



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 59

VERBATIM REPORT

FRIDAY, MAY 7, 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. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not going to make a ministerial statement, obviously, but in line with the tradition that this House takes note by resolution of certain events in the Province, may I be permitted either to move or to second - it might be appropriate for the House Leader on the government side to move it in the absence of the Premier - that the House has extended congratulations, Sir, to two of our colleagues in the House, fellow members who have been appointed as chancellors of the two new dioceses of Central Newfoundland and of Eastern Newfoundland and Labrador, the latter being the House Leader himself and the former being the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

It was with a very great deal of pleasure that I learned, Sir, that a former member of the House, and a man who may return to the House at some point, but a former member of the House, Mr. Clyde Wells of Corner Brook has been appointed chancellor of the Western diocese or the diocese of Western Newfoundland. I think it would be appropriate Sir, and either I move it in my own name or I will give way to the government House Leader if that is his wish, that we should send a suitable resolution or a suitable indication of our acknowledgement of this and our congratulations to Mr. Wells.

MR. NEARY: Who worked on the new synod, I think.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I was going to mention that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Wells was one of the architects.

MR. ROBERTS: I think we should send a suitable indication of our feelings on this occasion. Mr. Clyde Wells is well known I know to all of the members of the House. He served with distinction in this House on both sides in the - I am not sure if it was the thirty-fourth or thirty-fifth General Assembly, the General Assembly elected in 1966.

MR. ROBERTS:

He served as a member of the Smallwood Administration until he left it on a matter of principle and then stood and fought for his beliefs from the Opposition side. He has been very active in many facets of public life including in particular the work of the Anglican Church in the diocese of Newfoundland and Labrador and now in the Western diocese. He was one of the men who was very involved with the Archbishop, the Rt. Rev. Robert L. Seaborn, under the Archbishop's direction in preparing the moves which have now resulted in the creation of the three new dioceses. Altogether a most appropriate choice for the important position of chancellor, and I would suggest, Sir, that the House would wish Mr. Wells well, to congratulate him on his appointment and to wish him a long and a successful tenure of the office of chancellor. I would hope, Sir, in due course a long and successful tenure of other public offices because I believe, Sir, that Mr. Clyde Wells has done much for the good of this Province and I believe he has much more yet to do, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. R. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, it certainly gives us great pleasure and as the hon. Leader of the Opposition has moved the motion by all means rather than as he said deferring to me to move it, I will certainly accept the fact that he has moved it, and gladly for our part second it. Mr. Wells, as he says, was a distinguished member of this House. He has had a distinguished career in his profession. He has done a great deal of work as has been said in setting up the new system. And certainly I am sure we all are very, very pleased that he has been chosen to be Chancellor of the Western Diocese, and I think we can certainly speak for our side when I say that we agree and extend congratulations to him, and that he be suitably written from the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. J. R. SMALLWOOD: It is one of the fine offices that any one might hold in Newfoundland, and I add my congratulations to the gentleman who has received it.

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

HON. J. CROSBIE: I would like to say a word on this, because it is Clyde Wells, of course, who we are congratulating on this appointment.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is this in order?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, it is quite in order.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman is adding his words of congratulations with respect to the appointment of Mr. Wells.

MR. NEARY: Does that mean that anybody then can add theirs?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, having disposed of this intervention, let me carry on and say that I would like to add a few words because of the fact, that of course during several years here in this House Clyde Wells was a member at the time that I was. We were both members of the original Liberal Reform group.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CROSBIE: And the predecessor to - I suppose it is the predecessor

Mr. Crosbie:

to the present Liberal Reform group. And for several years Mr. Wells tried to reform the Liberal Party, but it was not possible under its then Leadership. And of course another attempt is going on now, I do not know if it is necessary or not. But I certainly have a high appreciation of that gentleman's abilities and I am sure he will do a first-class job as Chancellor of the Diocese on the West Coast of the Anglican Church.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

HON. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 30, I informed this House about the big game licencing system for 1976. In conjunction with introducing this system my department will be tightening its enforcement activities particularly in relation to illegal hunting of big game.

I propose amending Section 19 of the Wildlife Act which now provides for the cancellation of a licence held by a person convicted for any offence related to moose or caribou and further provides that the magistrate may prohibit that persons from holding a licence for a period of three years from the date of conviction by increasing the period of prohibition to five years in the case of a first offence and increasing to a lifetime suspension for a second or subsequent offence occurring within two years of the previous conviction and making such suspensions mandatory. I realize these measures are severe. However, if we are to make our wildlife resource available for future generations so that they can have the opportunity to enjoy their share, I feel such measures are absolutely necessary to help curb the apparent increase in this illegal activity.

I would also like to clarify a number of points which have been raised in relation to the new licencing system. We had hoped to have applications for big game licences in the hands of the general public by this weekend.

Mr. Hickey:

However, logistics have made it impossible for us to meet this deadline but we hope to have most of the distributions completed by Tuesday of next week. We are processing all applications received by the Wildlife Division as of Midnight, June 4, 1976. Any application received after that date will be disqualified. Extreme

MR. HICKEY:

care should be taken in making an application since those applications incorrectly completed will also be disqualified and will not be returned for changes. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, the reason for this is that time will not permit it. We would never get all the applications taken care of if we were to return them or indeed attempt to make the changes.

The party system is experimental and its success will depend on the integrity of the hunting public. For those people who elect to hunt on a party license I stress again that only one animal can be taken. The onus is on the holders of the party license to ensure that only one animal is taken on that license. Should two animals be taken on a party license the second animal will be treated as an illegal kill and the full extent of the law will prevail. I ask for the full co-operation of the hunting public in this matter.

There are some 10,494 moose licenses available this year in thirty-five moose management zones. There are also 1,470 caribou licenses available in eight caribou zones. Zone maps will be distributed with the big game application form to assist prospective hunters in choosing the area in which they may propose to hunt. I should also like to inform members of the House that there will be no black bear season this year. The number of black bears taken by big game hunters is insignificant. However black bear license sales have increased. The whole matter of black bear licenses and open seasons is being thoroughly reviewed by my wildlife division and a new policy will be developed in this regard. However until the assessment has been fully completed and the policy developed the season will remain closed.

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MP. WHITE: I would like to say a couple of words in connection with that. First of all we welcome the severities announced by the minister with respect to the poaching and the breaking of the law with respect to the hunting of moose and caribou in Newfoundland. For a long time I have maintained, Sir, there was far too much poaching going

MR. WHITE:

on in Newfoundland and the most severe measures possible should be implemented with respect to cutting out poaching because there is a lot of it going on in Newfoundland, more than most people realize and being done by not just those whom you would suspect, the criminally inclined that would be doing it, but done by other people as well. I am sure the minister knows what I am talking about.

In relation to the applications, I assume what the minister is saying there is that the date has been changed from May 17 to June 4 for the submission of applications. This was a little bit - I worried about this first when I saw it because I wondered if people had enough time to get their applications and get them filled out to get them in and so on and so forth. So we welcome this change and I am sure moose hunters across the Province will be happy about that.

