On the other hand we have deviated from the policy. I think my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is the person who brought it to a bit of a head with the craft guilds.-

MR. NEARY: The Gateway Guilds.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The Gateway Guilds - where we did deviate from the policy on this particular programme, and I will say without bragging openly about it, or exaggerating the fact, that we are willing to look at projects if they do not go through an association, that is, community project funding.

Mr. Lundrigan.

On the other hand, everything else in the department pretty well does not have to necessarily go through an association at all. For example, the Rural Development Authority, which is part of one of the divisions and the loans made under that authority, have no direct relationship necessarily with the Regional Development Association. But I will say this, that in areas where the Regional Development Associations have been active and effective there is a high correlation between that fact I just mentioned and the number of loans, and the number of applications and that that we receive. The Regional Development Association concept generally is working. The member mentioned the homogeneity- is that the right word?-or how do you define a region, how do you define a region to set up an association? How do you take a number of communities and classify them as a region? We are always constantly analyzing. And this year, the last three or four months we have gone through a real process of looking at and saying to ourselves, is this really a proper definition of a region to have an association? Should there be a new type of setup? Should there be a new type of definition for a regional development association? And I feel

MR. LUNDRIKAN: that we have to always have this attitude. There are changes constantly. There are new industries starting which tend to provide a shift in emphasis, or to maybe shift a community of interest. There are all kinds of reasons why we cannot apply a hard and fast rule in, say, dividing up the Province and saying this is a region, that will have an association, and that is the end of it. But we are, like the hon. member, assessing how we define a region and how the association will apply.

Regional policies - Before the end of this present sitting I hope to be able to make a comment on this question in more detail, and I hope that my two colleagues in particular, without any disregard for my colleague from Western Labrador, will be able to have some input on policies in the department as they relate specifically to Labrador. We have got a lot of things that can be announced maybe shortly as it relates to Labrador and development and I hope that both my colleagues in this respect in the House can have some input.

The department is becoming more active rather than passive. There is a little bit of a contradiction in the hon. member's comments here. He agreed with the position that we have taken, that we cannot just sit back as a government, especially in a province that has an economy that needs stimulation, and say, here is an association, or here is a group that is working for development purposes, let them take it and let them carry the ball. We have to always provide whatever support capability we have to make sure that they become active in their endeavour.

On the other hand, there is a real touchy question; how do you do that and at the same time allow the associations and the rural development council to retain the - what is the word? The member used it, the word - the total independence from, and their interdependence as well and their sort of, not isolation, I cannot think of the word this morning, I was up late last night, too.

MR. LINDRIGAN: The hon. member knows what I am talking about - that the association, in our effort to make sure that we give it every bit of support, we give it every bit of encouragement, that we take an active role. At the same time we have to be careful that we do not make the associations and the council creatures of government. We have to be very careful about that and that is the very, very straight and narrow line that I have to continuously tread. The officials in the department remind me of that. I am a little bit impatient. I am a little bit impetuous about this. I am a little bit hasty and they constantly remind me, "Do not worry about it. You know, the association, it takes time, they have got to grow, Do not try to move in and do it. If you do that you will destroy the whole process." But I think we are playing our role fairly effectively and not remaining too passive, and at the same time providing a good bit of sport capability in the various regions.

The member mentioned something which is a good political point. I have to say that if I were in his position I would be a little bit stronger about it because it will always score politically, and that is the business of the two hats of Industrial Development and Rural Development. That is a good political point and that is the point that I will predict that several other members will mention when they get into the debate. How can you - you know, you talk about industrial development and rural development - without degrading or downgrading one or the other. Now I believe that one of the reasons why that argument has some plausibility is because of the fact that we have had in the Province a particular definition of industrial development.

The definition we have had of industrial development is something growing out of the experiences we have had; heavy industry, linerboards, oil refineries, steel mills, rubber factories, leather factories, and you name it all over the Province, that is the attitude, large foreign, foreign to Newfoundland, operations. That is the definition

MR. LUNDRIGAN: of industrial development. My definition of industrial development I hope will find its way, if I have got enough courage and enough strength and determination, will find its way firmly into the department and into government in a way which is compatible with rural development. I believe that it is a very unique and unusual thing for any kind of enterprise to be developed in this Province which depends on foreign product, imported and manufactured and exported at the same time, that kind of a - what would you call it, I hate to use the word process again - that kind of a pattern; that to me is the type of thing which has to be questioned very seriously forever into the future. To say that we have to look at resource development is cliché, Nobody needs to say that again. But I hope that it will grow up and develop in the Province, if I can attain the dual role of Industrial

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

development and Rural Development, compatibility between the two, and I believe that has happened. I believe the kinds of things we have tried to do - we have placed a lot of emphasis on fisheries, for example, in co-operation with my colleague in fisheries. There will be more emphasis on fisheries and more emphasis on the sawmill operations. We are producing today in the Province only forty per cent of the lumber requirements of the Province, in a Province that has an abundance of timber that would be the envy of a country almost like Finland. Here we are producing only forty per cent.

On the one hand in Rural Development we have funded many, many small sawmills. A lot of them have not succeeded. A lot of them have not met up to our expectations. There are some areas where we have done assessments in the last number of weeks - and I would like to mention it, I believe I mentioned in the House - within the department itself by young Newfoundlanders working for the department, no consultants, no large outlay of funds, excellent reports done by our own people. One young fellow Martin who went down to the Bonavista Peninsula, went down to the Lewisporte area, the Botwood area and did studies in the last two or three months that would take consultant firms six or seven months and would cost us \$25,000 or \$30,000. He did it as part of his job in a matter of weeks under extreme pressure.

We have been able to assess in Rural Development the direction we should go in funding small sawmills. In Industrial Development we have been able to look at the problem in a little different context, perhaps thinking of the larger unit of operation in the sawmill industry. I believe there is growing up an interrelationship there that would be beneficial to the sawmills in the Province. I can use other examples of where there is compatibility between the two departments.

I have no great desire to want to carry the load of two government departments. I will tell hon. members right now that if



MR. LUNDRIGAN:

I were to do what would be the normal thing, I would like to have a cozy little setup like other colleagues of mine with one little department to run and all that sort of thing. The Minister of Social Assistance down there - what is the right name of his department?

AN HON. MEMBER: Social Services.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Social Services is looking at me and he is giving me -

MR. MURPHY: You would trade that for five others if you had the chance.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is right. And the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing if he were here, I think, I would possibly get a blast from him; the Minister of Highways and other members who have really a larger plateful than they can carry and that goes for every minister.