I am glad to see the black bear licenses done away with. They have only been used as an excuse by hunters to get in the woods with a gun in the last few years and it is half the reason for the large amount of poaching that has been going on. So I think it is a good thing.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of Corner Brook Act". (Bill No. 33)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Solemnization Of Marriage Act, 1974." (Bill No. 54).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on tomorrow I will ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Register Mortgage Brokers And To Control The Amount Of Bonuses To Be Charged By Mortgage Brokers And Mortgage Lenders." (Bill No. 55)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Companies Act."
(Bill No. 53)

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: I just want to answer a question asked yesterday by the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) regarding the school tax collection. The ball park figure when the authority began here was \$4 million or \$4,100,000. As I said that was a ball park figure. They revised it this year when they saw how things were coming in when their assessments had gone out to \$3.6 million. Now the total take or the total amount paid to school boards at the end of the first nine month period is \$1,924,000. That is \$600,000 more or forty per cent more than the total for last year in assessments. It must be borne in mind that

MR. HOUSE:

last year's assessments, of course, were taking into account arrears in the past also. If it comes in at the same rate now without picking up the final arrears they will collect about, by the end of July this year when their year is up, about \$2.7 million which is double the amount that was taken in by assessments last year. There is approximately \$1 million then under the assessment of \$3.6 million or \$900,000 under. Of course, a lot of this is made up - first of all in the business, they have not been able to get the business, the total co-operation. They have about \$300,000 outstanding on business. There is about \$200,000 on the Federal Government. They have not been able to get the poll or the exemptions from the Federal Government. They are co-operating now with their employees. There is about \$200,000 to set up the structure and another \$200,000 outstanding in poll tax. So what I am saying is that it will be double the amount of the assessment last year by the end of July. Right now it is forty per cent above the assessment of last year.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde, and then the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. F. ROEF: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communication. Has the minister received a telegram from the town council of Bay de Verde requesting his immediate attention to the hazardous conditions of the rock cut entering that particular community because the frost action of the past Winter, has loosened the entire face of the cliff and rocks are presenting a serious hazard to the traffic going to that particular community? Has the minister received a telegram from the town council?

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, yes a telegram was received approximately two weeks ago from the town council of Bay de Verde indicating the need for some corrective action. The same matter was discussed with the council sometime this past Winter at a meeting with them in my office. I referred

MR. MORGAN:

the telegram to a maintenance engineer and asked him to have the maintenance forces in that area take some corrective action.

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

MR. ROWE: A supplementary. Can the minister assure the House, Sir, that there will be a thorough scaling of the cliffs as requested going into Bay de Verde because the answer that the minister just gave me was the same answer the delegation got last Winter and nothing has been done since.

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

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot assure them that there will be a total scaling of that cliff. But I have asked the engineering staff as well as the maintenance staff to take a look and to give recommendations, in other words, the engineering staff to recommend to the maintenance forces exactly what precautionary measure and what corrective action should be taken.

MR. ROWE: Let us hope we do not have a tragedy.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, fresh back from the federal-provincial conference in Ottawa. I would like to ask the minister what position this government is taking regarding the new energy policy and the increase in heating fuel and gasoline? Is the government's policy any different from that of the official Opposition, that they go along with it? Is this government fighting the policy tooth and nail? Would the minister enlighten the House as to whether or not they have managed to straighten out Quebec with regard to the boundary situation, that it is non-negotiable?

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

HON. J. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the second part of the question first, Mr. Speaker, Quebec has certainly been straightened out. There is no further straightening to be done. They know our position perfectly clearly on the boundary or any sale of land in Labrador. So that is being made perfectly clear.

MR. NEARY: No recent plan?

MR. CROSBIE: I think I just answered the question, Mr. Speaker, that they know our position on the boundary and that we would not sell them any land in Labrador. There is no change since I last spoke on the matter in the House last week.

As far as oil and gas prices are concerned the Province's position has been and still is - the Premier was presenting it yesterday - that it is recognized that the federal government's case, that the price of oil and gas has to be allowed to rise gradually towards world levels, that this case is not one that one can argue with, that

Mr. Crosbie.

Over the next few years this has to come about. That is the federal government's position and most provinces accept the fact that that is so. Our position this year has been that any increase this year should be a minimal one because of the present economic situation, because of the present inflation, the present unemployment, and the fact that the economy is coming out of a recession, that any increase this year should be kept as low as possible and \$1.05 is the lowest increase that anyone has suggested, or we have suggested that it should not be in excess of \$1.05, the increase on July 1 or whenever that is permitted. The reasons for the fact that there has to be some increase has been outlined by the Government of Canada in detail. They have detailed those, the fact that their revenue on the export tax in Western oil is declining, that that revenue plus the ten cents a gallon excise tax they imposed on gasoline last year are not giving them sufficient revenue to meet the subsidy they are paying on Eastern oil, the fact that we have to encourage frontier development and exploration for oil and gas in the Arctic and off the East Coast of Canada and so on and so forth. It has all been detailed in their statement.

The Province's position, as I say, Mr. Speaker, is that we feel any increase this year should be minimal, kept as low as possible, and that is the position we have put forward. There has been no agreement on it. There is not going to be any agreement on it. There was no agreement on it yesterday. The Premiers are not going to agree. There is no unanimous agreement on what should happen and, therefore, the matter has to be left to the Government of Canada to decide with the Government of Alberta, and the Government of Saskatchewan. There is nothing any of the other provinces can do. It is only the Government of Canada who has the jurisdiction and the authority to either continue a subsidy or to permit an increase or not permit it.

Mr. Crosbie.

So now it will be in the hands of the Government of Canada. And what they are going to suggest I do not know. The highest amount that has been suggested seems to be \$2.00 a barrel. This seems to be suggested by the producing provinces.

MR. NEARY: What is the price now?

MR. CROSBIE: The price now is \$8.00 a barrel, and there is a subsidy of roughly \$5.50 in Eastern Canada which the federal government pays. What seems to be suggested is that it may go up to \$2.00 a barrel. On the other hand because we have been arguing and other provinces have been arguing it should be as low as possible this year in view of our economic circumstances. It is possible that it will be less than that. But there will be an increase. There is no doubt. It will be between \$1 and \$2. The top figure anyone suggested is \$2.

MR. NEARY: What about the subsidy?

MR. CROSBIE: Well that would mean that the Government of Canada would reduce its subsidy by that amount. If they agree that the price of gas or oil is going up \$2 a barrel, then in Eastern Canada they would reduce their subsidy \$2 a barrel, and the Eastern Canada price will go up \$2 a barrel. The price in the United States, the average price in the United States now - and they have a different system, they have a system of old oil and new oil, and it is quite a complicated system - is about \$10.80 a barrel, and everyone has urged that the price in Canada certainly must not exceed the price in the United States because of trade competition and the like. So the general feeling is that it will be somewhere between \$1 and \$2 and now it is in the hands of the Government of Canada to make a decision with Alberta and Saskatchewan.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Could the minister then give the House the forecast, say, for the next five years? The minister has told us

May 7, 1976

Tape no. 2534

Page 3 - mw

Mr. Neary.

that this year it may increase if the recommendation of this Province - and I presume the minister did not make it clear that this Province was joined by the other Atlantic Provinces in this matter to

Mr. Neary:

try to hold it to \$1.05. But what about the next three to five years will there be drastic increases? And would the minister indicate whether or not any money that is collected in the way of revenue of the public treasury, the Government of Canada and so forth will be used to increase exploration off our shores, off our Continental Shelf as we are led to believe or will it all go into the public treasury and just be used for other purposes of general revenue?