What I am really saying is that it is not a desire on my part to want to try to assume the responsibility for two departments. But I do believe that by having -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member yield?

MR. SIMMONS: No, there is no need for him to yield as I realize now. I would like to move that Mr. Chairman do now leave the Chair. The motion is nondebatable and only the members in the House of course can -

AN HON. MEMBER: Report progress.

MR. SIMMONS: Nobody can leave the House, Mr. Chairman, and nobody can come into the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are not allowed to leave.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, under the rules the question is now callable.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, in case the minister is wondering -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Are you asking for progress to be reported?

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Are you asking for progress?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman -

AN HON. MEMBER: Point out of order -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The minister may not come in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: There were seven of them in this House.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, may I speak to my -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

I would remind hon. members that the question has not yet been put from the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

MR. SIMMONS: In the last week, Mr. Chairman, may I submit that a precedent was established where the Chairman then in the Chair ruled that no members may enter or leave the chamber and indeed, Mr. Chairman, invited two members to leave the chamber before the vote was taken on the same motion in the last few days.

MR. MURPHY: No precedent can violate a rule.

MR. SIMMONS: No, it follows the rule.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I am on a point of order and the Minister without Portfolio is officially not in the chamber now, not supposed to be in the chamber, and I scarcely see how he can speak to a point of order. The Minister of Fisheries came in, the Minister of Manpower, the Minister of Transportation, the Minister of Tourism. Mr. Chairman, it was clear. I was listening attentively to my friend from Grand Falls, but only five of his colleagues were bothering to listen. If we are going to do the business of this Province, let us at least keep a quorum in the House. We did have a

MR. SIMMONS: quorum, thanks to this side of the House, but  
Mr. Chairman, I moved a motion that is non-debatable -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Point of order, Mr. Chairman!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I am on a point of order.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I am on another point.

MR. SIMMONS: But you cannot introduce another point -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It happened there the other day.

MR. F.B. ROWE: No it did not. That was a question of  
privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, a question of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

I would point out that if a point of order  
is being discussed another point of order cannot be raised, but  
a point of privilege can be raised. Hon. members, of course,  
will be careful to observe the standing rules in what is a  
point of order and what is a point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: A point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of privilege, I think, has been  
suggested by the hon. the minister.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, just in the way of perhaps  
a conciliatory point, if I might, that the hon. the member for  
Burgeon-Bay D'Espoir, has raised a point of order. He is entitled  
to state his point of order. I certainly have no feeling of  
objection, neither do I have the right to, The hon. member as  
well has a point. I think that hon. members should realize that  
the prime reason for the use of the time of the House today is to  
debate the estimates, and I hope that if there are points to be  
made they can be made with a great deal of civility, then let  
us get back to the important business of the House.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

The Chair would not understand that the point  
raised by the hon. minister is a true point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir, rising on a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking to the point of order I raised earlier, and I yielded because there was a point of privilege before the Committee. Mr. Chairman, my point of order related to the motion I moved a few moments ago. It is the same motion which my colleague the Leader of the Opposition moved some days ago here in Committee. And the precedent, it did not have to be established because the rules provide for it, Mr. Chairman, under Standing Order No. 22, and the rules are clear. The motion is non-debatable, no member can leave or enter the Chamber, and I remind, Mr. Chairman, that the precedent was endorsed again three or four days ago when Mr. Chairman invited two ministers who had entered the Chamber to leave for the count. The procedure here for counting the Committee is not the same as for counting the House. We went through it a few days ago. The appropriate thing to have been done, and I would now suggest it be done, is that the members who were in the House at the time that I moved the motion, which was a non-debatable motion and therefore should have been put immediately by Mr. Chairman, and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I am still speaking to the point of order. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the only proper thing to do now within the rules of this House is for Mr. Chairman to direct the Clerk to count those members who - no, first of all, direct those members who came into the House after I put the motion to leave, and secondly, to count those members who were in the House at the time I put the motion. Mr. Chairman, if there is any doubt who these were I am sure each member can be relied on to be honest about it, and for confirmation my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has taken the trouble to make a list.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, to a point of privilege, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

May the Chair just make a comment first? Before going further with the discussion, I might say that I am prepared to give a ruling and in giving the ruling, of course, I would remind hon. members that that may be appealed to the House, in which case the Speaker will then take the Chair. I certainly will entertain any further comments but on the other hand, as I say, I am prepared to make a ruling on this.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one comment. I was accused of not being in the Chamber. I was in the Chamber. I was standing there by the door.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, my point of privilege, Sir, is that under the rules of this House, Sir, when a motion is made that Your Honour leave the Chair, Your Honour has no choice but to put the motion, and members who come in to the House, whether they are ministers or government House Leaders does not make any difference, Sir, they are not permitted to participate in any debate, any discussion, any activities of the House.

MR. SIMMONS: Or any vote.

MR. NEARY: Or any vote. I would submit, Sir, that the Minister of Tourism violated the privileges of this hon. House, and all the members, all the ministers who have come into the House, and I have a list of them here, Sir, who have come into the House are violating the rules of the House and should be asked to leave the House immediately by Your Honour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: To that point of privilege, Mr. Chairman,

MR. HICKEY: To that point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! May I make a comment? Order, please!

I do not understand that the point raised by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was a point of privilege. It was clearly in the area of the point raised by the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons); in other words, he was speaking to the point of order. So the point of order has not been superceded, and if I read it right I am prepared to make a ruling if hon. members feel that they have no further cogent observations to make.

MR. NEARY: We had a precedents, Sir, the other night.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Does Your Honour want a few minutes to go and consider the matter?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I prefer to make the ruling.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! If I may read Standing Order No. 22, "A motion to adjourn(except when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance), shall always be in order, but no second motion to the same effect shall be made until after some intermediate proceeding has been made." Now the motion moved by the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir is clearly in order.

Standing Order 44(a) "The Standing Orders of the House shall be observed in the Committees of the Whole House as far as may be applicable, except the Standing Order as to the seconding of motions and limiting the number of times of speaking." There are other parts of that Standing Order but I do not think they apply at this time. So that I would understand from that that the Standing Orders that apply in Committee are similar and the same and identical with ones that apply to the whole House.

If one then turns to Standing Order 82, and particularly to 82(c) which states; "No member shall be entitled to vote in any division unless he was in his place when the question was put."

Mr. Chairman:

That is a rule that applies to the House, and accordingly it applies to the Committee. So that members may not vote if they were not in their place when the question was put.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: As of this time the question has not been put.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. MURPHY: Now we are going to hear it, the greatest parliamentary authority in the world. Carry on!

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Chairman, I am not the greatest parliamentarian, I am just one member who has some rights in this House, and I will not have them trod on by the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy), Mr. Chairman. And I would like to have silence particularly from him while I make my point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: I am sick and tired of the ramblings and babblings of that gentleman. I am sick and tired of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: If he would say something intelligent for a change I would not mind.

MR. HICKEY: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! A point of privilege is raised.

MR. HICKEY: The point of privilege being, Mr. Chairman, that the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir is attempting to suggest to Your Honour that the question was not put. I submit that I do not wish to get into debate as to where I was, I had my two feet in the door, and it is commonly known, Mr. Chairman, that when one has one foot in the door they are in, well I had my two in. So we will not go into that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: But the matter of privilege -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Shame! Shame!

MR. HICKEY: Can I be heard?

MR. SIMMONS: Shame! Shame!

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame! Shame!

MR. HICKEY: We just found that out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, my point of privilege is this, privilege of the House, The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir is suggesting that Your Honour did not put the question.

MR. SIMMONS: I have not.

MR. HICKEY: He did before, Mr. Chairman. I submit that Your Honour did not put the question because Your Honour did not get a chance to put the question, because there was debate going on from both sides, and Your Honour cannot hopefully put a question if two or three people are up on both sides, and that is why Your Honour did not get a chance to put the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I would be prepared to -

MR. SIMMONS: May I speak to my point of order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. WELLS: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I would be prepared to rule on the points of privilege, but if the hon. House Leader feels that he has a point of privilege, then proceed.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Chairman, Your Honour has ruled. That is the end of the matter, there is no further debate permitted, that is the end of the matter, and the question in due course is put and we will vote on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS: And I think any debate on this, which seems to be following now under the guise of points of order, is entirely out of order.

MR. SIMMONS: To the point of privilege, first of all, Mr. Chairman. To the point of privilege.



Mr. Simmons.

I believe my intent has been badly misconstrued. I did not say even what my point of order was. I did not get a chance before the Minister of Tourism interrupted to imply that I was about to pursue an issue already decided. It is first of all very wrong on the part of the Government House Leader. I was about to raise a new point of order, which the rules permit. I can raise a point of order at any particular time. And I was about to raise a new point of order, and would like to do so as soon as this matter of privilege has been disposed of.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I would take it from the comments offered to the Chair that a point of privilege in the strict sense of the term does not exist, and I would recognize the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir to continue his point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, my point of order is that accepting the ruling of Mr. Chairman, I personally disagree with it, but I have a recourse for that, but I will not pursue it. But I respect the ruling - I do not agree with it - the ruling that the question had not been put. I do not agree with that, but that is another issue. But, Mr. Chairman, I submit that if Mr. Chairman's ruling is correct then my point of order is this, and I perhaps should be speaking to a point of privilege, because the privileges of the House have been violated in that Mr. Chairman, when the motion had been put by me, as a member of this Committee, Mr. Chairman did not immediately call the question. And I submit, Mr. Chairman, that in that context the privileges of the House have been violated. And I do not know if there is much we can do about it this time, but I would hope for the record that the next time we do not have several minutes transpiring during which men who are out in the corridor for whatever reason, not wanting

Mr. Simmons.

to hear their colleague from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), rush into the House, and had the question been put, Mr. Chairman, if indeed it had not been, had it been put when I moved my motion which it should have been under the rules of the House, without debate, without delay, then we would not be in this altercation right now, and we would have clearly demonstrated that the government members are not staying in the House to hear their own colleague.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! If the hon. House Leader would permit me.

MR. WELLS: I would like for one moment to clear up one piece of -

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I just make a comment first?

MR. WELLS: Oh, yes!

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not have the wording of the Standing Order directly in front of me now, but my understanding is that if the ruling of the Chairman is questioned, a motion may be made that an appeal be made to the House and that this motion is nondebatable. The motion should be put, no debate should be offered, and I take it from what the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) said that his point of order was in that area. And I would think that the proper proceeding, if he feels he should persist in his argument, would be that he should appeal the ruling made by the Chairman. If he should do so I understand that he should make that motion, but he should not enter into arguments or a debate over it.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Point of order. No, Mr. Chairman. I apologize if Mr. Chairman misconstrued my intent that way. I said (1) I disagree with the ruling, and I have recourse if I want. I do not

Mr. Simmons.

intend to take that recourse. I respect the ruling which says -  
the ruling as I understand it that we are -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Here we go again.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I can have my own private opinion  
which I have stated. Mr. Chairman, may I continue?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. member is in the same area of  
questioning the ruling of the Chairman, and I would ask him to  
either state his motion for appealing the ruling, or I must ask  
him to retain his seat and in doing so after he has taken the  
appropriate action, I would like to read another part of the  
Standing Orders of the House which, I think, may clear up an  
area of confusion.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, just to avoid some unnecessary  
confusion there. My point of order -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I would take it that the hon. member is out  
of order, and I would ask him to take his seat.

MR. SIMMONS: Can I speak to a point of order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MORGAN: No, you cannot.

MR. SIMMONS: To another point of order?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, may I say a word to the point  
of order that is before the Chair now, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not understand that a point of order is  
before the Chair.

MR. ROBERTS: I understood my friend has raised a point of  
order, and the gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) is about to speak  
on it, which is fair enough, but I would like to say a word or two  
if it is in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I have taken the position that the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) has not raised a point of order that was recognized by the Chair.

Before going further I would ask hon. members to permit me to read the second part of Standing Order 82 (b) which states: "When members within the precincts of the House have been summoned to attend in their places for the purpose of a division, Mr. Speaker or the Chairman as the case may be shall wait three minutes before putting the question." In other words, when the motion was called the Chairman may wait, as indeed the Standing Orders suggest he should wait three minutes before putting the question. And I would remind hon. members that the rules of the House apply precisely in Committee

MR. CHAIRMAN:

as stated in our Standing Orders except on two points, those two points being that motions need not be seconded and that the times of speaking are different. My understanding is that in all other respects the Standing Rules apply in Committee. So I would take it therefore that the Chair was within its proper function to have waited a period of three minutes. And I would point out that during that time many points of order were raised so that it would have been impossible for me to even put the question in three minutes. I believe the Clerk of the House timed it, the last time I heard from him, as twelve minutes.

I would therefore take it that no point of order at this present time stands before the Chair so that the motion that the Committee rise and report progress in now in order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, may I rise a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not in relation to the matter I just discussed, but any other matter.