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, we have not recommended any move to the Government of Canada. The Government of Canada has its own policy and it is instituted, and it has the jurisdiction and control, and it has instituted, you know, its own recommendations and it started this whole system of subsidization for which we must feel ourselves to be very lucky. We are not recommending that there will be any change this year. We are simply stating that if there is one that it should be kept as low as possible. And we cannot in all fairness, you know, disagree with the Government of Canada's position that there has to be some change, although we feel there should be a gradual one. As to what happens to the revenue that is very complicated. Any additional revenue, some of it goes to the producing provinces in taxes, some of it will go to the Federal Government, the oil companies will get an increased cash flow from it from which they use the cash flow to go on with further exploration and development in the Arctic and offshore areas. That is very much to be desired.

Now in our own offshore area Eastcan is pressing ahead this year. They will have an extensive programme off Labrador. And, you know, that could cost considerable monies. So our own effort off the East Coast of Canada, the Labrador area is the most prospective, plus the North East Newfoundland area. And there will be considerable activity this year.

MR. F. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for Lewáspote.

MR. F. WHITE: I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not he gained any information while he was in Ottawa with respect to the Federal Government's position regarding the subsidization of electrical rates in the Atlantic Provinces and whether Newfoundland would come under such a scheme?

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members know there are already subsidization of - I think you said electrical rates, was it? -

MR. WHITE: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman I guess is referring to, at least I assume he is referring to the position put forward by Nova Scotia that they should have a special assistance, because most of their electricity is produced by oil fired steam plants.

MR. NOLAN: They have no hydro

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, they have some hydro. Yes, I think, 65 per cent of Nova Scotia's energy comes from oil.

Well they put forward a plea that they should get special assistance. P.E.I. is 100 per cent. Newfoundland, I think, in the year that just ended, was about 15 per cent. Of course all of our rural areas or most of our rural areas are oil, the diesel areas. And the steam plant at Holyrood is coming on to be used more and more now, and will be fully, you know, operating most of the time from now on. So our percentage use of oil fired steam power will be increasing. But Nova Scotia has made a plea to the Federal Government that they should have special assistance. The position we have taken in this Province is that you cannot isolate just one thing like that. It is true that Nova Scotia has a special problem because most of its electricity is generated from oil. But in devising any programme of assistance it should be based not on just that factor, you have to look at the per capita income of the people in each province, you know, the cost of living in the province, the unemployment figures and all the various indices. And if that is done then Newfoundland would have a stronger case for special assistance than Nova Scotia. You just

Mr. Crosbie:

cannot take one piece of the picture and just look at that.

Now the Government of Canada has indicated wherever this has come up, at least at the Energy Ministers meetings and Finance Ministers meetings, that they are not going to agree to any special assistance for Nova Scotia and P.E.I. I do not know, well the subject probably came up at the Prime Minister's meeting yesterday, and, you know, the Premier will be able to comment on that. So their position certainly up to date is that there will be no special assistance.

Now the Premier and I had a meeting with Mr. Gillespie on Wednesday morning, this is Friday, Wednesday morning in which we reviewed the whole situation with him and the importance of hydro. And we have put to Mr. Gillespie our disappointment on the energy statement, I do not know if hon. gentlemen opposite have received copies of that, they probably have, the Government of Canada's book that they just sent out on their energy policy for the next few years. The very disappointing lack of any mention of hydro, there is a mention of hydro, but just an incidental one, the policy concerns itself with oil and gas and pipelines and the like and nuclear. And our disappointment at the fact that they are not giving any great emphases to hydro, and they seem to ignore hydro,

MR. CROSBIE:

and the importance of developing a hydro inventory. The federal government should help finance that, more assistance on transmission lines and even hydro development itself. Those general matters were discussed with Mr. Gillespie on Wednesday and I think that he was quite interested in the points being made, he and his officials. And we are hoping they will become more active in the hydro field.

Up to now the Government of Canada has pretty well left it up to the provinces to develop hydro or to have their own policies on hydro. While they have offered assistance on transmission lines, and they will supply fifty per cent of the financing for the first nuclear plant in any province, you know their role has been rather an inactive one in the field of hydro development. We pointed out to Mr. Gillespie that there is not difference between, in theory or in practice, an oil and gas transmission line which they authorize to be built to go across provincial boundaries, oil or gas pipeline which they have done now for years. Under the BNA Act I think these are works declared to be for the general or national interest of Canada. There is no difference between a line that carries oil and gas which is energy and a transmission line, and that the Government of Canada should consider transmission lines to carry electricity in exactly the same way and treat them the same way as they treat oil and gas pipelines.

In oil and gas for example they do not ask Alberta or Manitoba or Ontario, can we have permission to put an oil and gas pipeline across your province. They go ahead and do it because they have the power under the BNA Act to do it and they could do that for electricity. So we also discussed that with Mr. Gillespie and energy matters generally but in particular hydro.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister -

MR. SPEAKER: Actually I had indicated to the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) that I would recognize him and he has been waiting for some time. So I think I shall do so now. There may well be further supplementaries later on. If the hon. member for Conception Bay

MR. SPEAKER:

South (Mr. Nolan) wishes to yield obviously that is his privilege. With respect to supplementaries as hon. members know the general rule is that there will be supplementaries by members at the discretion of the Speaker. There have been a number and one of the factors I take into consideration is, you know, whether there are other members who have been waiting for some time to put a question. Nothing of course precludes coming back to the subject again.

The rules are quite elastic there. They say there can be a number depending upon the discretion. I think one of the factors one has to bear in mind is whether there are other members who obviously wish to ask a question which is not supplementary. So I would recognize the hon. member for Conception Bay South. As the hon. members know there is nothing to preclude coming back to the subject of the previous questions later during the Question Period.

MR. NOLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank you very, very much because I wanted to ask this question as we have been on this situation regarding the Minister of Mines and Energy since we started the Question Period. I was fearful I may not get some of the questions in that I had for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. With his permission and the permission of the House I have a question regarding a number of items actually. One is the Trans-Canada Highway and the negotiations that have been going on regarding funds from Ottawa for the Trans-Canada, and the DREE projects on roads that are currently underway which we have had no public discussion on in this House to the best of my knowledge at the moment, and for that matter the Summer maintenance programme.

Now I realize that is tying a lot into one and I can appreciate the fact that the minister may not want to answer one of the questions that I have tied in here. That is entirely up to him. But I know that this is a matter of great interest to many areas of the Province and I would appreciate any information he could provide at this time.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in reply to these questions; with regards to the Trans-Canada Highway and our negotiations with the federal government, our requests made to them, as a result of my meetings with the federal officials in the surface division of the Ministry of Transport approximately two weeks ago, on Tuesday of next week four top officials will be here in the Province meeting first of all with myself and my officials on next Tuesday afternoon. On Wednesday they will be leaving St. John's to travel the Trans-Canada Highway from St. John's to Port aux Basques to carry out an inspection of the highway and to make a report to their minister. I am hoping that as a result of my meetings with them that they will make recommendations.

I am also hoping while they are here in the Province that they will get a first hand look at the increased volume of traffic, especially the tractor-trailer traffic, on the Trans-Canada Highway. This is an important factor. So they will be leaving St. John's I understand Wednesday morning after my meeting with them on Wednesday and travelling from here

MR. MORGAN: to Port aux Basques and their trip will be approximately three days in the Province. So I am hoping that the recommendations will be made to the minister that something be done with regards to the reconstruction and the upgrading work necessary on the Trans Canada Highway.