MR. ROBERTS: My point of order, Sir, is this, and Your Honour will have to tell me whether it is in relation to it or not since it does deal with essentially the same subject matter, Sir, Your Honour has made a ruling and I do not wish to appeal it, and I do not intend to, but my point is this, Sir.

Your Honour has made a ruling which I believe has been - well, forget what I believe for the instant. The ruling, Sir, has been made, I would submit, without allowing members to give the Chair the benefit of their advice. Your Honour would then make whatever ruling Your Honour wished, and that is in order. This is an important question. Before Your Honour came in the House we had a number of instances of unfortunate rulings from the Chair which eventually the Speaker took in hand. There was one on a six month hoist on a third reading that the Speaker of the day, Mr. Speaker Stagg it was, made a ruling that

MR. ROBERTS:

was very wrong and it caused a lot of trouble until eventually Mr. Speaker Russell overturned it. Now what I merely ask of Your Honour or suggest is that Your Honour - the ruling stands now, and we are not going to appeal it, and that is that - and I would ask if Your Honour would allow at some point members to make submissions on it.

I happen to feel, Sir, there is a case which I do not think Your Honour has considered which hinges around the words in Standing Order 44 (b) that insofar as applicable the Standing Orders of the House shall apply in Committee. I think there is one fact which means that the rule of division is not applicable in Committee and that is, Sir, that we do not divide in Committee. That is well-established in this House, Sir. It is impossible, Sir, under our rules to divide a Committee. You can have a vote, but it is not a division in the sense it is used.

So all I am asking, Sir, is whether Your Honour - now Your Honour has made a ruling and that is that, and it stands and no question - but whether Your Honour would allow at some point, Sir, members to make submissions, members on this side, members on Your Honour's left, to make submissions to Your Honour and then Your Honour may very well wish to consider the matter and consult with the clerks at the table and other authorities, well that is fine. What concerns me, Sir, is a ruling has been made without submissions being made by hon. members on the point in question, a ruling which will stand, Sir, and a ruling which I believe should be made only after all sides have made their comments and given the benefit of their advice and their opinions to Your Honour. That is my concern, Sir, and I am not sure if it is a point of order. But if not, it is a matter I believe affecting the privileges of the House. And as I said, in a previous House before Your Honour became a member, Sir, we have had cases where - it was the Chairman of Committees but he was in the Chair of the House as Mr. Speaker at the point - made a ruling before he had heard any argument, Sir, as to whether a motion that a six month hoist be applied

MR. ROBERTS:

to the third reading of a bill be debatable. Sir, he made a ruling without hearing any argument on the point at all. Forget why he made the ruling, but he made that ruling and it was against all the precedents of this House, against all the precedents of Ottawa and so forth. So all I am asking is if Your Honour would at some point allow submissions on this question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: That is out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: I am able to hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: Okay, sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I would like to respond to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I feel that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has been most helpful in his comments. I think that I have allowed him considerably more latitude than I strictly speaking am permitted under the Standing Orders of the House. And I feel that it would be appropriate for me to respond now.

I would point out that a ruling has been made and that I think that the proper course - and I would sincerely request the hon. members who have spoken to undertake this course of action - I think the proper course now would be to appeal the ruling. The ruling has been made and I would

MR. CHAIRMAN: think that if the ruling may be unfortunate from the view of hon. members, that this may be unfortunate for the future proceedings of the House, it should be remedied and the proper way, according to the Standing Rules, I believe, and according to the tradition of the House, would be for some hon. member to appeal my ruling to the House, a debate would then take place, and this matter could be settled once and for all.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that Your Honour's ruling be appealed.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the problem is that when the ruling is appealed to the House, Sir, it cannot be discussed.

The procedure, I am not sure if Your Honour has been through it yet, is that Your Honour - you know the Committee rises, Your Honour takes his seat in the House, the Speaker takes the Chair, Your Honour states the point, and then the Speaker without any discussion puts the questions, "Is the Chairman's ruling sustained or not," and almost inevitably of course the Chairman's ruling is sustained.

So that is why I suggested this procedure. It cannot be discussed in the full House, Sir, as I understand it on appeal. That, Sir, is the problem. That is why an appeal is of no help.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I withdraw the motion.

MR. WELLS: It has been very difficult to even get an opportunity to say a word on this. I think the hon. member's appeal is quite right. I think this should be disposed of because what has been happening here in recent moments, Mr. Chairman, is that while not accepting Your Honour's ruling, certain members on the Opposition side have been saying at the same time that they think it is wrong. Now you cannot have your cake and eat it too. Now this is an entirely spurious, I suggest, procedure. "When members within the precincts of the House have been summoned to attend in their places for the purposes of a division Mr. Speaker or the Chairman, as the case may be," and of course



MR. WELLS: the Chairman sits literally in the Chair and the rules that are applicable to the House apply to the Committee, so if there is any doubt, any argument, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that some member move that the Chairman's ruling be appealed, and let us get on with it, if not then there is no further need for discussion.

MR. ROBERTS: I will move the appeal if the hon. gentleman would allow us to make submissions to the Speaker in the full House, if it is merely a matter of an appeal then it is a waste of our time and let us not do it.

MR. WELLS: No. No. No. No.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, then the hon. minister has no desire, he misquoted the rules, he has no desire to see the matter settled properly. The Chairman obviously has a desire to see it.

MR. WELLS: The matter will be settled properly, Anyone can make representations in writing, as I presume the hon. member wishes, to the Speaker at any time.

MR. ROBERTS: But then the precedence stands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! To preserve the proper functioning of the House I move that I do now leave the Chair for a brief recess.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I would like to inform the hon. House that I would like to correct a ruling which I had given which is based on Standing Rule 82, and I had interpreted part of that Standing Order as applying in Committee. I would like to make a correction there and I think that in reading 82(a), it refers to a division: "When members have been called in preparatory to a division, no further debate is to be permitted." It then goes on to state the three minutes point.

In Committee a division is not in order so that the Standing Order 82 therefore applies to the House and not to the Committee. It applies to the House when a division is underway. In Committee we are dealing merely with a vote which is not a division. In other words, the Bar of the House is not in place and I would point out, of course, as hon. members know, that when the Bar is in place no member may enter the House in order to partake in the vote. If the Bar is not in place, it is the right of every hon. member to come and go in the House at any time during its proceedings.

I therefore correct that ruling and state that we are now in the process of taking a vote in Committee. The question has now been put and I would therefore call upon the hon. members to state their 'ayes' and 'nays'. Those in favour -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, do I understand -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I am in the process of putting a question in Committee and I would call upon the hon. members to respond when I put the question.

MR. NEARY: Does everyone vote?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would point out that, as I have already, it is the right of hon. members, unless the Bar is down, it is the right of members to come and go in the House as they please and they accordingly may take part in the vote unless the actual vote is underway. The question having been put, the consensus of the House has not up to this point been taken. And until the vote is actually

MR. CHAIRMAN: in progress, hon. members have their inalienable right to come and go as they please and therefore may partake in the full proceedings of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: When is it in progress, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The vote is in progress at this time and I call upon members to vote. Those in favour of the motion 'aye', those contrary 'nay'. I rule that the 'ayes' have it.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS: Could the motion be read again?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion states that the Committee rise and report progress. I would put the question: Those in favour 'aye', those contrary 'nay'. The 'nays' have it.

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Now that the voting has concluded, Mr. Chairman, I object to that proceeding. The rules of the House - Your Honour clearly put the question once. Then at the request of the gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells), Your Honour put the question again. But, Sir, the rules of the House as they apply in Committee clearly say that the motion may not be put twice without some intermediate proceeding. There has been no intermediate proceeding, in my submission. Therefore, Sir, it was improper in my submission to put the motion the second time. It is in order for the member from Kilbride to make the motion, of course, Sir, but not before some intermediate proceeding. Your Honour put the question, Sir. There were 'ayes' and 'nays'. Your Honour said, as I understood it, that the 'ayes' have it. In that case, Sir, the motion carries. The Committee must rise, report progress and then what will happen will happen. That is my point of order, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! So as not to hold up the proceedings of the House I handled that particular proceeding clumsily. I thought I was not putting the question the second time but merely was making a clarification. An hon. member had asked what is the motion. I felt that I was making a clarification. However, I think that in the circumstances the easiest way for the House to settle this point is to take it therefore that the 'ayes' have it and the Committee therefore does rise and report progress.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to them referred and direct me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee reports that the Committee has met, considered the matters to them referred, have made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am not wanting to consume any more of the time of the House on this matter. I believe though, Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House I am entitled to be able to sit here without being name-called in the way that the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) insists on -

MR. MORGAN: You are irresponsible!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, may I continue?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, in case the minister is trying to -

MR. MORGAN: He is wasting the time of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, unless the -

MR. MORGAN: Sickening!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, when I get silence from that gentleman -

MR. MORGAN: You have been going on all morning.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I can understand the minister wanting to misrepresent what has been done, but let the record show that what has been done is that while the minister -

MR. MORGAN: You are just wasting the time of the House.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, may I have the right to be heard in silence?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member is making a point of order.

MR. WELLS: There is no point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I have not been allowed to proceed with my point of order. So I cannot see how the Government House Leader can decide there is none. If he would keep his colleagues

MR. SIMMONS:

quite I would try and make it. Mr. Chairman, I am fed up too with the babblings of that gentleman over there.

MR. MORGAN: What is wrong with you this morning?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I would encourage the hon. member to make his point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the point of order that I would want to bring to the attention of the House is that the member for Bonavista South has been misconstruing badly our intent in raising this matter originally some time ago. Our reason for doing it, and our only reason for doing it, was to draw the attention of the House, Mr. Chairman, and Committee to the fact that while the Minister of Industrial Development was speaking about his estimates only five of his colleagues were in the House. We have now managed to get more of them back in the House. So we have served well the purpose we intended to serve when we set out on this matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. WELLS: That is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman, but a point of nonsense.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise on a point of the privilege of the hon. House, Sir. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether members realize it or not, but that vote which was just taken is more serious, Sir, than members would lead the House to believe. In actual fact, Mr. Chairman, what it was was a vote of non-confidence in the government. And the government, Sir, according to parliamentary tradition, Sir, the government House Leader has no choice but to report the results of that vote to his leader who in turn must go down to the governor, pass in his resignation, Sir, and call a general election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: To do otherwise, Mr. Chairman, would be a violation of the privilege of this House. Unless the government House Leader moves a vote of confidence that is debatable the leader of the administration

MR. NEARY:

has no choice at this moment according to British Parliamentary tradition but to go and resign and have a general election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

I do not recognize that a point of privilege has been raised, that the hon. member was stating a viewpoint. We are therefore on subhead 1601-01.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to the head under discussion.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I just have a few more remarks. I believe I was no my feet when the -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, there is no - if the minister is going to be finished in two or three minutes I would like -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Five minutes.

MR. SIMMONS: Okay, five minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member yielding?

MR. SIMMONS: I would like to speak immediately after.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Chairman, I was finishing off my response to the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). I have really enjoyed the last hour because it gave me a break a little bit. Also I would not expect this mood to exist in the House on a Friday morning though. I thought that would have been the sort of thing we would have expected on the Thursday late sitting, last evening.

Your Honour, this brings back a lot of memories. I know I am not allowed to touch on it, but my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries and I saw wilder ones than we had here in the last hour, to the point where there were books thrown back and forth across the House. I think it would be in order for me to say that Your Honour - I think I am speaking for all hon. members - distinguished himself in the way that he coolly and collectively handling the proceedings and -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I know it is not on the estimates, but I have never seen

MR. LUNDRICAN:

Your Honour, who is a relatively new member and certainly new to the Chair, I have never seen proceedings handled with any more judiciousness in the House of Commons even by Speaker Lamoureux. I was most impressed, as I think all hon. members were.

The estimates that we are dealing with were delayed for about a half an hour or so so it is not that serious. The member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) has made a number of points. I was responding at the last moment to the point that he made about the dual responsibility. I hope that I did allay some of his fears, that the dual role is not one which will see the downgrading of Rural Development. My hope is that it will see the underscoring of and the reinforcement of the role of Rural Development. As a matter of fact we can almost say in the Province that any aspect of development in the Province could be classified as Rural Development.

I might say as well, just to touch on a point which might touch off a bit of controversy, I will beg the question and say that I do not consider development in any part of the Province to be anything but rural development. Whether it is in the town of Gander, or the town of Grand Falls, or the city of St. John's where a lot of the types of development that could take place could be compatible with rural development because the city in itself serves the whole of the Avalon Peninsula in terms of work force. So we have exercised a fair amount of latitude in trying to apply the various aspects of our department. Now I made that comment and I know that that will received some response.