With reference to the DREE projects in the Province, all hon. gentlemen will probably see the tender call today in the papers. The Federal Minister of DREE, the hon. Mr. Lessard, has given my department the authority to call tenders for seven projects and these are now listed in today's paper. The DREE agreement has not been signed to date but because of the lateness in the season and because of the short construction season we have in this Province, at my meetings in Ottawa recently I requested for them to give us authority to call tenders on the projects that we feel would be obviously included in this year's agreement and for us to go ahead and call tenders to get the contractors moving and the projects under way.

Now these projects are today called and the tender call is in today's publications of the papers. But there is no actual agreement signed so because of that I cannot comment on what projects will be carried out and what we anticipate will be included in the two year agreement.

With regard to the summer maintenance programme and the work we will be carrying out this summer, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that May 12th. this year will be the commencement of our summer maintenance programme and it will this year end on the 28th. day of September. This is a change of policy from previous years based on the fact that every Fall it seems that my department gets caught with its pants down, if you wish, and snow storms come along and there are situations where our men and equipment are not prepared for the Winter season. This year I am going to make sure that this is not the case. We are going to cut off the summer maintenance programme the end of September so it will give the

MR. MORGAN: men the month of October to prepare for the Winter.

And as of May 12th., in fact next Monday, I have assigned this year a special crew to do line markings on our roads in the Province. I am giving top priority to the Trans Canada Highway. They will commence work next week and they will be doing nothing else this summer only line markings. And in conjunction with that, in doing the line markings first of all on the Trans Canada Highway I will be removing these controversial signs we have on the Trans Canada Highway which now read, "Slower traffic keep right," a firm decision is now being made. These signs will be removed in the month of May, as soon as the line markings are completed. As the line markings are done the signs will be removed as well, and the new signs will read, "Keep right except to pass."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the regular maintenance units, also this year we will have a special unit in each region of the Province which will be assigned to carry out local road work in unincorporated communities where we have local roads but the communities sometimes are left out. In the fall of the year they still are requesting to get some local road work done. So this year there will be special units designed and assigned to do that kind of work, just local road work in these unincorporated communities.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy which grows out of a statement he made I believe in response to a question here in the House a week or ten days past about charter flights originating here in St. John's and it is back in the news again today of course. Could the minister tell us whether the government's position is that we should be allowed to have charter flights coming out of St. John's and going - you know originating in St. John's and going directly to where they will, London as a rule, or whether all flights would have to originate as they now must,

MR. ROBERTS: as I understand it, in Gander. To go Overseas you must go to Gander. A charter flight cannot come from St. John's, it must originate from Gander. Could the minister tell us, you know, what is the government's position on it and I ask him because he is the man who made some statements here in the House as I say a week or ten days past.

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the position in St. John's Airport has not changed. International charter flights have been permitted in the past to originate from St. John's and should be permitted now to originate from St. John's. That is for groups of people leaving from St. John's.

MR. CROSBIE: There have been difficulties in the last several months with implementing that, where several charter flights have not been permitted to leave from St. John's because of suggestions by the Department of Customs and so on, that they do not have the facilities to properly serve them. For the last ten years, twenty years, I do not know what period of time, charter flights have, for groups that originated in St. John's left from St. John's and returned to St. John's - the St. John's Board of Trade and other groups.

MR. HICKMAN: And the schools.

MR. CROSBIE: And the schools and others. Recently several groups have been refused this permission for their charter flights to leave from St. John's. One is a group of Naval Veterans who are leaving in June, who have been refused that facility, second was a group of children from one of the high schools here in the city who had to go to the expense of getting buses and be driven to Gander for the same purpose. So the government's position, as I understand it, is that that service should continue from St. John's. And that is an entirely different matter and it has no connection whatsoever with St. John's having any status as an international airport.

The government's position on that has been very clear, and is still quite clear. The Government of Newfoundland supports only one airport in Newfoundland, on the Island of Newfoundland as an airport that should have international status, and that is Gander Airport.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: The government has never suggested, does not suggest now, and does not intend to suggest that St. John's airport should have international status.

MR. MURPHY: Or Deer Lake or Stephenville.

MR. CROSBIE: Or Deer Lake or Stephenville or any of the rest. There should be one international airport on the Island of Newfoundland and that is Gander. Now the difference between that

MR. CROSBIE: and the position, say of St. John's now, the position on originating charter flights is quite simple, that other airports in Canada with the same status as St. John's at other airports in Canada with the same status as St. John's originating there. The flight can leave from that particular airport, such as London, Ontario.

MR. NEARY: You cannot have your cake and eat it too.

MR. CROSBIE: You can have your cake. It is not a question of having your cake and eating it too. If St. John's had status, if St. John's had the same status as Gander the position would be that any flight, international flight, could choose to land in St. John's. Any charter flight, no matter where it originated from or from what country, could choose St. John's rather than Gander or Gander rather than St. John's.

MR. NEARY: Are you Acting Minister of Transportation, or do we not have a Minister of Transportation now?

MR. CROSBIE: I have been asked a question and I am answering it, Mr. Speaker. We do not suggest that this should be so. Our position is very firm that Gander should have international status and should be the only international airport in Newfoundland and should be the only airport from which scheduled international flights depart or land. It should be the only airport at which Trans-Atlantic flights of any description should be permitted to land. But with respect to St. John's Airport, we feel that where flights originate in St. John's, charter flights, of groups in St. John's, that the past practice should continue and that these occasional flights which might amount to four or five or ten a year should be permitted, as they have been in the past, to leave from St. John's.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to the Minister of Mines and Energy again, it is such an important subject. I will put two questions to the minister to save the trouble of having to ask a second question. Could the minister assure the

MR. NEARY: House that if -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I did not hear the hon. gentleman, or it took some time for me to realize exactly what he was asking. I would suggest that he ask one question at a time.

MR. NEARY: One question at a time? All right, Your Honour. I would like to ask the minister if the government will lower the provincial tax on gasoline in order to off-set the severe blow that the increase in gasoline and heating fuel is going to have on the consumer in this Province?

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

MR. CROSBIE: The government will suggest to the Federal Liberal Government in Ottawa, that it drop the additional ten cents a gallon excise tax on gasoline that it imposed last year if there is any increase in the price of oil or gas. This government, as hon. gentlemen know, in its financial position is not in any position to drop the taxes on gasoline or anything else. The federal government is. They imposed an additional ten cents last year and they could quite easily remove that. The effect of a two dollar increase, I think, in the price of oil would be about six or seven cents a gallon on gasoline, and the federal government could just adjust that by taking off their excise tax they imposed last year.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: In connection with the offshore drilling for gas and oil off Labrador by Eastcan can the minister assure the House that if there is a discovery offshore that the oil or gas will not be piped into Quebec Province, that it will be kept in Newfoundland and that Newfoundland will get the revenue? And can the minister tell us if there is anything new on negotiations for the offshore rights on gas and oil and minerals?

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, you know, no government can speak so far ahead of the event about gas or oil or whatever. And, of course, unless the Province of Newfoundland is found to have, as we suggested does have, jurisdiction over gas and oil it will have no authority in that area at all. The only way we could control the situation would be if we owned the oil or gas. Even if we owned the oil or gas the federal government, under the BNA act has complete authority over external affairs, over international trade, over inter-provincial trade, over gas and oil pipelines that go from one province to the other. So these suggestions would have to be made to the Government of Canada. In addition, Mr. Speaker, if huge volumes of gas were discovered off Labrador and the market in Newfoundland and Labrador was limited - we could use whatever gas we could to develop industry here first - there would bound to be a tremendous volume of gas that could not be used here, and it would be silly to say that it could not be exported anywhere else and, therefore, the oil and gas fields could not be developed at all. I mean that would be a piece of stupidity. So the hon. gentleman's question, you know, raises issues which would take very many years before they would become pertinent here. Because even if gas is found off the coast of Labrador in commercial quantities I am advised that it would be at least ten to twelve years before the technology for developing and utilizing it can be perfected.