The



Mr. Lundrigan:

business of what the department has done in Labrador. I believe that the comments the member has made, and then these are comments I have heard privately, and I hope to hear in the House from the hon. member, my colleague from Menihek, are very well received by the department. I think lots of times the members of the department staff feel that the kind of work they are doing does not get the proper focus. And the members of the staff are particularly pleased with the comments made by the hon. member indicating that the department, a small department, a new department, and new in trying to determine a role, I might indicate, not a bit presumptuous or immodest about the fact or the attitude that we have all of the answers. We do not have all of the answers. It will take years and years and years before the department can stand up and flex its muscles and say that we are certain about all of these directions. As a matter of fact I hope that we never can say that kind of a thing. And the department is very pleased that members representing Labrador have found the presence of the department, found the presence in a considerable number of ways because I can indicate to the hon. member that we have funded quite a number of projects, quite a number of small industries have been assisted, and I am looking here now at - I cannot give the precise number, it must be about twenty small industries that have received various types of assistance in Labrador, and I am also looking at a number of ARDA III grants that have been made, some small, others a little larger. And the hon. member last evening touched on a programme that is still being pursued, I understand, in Main with the netting of seals in order to try and experiment, it is a pilot project, experiment with a new concept, a new idea. It is being organized by the people, by the fishermen, with the co-operation of the community leaders like the hon. gentleman did perform when he was there, and I hope will continue to do. And that kind of a project might very well enable us to apply the findings on a much broader scale. I believe the fishermen found that their incomes were reinforced and

Mr. Lundrigan:

increased to the extent of some 63 per cent, as I have been advised. Anything of that nature, to try and look at a new technology, a new approach to reinforce lifestyles, the economic component of the way of life in communities that is one of the major objectives of the department. Again, I welcome other comments.

MR. NEARY: Can the minister explain a little about the nets?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: On the seals? I am going to leave that up to my hon. friend. And my hon. friend as well, I do not know if my friend from Menihok is familiar with the conception - from Naskaupi, I am sorry. I know exactly what the area represents and I always get a confusion there on that particular side. I will leave it up to my hon. friends who are expert in it. It is a new type of netting procedure used for seals. I do not know if my hon. friend, who is also an expert in the area, is aware of it. I do not know if it is the same type of process that has been used before. I understand it is unique. I do not know the details of it. I hope to be able to find out for myself before this Summer is out by actual personal experience in that particular community.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on the first heading before we move to the details of the estimates. I do not intend that the comments should be long, (but I wonder would one of the gentlemen back here give me one of those little benches so I can see what I have here).

Mr. Chairman, this department I suppose more than any other is a department that is concerned with the real guts issues which face all of Newfoundland. I subscribe to what the minister said that indeed most of Newfoundland can be considered rural. I would suggest to him that is why we talk about the whole of Newfoundland as being rural in some respects, we ought to keep in mind the legislation of his department and of the Rural Development Authority which specifies for the purpose of the legislation what parts of Newfoundland are rural. But aside from that

Mr. Simmons:

we are talking a fairly small jurisdiction geographically. We are talking about a number of communities spread throughout the Island and throughout Labrador which have a number of characteristics in common, including sparse population, low concentration of population, say, per square mile, per square unit or whatever, which has generally what has come to be known as pretty well a folk society lifestyles, certainly a rural lifestyle. And without, you know, getting

MR. SIMMONS: into any discussion of what the essential characteristics of rural Newfoundland or rural society generally might be, I think our terms of reference we agree on, that we are talking essentially about most of the Province.

I started to say, Mr. Chairman, in my view it is a department which really gets at, or should be getting at the guts issues which face most Newfoundlanders. I was particularly delighted, and I got back now for a moment to February, I guess, 1972, just a month or so after the present administration took office, it was my privilege to be a member of one of the very first delegations, I guess, that met with representatives of the new administration, the Premier, the Minister of Social and Community Development of that day, and a number of other ministers, and in that meeting the Premier told us about his plans for a Department of Rural Development. I must say I said then, and I said publicly after and I have had no reason to change my view, that I felt the move to set up a Department of Rural Development was a brilliant move, a good move. It got it away from the old connotations of resettlement per se, which was the connotation that was associated largely with the old Department of Social and Community Development, and it put an emphasis where it needed to be put, the legislation put the emphasis I believe in the proper place, and I believe the announcements of the Premier and the minister of the day and others who succeeded him, put the emphasis where it needed to be put, the emphasis being to attempt to apply some particular measures to the developing of rural Newfoundland.

I subscribe very much to that philosophy and I listened with interest to what the minister had to say, and what he said was no surprise to me because I know his background; his background is rural, not only as a person growing up in Upper Island Cove, but also in his involvement in the schools in Gander and so on, he has had his finger on the pulse of rural Newfoundland. So I was not at all surprised, but I was very pleased, to hear him articulate the

MR. SIMMONS: philosophy which he has. It is important. It is important that you have in charge of the Department of Rural Development a person who shares a concern for rural Newfoundland. If I might say so, I have always felt the minister was that kind of an individual. He has demonstrated that in the House and I find that very important, that the person who speaks for the department be a person; and is a person who knows rural Newfoundland, not the CFA, not the Come-From-Away, when I say from away in this case I mean from the larger town, but the fellow who himself wrestled, or his family wrestled with the problems perhaps of some of these - I do not know his family well - but the problems of poverty or lack of what we call running water or indoor plumbing and lack of roads and that kind - these are some of the ingredients of the framework of problems which the people in rural Newfoundland have traditionally faced. It is important you have that kind of a person heading up a department, and as I say I am very glad, I am sure I speak for my colleagues when I say that I am very glad and we are very glad that that kind of thinking, that kind of background is now available to the department through the person of the minister. I share his philosophy. I welcome his obvious awareness of the problems which the people of rural Newfoundland face.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not enough to have the philosophy, of course. One must be able to put that philosophy into practice so it is much too early at this point to determine whether the minister is going to do a good job in his department or a bad job and I do not think that is particularly the point of the estimates, or the debate here anyway. But what I am saying in effect is that I believe, perhaps even in a larger measure than we should say in the case of other ministers, other departments, in the case of Rural Development we are talking about so many intangibles where the minister cannot come in and say, "Look, quantitatively here is

MR. SIMMONS: all we did for rural Newfoundland today." Where it is difficult to demonstrate the effect of your departmental policies, I think the onus is on all of us to -I was going to say to wait and see, Well, not wait in a sense but not to jump either and I for one am always prepared to give the benefit of the doubt when it comes to matters effecting intangibles like rural development, for example.

I have had some comments in the past about in particular the Rural Development Authority, and I probably will in the future, but rather than get into that tangent at this moment I would like to pursue the matter of the need for rural development in the overall, the need for improving the way of life, or applying what measures we are able to apply within our fiscal capacity, and not only our fiscal capacity, because I believe very often we get waylaid, particularly when you are talking about the Department of Rural Development, into putting dollar signs on the effort and saying that you are only spending so much here.

I

Mr. Simmons.

have always been much more encouraged, as I look at the Department of Rural Development's staff, and I concur with my friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), that my dealings with these people, Mr. O'Reilly and his colleagues in the department, have always been very amiable. I have always gotten excellent co-operation from them, and co-operation is not enough. I also have gotten understanding, and I believe an indication that these gentlemen and these people in that department perceive very well the problems they are wrestling with.

But again - excuse the tangent - I was about to say, Mr. Chairman, it is not enough that we place emphasis on the fiscal input into rural Newfoundland, but more important that we have a close look at how the money is being spent, how the advice is being made available and how the programmes are being geared to the particular needs of the people in the given communities.

Mr. Chairman, there is so much to be said about this subject, but I think I will just leave it at that in terms of a general statement. I would want to respond to two or three things that the minister has said, items that my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) may not have responded to or did so only in part. Now the minister said, I believe, sometime last evening in Committee that - speaking for government, I presume, and I quote him - "We do not believe a programme can succeed unless it comes from the people." It is not the most profound statement you have ever heard but an important one and one that needs to be said, and I am glad he said it, and I am glad he reaffirmed it, as we will show in Committee, I hope. There are times when that statement is not borne out by the facts, but as long as the minister pleads he is trying to make the programmes emanate from the people rather than going out and saying, "Here is what you should do."

Mr. Simmons.

There are indications, and I am just going to quote one now - and this goes back a long way, Mr. Chairman, and I am not particularly wanting to keep reminding a fellow of his mistake way back there in the past, but in view of the minister's indication that they are looking at the possibility of redefining boundaries, I believe I heard him say, for development associations ?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We are always doing that.

MR. SIMMONS: I see. In a continuing context, all right.

I just remind the Committee that when this thing was done the first time round it was done very, very arbitrarily, very arbitrarily. I was at that time the president of a development association in Green Bay, the Green Bay Economic Development Association, and I know whereof I speak in terms of this comment I am about to make. It was done quite arbitrarily, and without any input at all really from development associations or from the local communities. Indeed we got a map in the mail one day and it said, you are in zone 23 or 24 or whatever the case might have been. Well that is past. But I have that as the continuing view goes on I hope it will be with the active input of not only the rural development council, and that is important, not only the existing development associations, and that is important, but also that great body of people who have not yet organized themselves into any development association. I hope they get some input into any new boundaries, because very often only the local people know what ties they have with a given community, whether their educational ties are in that direction, or their economic ties or, their job ties are in that direction, or their cultural ties and the families they married into are in this community over here, and these are all considerations. Because if you impose on any given area of the Province a superficial structure, a superficial grouping of communities, you get a rivalry problem which tends to undo rather than help some of the goals you are trying to achieve in your rural development policies. So I hope there will be that kind of consultation.



Mr. Simons.

The minister talked last night, Mr. Chairman, about the potential of the department. Now if I have one - I have some criticisms I want to make later about RDA, but I would like to reserve that - but if I have one criticism of the department as such it is that perhaps we have heard too much about potential, and we have not seen the reality demonstrated enough. Now that would appear to contradict something I said a moment ago, that we ought to give the benefit of the doubt, and we ought to go the extra mile and that kind of thing. That is true. But that understanding, say, by Opposition members or by the Province as a whole should never be interpreted to mean that all one need do is go to Europe and come back and make a statement about resource development. I was glad to hear the minister say, too, that we perhaps had enough cliches about resource development. It is that axiomatic. We know we have to do that. But I believe what the people of this Province need now is a demonstration that not only does the department have potential, some of which has been realized, Mr. Chairman, in some very good programmes around this Province - and we will hear more about them as the minister details some of his estimates - but I believe there is a lot of potential there that has not begun to be tapped. I am no expert on that department, I do not know why, Mr. Chairman. I can wonder out loud.

MR. SIMMONS:

I know the team in that department. As I said insofar as my judgment goes they are a very competent team of people. But we must never forget the breakdown, the delineation which is always made in terms of government, administration and policy making. That is that the team I have spoken of are not the policy makers. They may advise. They may initiate ideas. But they are not the policy makers. They administrate what is. If there is some sense of direction lacking, then, of course, we must point a finger at the political head of the department and his colleagues in Cabinet, because the overall direction, the general direction must of necessity come from the people who are answerable to the public or else you do not have a responsive set of events. You then have people in the department not responsive in terms of having to get themselves elected again. You have those people initiating, articulating policy. That would be a danger that would have no place, a phenomenon that would have no place in our democratic framework where the minister or the policy maker is answerable to the people for the policies he makes, be they good or bad.

Mr. Chairman, the minister last night appealed to all of us to take a broad view of what is going on because the department does have feelings. I welcome his appeal and I for one have attempted to take a broad view. The minister is new to this House. He is not at all new to public life or new to his concerns for people. But he is new to this House and sometimes I have sat in the House of Commons in Ottawa, but he is far more the expert there than I. But sometimes when we put some very pointed remarks to him about an issue, it is about an issue, not about him. He might get to feel the brunt of it more here because the House is physically smaller than it would be in Ottawa. I will continue to be very critical of some of his policies, if I feel it is necessary. But if he continues to, not only mouth but share the philosophy which he has talked about in the last day or so in Rural Development, he will have my support for a long time to come.

Mr. Chairman, I do not expect, Mr. Chairman, to reach the member

MR. SIMMONS:

for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan). I will not try to do that. I will, Mr. Chairman, say to my friend, the Minister of Industrial Development that -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Rural Development.

MR. SIMMONS: Rural Development in this context, Rural Development.

MR. ROBERTS: He is rural today.