MR. NEARY: Well the hon. the Premier says four to five years.

MR. CROSBIE: Oil is different. If oil was discovered in commercial quantities off Labrador, I understand that within two to three to four years they could be producing oil, because oil could be taken from the producing wells by tanker. Gas, however, is a different matter. Gas can be liquified, but with gas you have to operate twelve months a year. With oil you could take it for six months and you shut the thing down for six months if the ice is bad and so on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not gas?

MR. CROSBIE: Well, not gas, because gas - the installations that take out the gas and so on apparently give a lot more problems, and the technology for that is going to be a lot more complicated. At least that is what I am advised anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: There is only time for one additional question.
The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. The announcement that he just made that the signs on the Trans Canada highroad will be changed from keep right except to pass or slow traffic keep right, that will be changed over as the new yellow lines are painted on. Does the minister intend to have his department educate the general public of Newfoundland to this change, which is going to happen so quickly? Mr. Speaker, there is a big difference. Right now the motoring public have accepted those signs, "slow traffic keep right." And there is a lot of difference, and they do not bother to read them any more because they know what it is. Will there be an effort made to advise the public that from now on the traffic regulation is keep right except to pass?

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

MR. MORGAN: Again, Mr. Speaker, we will be running ads and as much publicity as possible to the changing of the signs. We intend to commence the changing of the signs around the 20th of May, and have them completed in a week or

Mr. Morgan.

the maximum two week period, all changed at the one time. Between now and then we will be running ads and as much as possible through the media to give the people the information in regard to the changing of these signs.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The motion before the House is that subhead 101-01 be reduced by the amount of \$14,783.

The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

MR. A. MURPHY: Before we adjourned last night I was trying to say a few words -

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are going to have a vote.

MR. MURPHY: Oh, a vote? Oh, I see.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no, no.

MR. MURPHY: What is on the go here boys?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MURPHY: I suggested that last night and -

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is agreement that we vote.

MR. MURPHY: Is there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is hearty agreement.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, very good. I will only be two minutes.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not in agreement, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MORGAN: We will be taking a long time to vote.

MR. WELLS: There was an agreement.

MR. ROBERTS: No, there was not.

MR. WELLS: There was not?

MR. MURPHY: But, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to waste any space, we only have seventy-five hours to do these estimates and I would like to get through with them. Please do not hang the House up.

Mr. Chairman, I did rise last evening. I was on my feet for seventeen minutes and I spoke for one and a half. The rest was taken with points of order. But I did sit down when the point of order was raised, of course. But there was seventeen minutes wasted out of the seventy-five hours last night. My only purpose to stand up, Sir, is to support the actions taken by the Minister of Health. I think he has done an excellent job in this, and to allay, if I can, again the insinuations made by the Leader of the

MR. MURPHY:

Opposition as to the competency of the Minister of Public Health. Now it is nothing new to this House, Sir, to have the Leader of the Opposition stand up and assassinate, or try to, any minister of this Crown. I am doing a history now -

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

MR. MURPHY: I am doing the history now, Mr. Chairman, of the -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! A point of order has been raised.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the minister a moment ago talked about the waste of time last night. Well probably so. But he is the instigator of that waste as he is right now again. He has just said now, Mr. Chairman, no ifs, ands and buts or generalities, he said that the Leader of the Opposition had stood up and tried to assassinate. Now, Mr. Chairman, apart from the fact that that ridiculous statement could only come from that minister, it is quite unparliamentary, quite unparliamentary for him - and he knows that, Mr. Chairman - to attribute that kind of motive to any member of this House. It is even too raw for that minister, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MURPHY: Get back and teach kindergarten where you came from.

MR. SIMMONS: If he does not want us to waste a whole morning as he thinks we did last evening by interjections, well he can stay within the rules. I want to hear what he has to say about the minister. So few have said anything good about the minister. I am anxious to hear what the minister has done. I have not heard in this committee yet and I am prepared to sit here and listen.

MR. MURPHY: Is the gentleman making a speech now, Sir?

MR. SIMMONS: But I am not prepared, Mr. Chairman, to sit here and have him flaunt the rules in the name of dignity.

MR. MURPHY: As I was -

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised. I think that the hon. minister obviously used the phrase very metaphorically. I do not see where it would be in the documents available to us, strictly unparliamentary. But

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I think that the hon. minister may wish to rephrase the remark so as to give a clearer idea of his meaning. The hon. minister.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I did not mean that the Leader of the Opposition had put a contract out for the hon. Minister of Health. But I did say, Sir, by his remarks insinuating the incompetency, the utter disregard for human suffering and utter **callousness** with regard to dealing with other human beings. I think it was entirely unjustified, perhaps not justified but typical of the Leader of the Opposition. I am now, Sir, at the present time doing a little history of remarks passed by that same hon. gentleman with reference to all the ministers of this House. It will make very interesting reading when I get it all done. As far as the Leader of the Opposition's attitude is concerned, Sir, it reminds me of the story I heard yesterday where the lady in great worry phoned the doctor and told the doctor that her young son had swallowed a twenty-two bullet. The doctor of course was quite reassuring and said, "Do not worry. Do not do anything. I will be there as soon as I can. But for heavens sake do not point him at anybody." I think it is the fact that the Leader of the Opposition, if he points at someone at all prepare, prepare for annihilation political or in any other way.

Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to all the statements where there has been nothing done, I have two files here just on Baie Verte alone, from my Department of Environment, not talking about Health, and I did look back as far as I could for some case history of what is happening with regard to asbestosis or any other disease in the area of Baie Verte. The first correspondence I come across is dated March 14, 1974. Now I do not know how far back the previous government went with making sure that another St. Lawrence would not occur in Baie Verte, and this letter is a memo from Mr. Downey, Assistant Deputy Minister of Environment to the then minister, Mr. Gordon Dawe. And it says; "Following publication of Time Magazine January 28, 1974, many people concerned with the asbestos mines at Baie Verte became very uneasy. Their medical section dealt in some detail with the closure of an asbestos product plant, and it was pushed out of Pennsylvania and faced severe expenditure to meet United States environmental costs. This article created a major stir in the Baie Verte area." Now this was January 28, 1974. I do not know how long that mine is there. It must be ten or twelve years. I am not quite sure on it. But this is only 1974. "And the unions particularly were somewhat alarmed and made statements in public and to the press requesting action and assurance that they, too, did not have serious asbestos dust to contend with." That was the first indication that I have in the files of the Environment Department with reference to this query about the dust menace in the asbestos mine. And we immediately dispatched an inspector to Advocate Mines on February 14. This article appeared on January 28. Some two weeks afterwards, the Department of Environment dispatched one of the inspectors down to Baie Verte to talk with people and sound them out on just what the feelings were with regard to the mine.

And there is a paragraph here; "Since then over a dozen copies of a standard letter from individuals to Mr. Bill Rompkey

Mr. Murphy.

I think he is the M.P. for that district - (copy Bill Rowe, M.H.A.) - Now I think Bill Rowe had gone out before 1974. Am I right on that? He was the M.H.A. for the district. But this is in brackets. - has been received. And this deals with a letter from the very people in the area who had sent this to Rompkey in Ottawa, M.P., the Hon. Mr. Bill Rompkey and a copy to Bill Rowe who was the M.H.A. This was in this memo with reference to this. And our department at the time had held discussions with a Dr. Robert Ferguson, a biologist in Montreal, Dr. Clinton Edmunds, regional director of EPS, Halifax, and these gentlemen got together and had a look at the whole question and promised they would take some action on it. And I do not intend to go right into the whole question of what has been happening. But I want to repudiate without any doubt in the world, without any doubt in anybody's mind, and that is why I got a bit upset yesterday when I jumped up and demanded that the Leader of the Opposition was - I do not know what expression to use, because I was so disgusted. But for him to insinuate that a Minister of the Crown - and he referred to the Minister of Health this time - was so callous and this government was so callous that we had no worry at all about Baie Verte which is an absolute reversal of the true facts. Because we have done quite extensive work in the area. There is a joint committee of Health, Mines and Energy, and Environment together with Manpower, that have been meeting regularly on all this.

And if anybody thinks that an answer or a cure can be found even by the great doctor who he referred to, who is coming in here shortly to look at the thing, it is going to be a long way out, because when we talk about curing these things, and we look at St. Lawrence, as the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Hickman) says - and here again I would like to congratulate the member for the area of Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) because he has got a very, very serious problem on his hands and perhaps half of it may not be the disease itself

Mr. Murphy.

but it may be the anxiety and what lies underneath it, the fear. Perhaps fear is a greater cause at this time than the actual disease itself. We have looked at all areas of it, and my department particularly are not dealing within the mines. This is the occupational hazard. But let us not forget the hundreds and perhaps thousands of small children and people outside the mine on the whole Baie Verte Peninsula who could be affected by this air.

MR. MURPHY:

And the member mentioned that and I was amazed when my department told me a few months ago that the tailings on this type of stuff was being hauled from the mine and people were using it to put on their driveways. Here was a lethal weapon if you like and not one darn thing done about it, just spread on the mine. And the pit where the tailings come out, it is just brought out on a conveyor and dumped. We have recommended, Mr. Chairman, that these tailings be wet down to keep the dust from getting into the air because it is lethal as far as we know.

As far as the water is concerned, tests have been made to drinking water. We have sent the samples to different groups and from each group we got a different reading of the content of this water. That is one of the problems we have. If anybody thinks that because this doctor whoever he may be will come tomorrow and next week there will be a cure, let him forget it.

MR. RIDEOUT: Nobody is suggesting that.

MR. MURPHY: We had tuberculosis for hundreds of years. Do not let us get any impressions that this is going to be a cure all and do not let us talk that because the Minister of Health is not prepared to donate ten dollars per head that he is going to destroy Baie Verte. Let us not forget that, Mr. Chairman, and let us not insinuate it by any means, that \$5,000, \$50,000, that \$5 million may be spent before we find an answer to this problem.

I get back again to tuberculosis. We lived with it and anybody who had people or friends who were put in that sanitarium in on Topsail Road years ago and they opened up the window to give them fresh air, what they needed, and most of them died of pneumonia because they froze to death. But we got aureomycin. There was the miracle drug for tuberculosis and thanks be to God - and I say this - that great strides have been made and there are an awful lot of people connected with the Department of Health in the party who must take some credit for the great steps forward.

MR. MURPHY:

But if anybody thinks that this problem is going to be an easy one to solve, let us just not rush. It will be solved at some time in the future. But I will just say this now, that as far as my department is concerned, the Department of the Environment, and as far as the Department of Health is concerned, Mines and Energy and everybody else in this government are as much aware of the problem and have as much concern for human right for Newfoundlanders as anybody sitting on the other side of the House and let us not forget it. Do not value a life in Bale Verte at ten dollars per head or \$5,000 whatever the case might be.

Let nobody say or insinuate in any sinister way, to try to destroy a gentleman who has got more compassion in his system than half the crowd on the other side put together and I refer to the hon. Minister of Health, a gentleman who came up the hard way. He worked for his livelihood, slaved like a great many of us. He was not born with a silver spoon in his mouth I will guarantee you that. He came to this House here because the people sent him here because they felt he was the type of person who should be in this hon. House. I have known the hon. gentleman in politics since 1966. To me he is an outstanding gentleman and I will not sit in my seat whether I am out of order or not to hear him insulted and castigated by someone who has not got as much worth in his six foot frame as the hon. gentleman has in one of his fingernails. I say that and the gentleman who said it, he can grin now with that leer he has on his face but it is time for the gentleman to realize that he has got to grow up. We all grow up and have compassion for each other. God knows it is hard enough to survive in this world without having someone across the House try to destroy you with a few words, Mr. Chairman. That is why I get so worked up when I hear these castigations. I have been listening to it for a great many years, Sir, when the hon. gentleman sat here leering over the shoulder of the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) at us poor little people over there.

Mr. STEPHY:

As I say, Mr. Chairman, I feel within my heart and soul that nobody, but nobody, has more compassion for people than the hon. Minister of Health. I say that and if anybody cares to say otherwise I will stand up any time and challenge him. He is a family man with a large family and for anybody to say that he refuses \$5,000 perhaps to sacrifice human lives in Baie Verte, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a disgrace that such words were ever uttered in this hon. House. I say that. Again,

MR. MURPHY: Sir, I do not wish to delay the House. But I just say that all government departments are very much concerned. Whether I am the member for Baie Verte or St. John's Centre, wherever it may be, I have as much interest in Newfoundlanders, in all people as anybody else in this Hon. House, Sir. And I just urge in the name of charity if nothing else, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition for God's sake would grow up and get some sense and try not by insinuation to make a laughing stock - I can go right through it. I look at every member in this House where down through the years he stood on his feet there, Sir -

MR. NEARY: His old school buddy heard from him the other night on television.

MR. MURPHY: - and slurred and insulted everybody in this hon. House. He should thank God every minute of the day, Sir.

MR. ROWE: A point of order,

MR. MURPHY: He should thank God every minute of the day. -

MR. ROBERTS: Do not take him so seriously.

MR. MURPHY: - that he grew up where he did not have to worry like some of us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. ROWE: Sir, I just sat here for the past several minutes and listened to the language of the hon. member for St. John's Centre and I draw the Chairman's attention to section 154 (3) on page 130 of Beauchesne. "The imputation of bad motives, or motives different from those acknowledged, misrepresenting the language of another, or accusing him, in his turn, of misrepresentation, charging him with falsehood or deceit: or contemptuous or insulting language of any kind: all these are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference," presumably from the Chair.

MR. MURPHY: Tell us something. Tell us what it is all about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, am I going to be heard or what when I am making a point of order? Sir, the hon. member for St. John's Centre has used language in the last ten or fifteen minutes that

MR. ROWE: comes under the category of that subsection (3) of section 154, and I would like to bring the Chairman's attention to this and ask that the member not continue on with this type of insulting language.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order. Your Honour I would submit that my hon. friend who has suddenly become an expert on Beauchesne did not state what the point of order was. He did not state the language. And if the hon. member is going to make a point of order, Sir, he has to quote the words that the hon. gentleman said that were *offensive* or unparliamentary. All the hon. member did was to read from Beauchesne and did not state any of the words that are uncomplimentary that are insulting or unparliamentary and I would submit, Sir, that it is not a point of order.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: To that point of order. I would like - last night we saw the hon. member spend twenty minutes I think it was debating what turned out to be not a point of order. Now they talk about the time left for the estimates, I think there is nine hours left now. I want to get the Department of Fisheries estimates before the Committee. I am anxious to get them before the Committee.