MR. SIMMONS: - in his role this particular day in Rural Development, I will say to him as I have just said a moment ago before I got somewhat sidetracked, that I feel very strongly, I share very strongly his philosophy and I think it is high time for all of us to work together to make this philosophy work. Because my punch line is this: If it does not work we can have the most competent Ministers of Finance and Industrial Development and Transportation and Tourism and Education and Manpower and Social Services and Justice - and you name them all - you can have the most competent people, you can have the most effective programmes in all those areas, those departmental areas. But if you destroy the fabric of rural Newfoundland you will not need a Minister of Finance. The balance books might show that we will be doing all right in terms of dollars and cents, that might make the Minister of Finance very happy in the context that he is able to show we are in the black. But in the other balance books, the balance books that the Department of Rural Development must be concerned about, the balance books of whether we are losing or gaining, whether we are showing a deficit, whether we are in the red or in the black in terms of what is happening to the way of life along the Coast of Labrador, along the Southwest Coast of the Province, a part of which I am pleased to represent, if the balance books show there that we are in the red, then I say the game is over. It does not matter how many jobs we create. It does not matter how many Come By Chances we are able to bring to reality. That does not matter if in the process we have destroyed - and I do not want to be repetitious and repeat what my friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) said - but rather to reinforce, and I refer to the term he quoted from scripture tonight, the soul if we destroy the soul of rural Newfoundland, then you can get rid of all

MR. SIMONS:

the potholes in the roads, and you can have all four lane highways, and you can have balanced budgets, you can have nobody on welfare, you can have full employment, you can have two cars in every garage and two chicken in every oven and that kind of thing, but if you bring us to the situation through a lack of policy in the development of rural Newfoundland whereby we have effectively destroyed the soul of the Province, the soul of the people, then we are in deep trouble.

Mr. Chairman, it is one o'clock. There is no need to adjourn, is there? No.

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 direct me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of Supply reports that they have met, considered the matters to them referred, have made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted. Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until Monday at two o'clock in the afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Monday at 2:00 p.m. Those in favour "aye", contrary "nay", carried.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, April 12, 1976 at 2:00 p.m.

C O N T E N T S

April 9, 1976	Page	
<u>STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS</u>		
Mr. W. Carter made a statement on a new bounty for fishing boats.	5350	
Commented on by:		
Capt. Winsor	5353	
Mr. Smallwood	5354	
Mr. House made a statement on the High School Drama Festival.	5356	
Commented on by Mr. Simmons.		5356
Mr. Hickey made a statement that at the request of the Labrador Inuit Association the caribou hunting season in the Northern Zone was extended to April 30.	5357	
Mr. Maynard made a statement on the appointment of Mr. M. Monahan as Chairman of a Human Rights Commission to investigate allegations made by three workers at Labrador City.	5358	
Commented on by Mr. Roberts.		5361
Mr. Maynard made a statement on the strike at Churchill Falls.	5360	
Commented on by Mr. Roberts.		5360
Mr. House made a statement on Sabbatical leave for teachers.	5362	
Commented on by Mr. Simmons.		5362
Mr. Crosbie made a statement on MOT refusing to allow Trans-Atlantic charter flights to originate from St. John's Airport.	5364	
Commented on by:		
Mr. Smallwood	5365	
Mr. Simmons	5366	
Responded to by Mr. Crosbie.		5366
Mr. Hickey made a statement concerning a temporary exhibit of historic objects at the Duckworth Street Museum.	5368	
<u>PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES</u>		
Mr. Maynard tabled the report of the Workmen's Compensation Board for the year 1975.	5369	
<u>ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN</u>		
Mr. Crosbie responded to Question No. 472.	5370	
Mr. Morgan replied to a question asked previously concerning a tender for vehicles awarded to an Ottawa firm.	5370	
<u>ORAL QUESTIONS</u>		
Query as to what steps Government have taken to amend the Companies Act to bar lawyers from using their secretaries' names on share lists filed with the Registry of Companies.		
Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	5371	

C O N T E N T S - 2

ORAL QUESTIONS (continued)	Page
Ministerial opinion as to whether Government should refuse to deal with companies whose true owners have not been revealed. Mr. Neary,* Mr. Crosbie.	5372
*Mr. Neary expressed dissatisfaction with the answer and gave notice that he wished to debate it on the adjournment.	5373
Query as to whether the cardiovascular and kidney units at the St. John's General Hospital have been closed. Mr. Simmons, Mr. H. Collins.	5373
Placement of kidney machines at regional centres throughout the Province. Mr. Neary, Mr. H. Collins.	5373
Interest in a Provincial flag. Mr. White, Mr. Hickey.	5374
Consideration of a design unveiled by a former Minister of Tourism. Mr. White, Mr. Hickey.	5374
Enthusiasm for a Provincial flag. Mr. Smallwood, Mr. Hickey.	5375
Request that all correspondence having to do with a new Provincial flag be tabled. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Hickey.	5376
Inventory at the linerboard mill. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	5376
The Trans-Canada Highway West of Grand Falls. Mr. Flight, Mr. Morgan.	5378
Federal assistance for improving the Trans-Canada. Mr. Neary, Mr. Morgan.	5379
Role of Price (Nfld.) in damage caused the Trans-Canada West of Grand Falls. Mr. White, Mr. Morgan.	5381
Query as to action to be taken after the Highway is repaired to prevent further flooding. Mr. Flight, Mr. Morgan.	5382
Sale of repossessed fishing boats. Capt. Winsor, Mr. W. Carter.	5384
Status of the land in the Blaketown-Whitbourne area where mink ranches once operated. Mr. Callan, Mr. Rousseau.	5385
Query as to what assurance Government has received that the Grand Falls-Botwood road will not be damaged by Price (Nfld.) trucking newsprint to Botwood. Mr. White, Mr. Morgan.	5385
Contract with Guinea for construction of boats at the Marystown Shipyard. Mr. Neary, Mr. Lundrigan.	5387
Alleged over-cutting by Labrador Linerboard on the North side of the river in Goose Bay. Mr. Strachan, Mr. Rousseau.	5387
Query as to when answers will be available for questions placed on the Order Paper. Mr. Smallwood, Mr. Wells.	5388
 <u>ORDERS OF THE DAY</u>	
Mr. Wells moved appointment of the committee under Standing Order 84(a).	5389
Mr. Neary	5390
Mr. Wells	5391
Motion carried.	5392

C O N T E N T S - 3

ORDERS OF THE DAY (continued)	Page
Committee of Supply	
Head XVI - Rural Development - 1601-01 (continued)	5393
Mr. Strachan (continued)	5393
Mr. Lundrigan	5396
*Mr. Simmons moved that Mr. Chairman do now leave the Chair.	5405
Mr. Simmons	5406
Mr. Neary	5409
Mr. Roberts	5417
Mr. Wells	5420
Recess	5421
Ruling	5422
The Committee rose, reported progress, asked leave to sit again and was ordered to sit again presently.	5424
Head XVI - 1601-01 (continued)	
Mr. Lundrigan	5427
Mr. Simmons	5430
The Committee rose, reported progress, asked leave to sit again and was ordered to sit again on tomorrow.	5440
ADJOURNMENT	5440