MR. NEARY: Public Works and -

MR. W. CARTER: But if hon. members opposite do not co-operate or insist on wasting the House time, Mr. Chairman, by raising useless points of order, well then I am going to be denied the chance to bring my estimates before the House and the House will be denied the chance to discuss my estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! When a point of order has been raised of course comments certainly can be made by hon. members. But the rules do state, and I can only go by the rules, that the comments should be directed to the point of order specifically and not to any

MR. CHAIRMAN: other topics even though they might have an indirect relationship to it. The comments should be specific and directly to the point of order.

If there are no further comments I have consulted the section that was read by the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) and my interpretation of the first phrase is that untruths, falsehoods, deliberate falsehoods may not be imputed to an hon. member. I do not think the hon. minister did do such an act. The second phrase concerns itself with insulting language. I think the hon. minister stated his opinion as to what the hon. Leader of the Opposition said on a number of occasions but I do not think that by stating those facts that he undertook to insult the hon. Leader of the Opposition. My interpretation would be that he made a statement as to his understanding of the hon. Leader of the Opposition's remarks in the past. So I would not consider that a point of order is before the Chair.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I am going to clue up now anyhow because I get so carried away

Mr. Murphy:

when I see what is happening in this hon. House. We can debate any subject, Sir. But I grew up among a lot of young people and I tried to tell them that if there is one thing you have to do in the world have respect or try to have respect for the other fellow whether it is in sport or anything else. And when I see here repeated last night or yesterday, what I have seen of this hon. House so often, look, Sir, I really grieve. And as the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) uses the phrase "Wherefore and whither tending," I wonder in God's name where we are going to end up.

This Chamber is supposed to be two sword lengths or something across the House here. Perhaps we might get to that. Perhaps we would be more honourable, Sir, if we did engage in some kind of physical combat rather than use the tongue -

AN HON. MEMBER: That might happen too by the way.

MR. MURPHY: Yes. I can appreciate it really.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Please would you allow me? Before further proceedings I am sure the hon. members would wish to greet eleven students from Grades VIII and IX from Bishop Abraham Junior High in St. John's, who are in the public gallery with their teacher Mr. James Butters, and also ten students from Grades VIII and IX at the Lake Melville High in North West River with their teacher Mrs. June Blakie. And I understand that the students from Labrador are here in St. John's on an exchange visit. We certainly greet them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

HON. E. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir. Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that I do not intend to reply to the remarks made by the gentleman from St. John's Centre, the Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment. I think as he himself said he got somewhat carried away, and I will let the matter rest at that. I could deal with everything he said, in the same way as he dealt with the things I said, I would hope with a little less passion and a little more

Mr. Roberts:

clarity, but I do not intend to play the sort of game he wants to play. What I said in the Committee yesterday and what I say again today is that the Minister of - I have said nothing about the Minister of Health personally, the only people who feel that is the hon. gentleman opposite, and that is just a political tactic to try to divert and to skirmish and everything else. What I am speaking about is the minister's conduct of his office. And I think the minister's conduct of his office and the respect which I mentioned has not been what it ought to have been and what it should have been. I have listened to what he said in the Committee last evening, and I assume he will have a few more words to say. I would certainly hope so. And I am far from satisfied with the way in which he has responded to this question.

Whether or not the motion is silly is for hon. members to decide. The gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) feels it is silly. Well that is his privilege. He has been around this House for a long time. He has done some things that people accept, and he has done some things that people do not accept. I will find it if he is to vote against the motion, presumably he will, I will find it somewhat amusing to see him and the gentlemen opposite in the same political bed, truly hath it been said that politics doth make strange bedfellows. It may just be a harbinger of the coming coalition that we hear so much about, that is going to come into effect.

But, Mr. Chairman, I guess I just blew my invitation to lunch, did I? The Minister of Fisheries will have to have another lunch to make up for the one I am not going to get. Mr. Chairman, let me deal with a point that the Minister of Fisheries raised. I will not say that he did not know better, I believe he felt he was within the rules, but as Your Honour ruled he was out of order. The government would like to call the Fisheries estimates they tell us this morning, and they asked us whether we would agree not to say very much more on Health. Well I can say two or three things on that. First of all, Sir, we would like to see the Fisheries estimates called. Indeed my friend

MR. ROBERTS:

and colleague, the gentleman from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Canning) acting in our behalf or speaking for us as a group has put down a motion to allow debate on the fisheries estimates. We would very much like them to be called. But we are not going to give up \$197 million worth of expenditure - I am sorry.

MR. NEARY: Wasting it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I am just responding to what the Minister of Fisheries said. I do not think that is a waste of time. There is a rule against needless repetition and I -

MR. NEARY: How about your colleague?

MR. ROBERTS: No, my colleague has been acting properly. I must say I very much appreciate the way he has been acting because in view of the, you know, the well known Tory tactic of trying to get me which is underlying all the debate, I would like to have somebody stand up once in a while and venture a word or two in my behalf. But the point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that we do want the fisheries estimates to come off, very anxious to, and particularly in light of the news that came yesterday that the government of Canada have said, "Look, if you guys made a mess of the Gear Replacement Programme as you did because it is a provincial administration we are not going in any way to pay that." So now we are stuck with the whole shot. I am sorry?

MR. NEARY: When did that come in?

MR. ROBERTS: It has been in. The minister has been away. It has been on the radios, in the newspapers. I am sorry?

MR. DOODY: Who?

MR. ROBERTS: Quoting the hon. Mr. LeBlanc.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Well I do not know what correspondence the minister has had. Mr. LeBlanc has said nothing to me. I am just relaying what I have heard on the radios. I am not saying they are correct or incorrect.

MR. ROBERTS:

I am just relaying what I have heard. I do not know if hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Chairman, listen to the radio in the mornings. I have a little schedule. You can hear WOCM at quarter to eight and you can hear CJON at eight o'clock and at eight thirty you get the CBC National followed by a CBC local. It is a good way to get all three of the major radio stations.

MR. DOODY: That would be your peanut series.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! The motion before the House, of course, debates the hon. Minister of Health's salary. So I would just point out to hon. members that this is the topic under debate. And whereas incidental remarks can be made concerning other subjects, these should be purely incidental and not be gone into in any great detail.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: I would like to rise on a point of privilege, Sir.

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

MR. NEARY: A point of privilege. I would like to set the record straight, Sir. When the Government House Leader approached me about the Health estimates he did not ask me to restrict my remarks in connection with the estimates. He merely asked me if I would be very much longer on the Health estimates. There is a big difference, Sir, in what the Leader of the Opposition just stated. I presume he put the same question to the Leader of the Liberal Reform Party and the Leader of the old-line Liberal Party. It was not to try to close off the discussion. It was merely, the way it was put to me, "Will you be very much longer on the Health estimates?" There is a big difference, Mr. Speaker. I think the Leader has done the Government House Leader an injustice in the way that it was put to members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: There is no point of privilege there. You know, we are seeing a constant -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would permit me? I would take it that this was an explanatory remark rather than, strictly speaking, a point of privilege.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have made no reference to anything which was said to or by the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I am just merely saying what I said. Well if we want to talk about being long on it, the hon. gentleman from LaPoile has used up more time in this committee, I would think, as one member, and he is only one member - he may be an independent member but he is one member - certainly used up more time than the fifteen men and women who sit in our group here and the four gentlemen -

MR. NEARY: That does not speak very well for you.

MR. ROBERTS: It certainly does, Sir. It shows that quality is not equated with quantity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Rear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: My friend and colleague from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) last night said a few things that every member in the House thought was well said. I do not want to get into that. When I am after elephants, Mr. Chairman, when I am after elephants I do not want to be diverted by rabbits.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me come back to the point under discussion. I want to talk about the Fisheries estimates and I will gladly agree to sit any any time, at any hour to talk about them. Because I think if this House adjourns without discussing the Fisheries estimates it will have been one of the greatest collapses of our duty to the people. But, Sir, this Committee has met for forty or fifty or sixty hours, whatever we have been now. It is the government's decision not to have called Fisheries until here now getting near the eleventh hour, metaphorically speaking.

May 7, 1976.

Tape 2545

RH - 4

MR. ROBERTS:

That is the government's decision. They can say that the Minister of Mines and Energy was away and so he was. But the Minister of Fisheries has been faithful in his attendance here. It is no reason not to call them simply because the Minister of Mines and Energy happened to be away. He has been in Ottawa.

MR. ROBERTS: I know he has been on government business, Sir, I do not doubt that but only one day was he there on business which could not have been deferred. Other days, meetings and things, these could have been scheduled next week. The House of Assembly and the people of this Province do not dance to the convenience of any hon. minister. And so let it not be heard to be said that because we are going to take - I may well be another half an hour or so on some points I want to raise in connection with the minister's conduct of his job. Let us not hear the Minister of Fisheries say, "Oh well we are against discussing the Fisheries estimates." If the Fisheries estimates are not discussed at length, Sir, it is the fault simply and solely of the government of this Province, simply and solely. They could have called them at any time, Sir. We did not have to go into Social Services or Education before we went into Fisheries. Of course not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And they can accept the hon. member's motion.

MR. ROBERTS: They most certainly can. As the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) says, they can accept the motion put by my friend and colleague the gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning) which would open up that iniquitous seventy-five hour rule only in respect of the Fisheries estimates. But we will see. We will see Sir, whether the government ~~are~~ willing to use their majority in the House for that purpose. We will see.

AN HON. MEMBER: He might disappoint you on that.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, nothing would give me more pleasure than to have an opportunity to discuss the scandals down there, the bad administration, the - well I am out of order because Your Honour has already ruled I cannot get into that.

Let me come back to the Minister of Health, Sir, and let me -

MR. NEARY: The Summer Games scandal too, do not forget that.

MR. ROBERTS: Well fine but we cannot discuss that under Fisheries unfortunately. I have found a way to talk about the Scrivener scandal on Health and I think that is something anyway.

MR. NEARY: I welcome the hon. gentleman's -

MR. ROBERTS: Well the hon. gentleman welcomes me. I mean he was up last night talking about asbestosis and how he was the first man ever to raise it, you know all I would say, Sir, is he should have a look at the Hansards. And he and I were then together in a parliamentary group. We have had a schism in the political sense. He now sits there and I sit here. I hope there is no personal schism. There is certainly none on my part, Sir, and I am sure none on the hon. gentleman's part but all I will say is that the asbestosis thing has been a hobbyhorse with me for many years because I think it is a very real problem, a very real problem and I am profoundly dissatisfied with the way in which the minister has approached it. And nothing said by his friend and colleague the gentleman from St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) who you know has an opposition mentality. He was too long over here. He lost his breadth of vision.

MR. MURPHY: Carry on now.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman says carry on. He got up and devoted fifteen minutes -

MR. MURPHY: Try to be decent, for God's sake.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, he gets up and he spends fifteen minutes, gets up fifteen minutes, Mr. Chairman, calling me everything he can think of within the parliamentary lexicon and then when I merely make the reference that the hon. gentleman in my opinion has an opposition mentality, he was too long in the trenches, too long, taking the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune and now that he is in government he is not able to deal with them, not able to respond in a positive way as a minister. He has got a negative approach to everything. I think he was too long in opposition. It can happen to men and it happened to the hon. gentleman and I say that and I go on to say that I used to admire him in Opposition. It was not easy to be in Opposition with three men, the gentleman from St. John's East Extern. (Mr. Hickey), the gentleman from

MR. ROBERTS: St. John's East (Mr. Ottenheimer) as he then was, he now represents another seat in this House, and the gentleman from St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) constituted the entire opposition after the 1966 election and it was not easy and I admire the way they went at it. But you know I do not want to get into a row with the gentleman from St. John's Centre. That is a waste of time and not very helpful to anybody.

I do not think the Minister of Health, Mr. Chairman, has responded in any meaningful way to our points about asbestosis. We did not say that he was trying to poison people in Baie Verte. That is what the Tories say we said, trying to twist and to distort and to try to wiggle out from under. What we said, the gentleman from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) and myself, what we said is that the Minister of Health has done nothing to discharge his responsibility. We have here an admitted, problem, a very serious problem. The gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) agrees on it. The gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) agrees on it. We agree on it. We all agree on that. But the Minister of Health, Sir, has done nothing about it. We all acknowledge that it is essential that we have an independent -

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is hardly so.

MR. ROBERTS: It certainly is so. We have acknowledged and all agree that we need an impartial and an independent study.

MR. RIDEOUT: At once.

MR. ROBERTS: At once.

MR. RIDEOUT: Immediately.

MR. ROBERTS: Immediately, precisely. We have asked for it in this Committee time and time again in years gone by. I read last year in Committee a letter I had had from Dr. Sellikof and I hoped that would touch off an enquiry because that letter advanced certain opinions and the opinions were to the effect that there was a very real potential hazard and it should be looked at and the government ignored that. Then we had Mr. Leo Barry who was at that time, it was just after the

MR. ROBERTS: election, still a Minister of the Crown. He had not resigned his office as Minister of Mines and Energy. He had been defeated in his constituency. He had not been returned as a member. He had been decisively rejected by his constituents but he had - you know he was cleaning off his desk and he made a commitment then on a W 5 programme and I read that transcript.

MR. CANNING: Was he still making promises after that?

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning) asked if he was still making promises. Yes, he was still making promises after he was out of office.

MR. DOODY: Was the programme taped?

MR. ROBERTS: No, I think the programme was done live.

MR. CANNING: I do not believe it. He belongs to Placentia Bay too.

MR. ROBERTS: Miss Gosse, or Ms. Gosse, I am not sure of her marital status, said that it was you know, this comes to you live. It was a Sunday night from Toronto and the election had been the week before, three or four or five days before. So we had that commitment and that has not been honoured and now we get the situation where an independent expert meets the two necessary tests. He is independent, and he is an expert. And the minister gets up and attempts to pour scorn on Dr. Sellikof that he is only a researcher. I am sorry I heard the minister's speech, and the strong opinion that I got from what the minister said was that he was scorning, pouring scorn, heaping scorn upon the -

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I cannot permit this to continue. What I said last night, and the record will show, is I did make the statement that Dr. Sellikof is a researcher and he was coming to Baie Verte in a research capacity, but I also qualified that and said, "I suppose now I will be accused of saying that he has got no interest in the people in Baie Verte." I said, "I know he has an interest in the people in Baie Verte and everywhere else." The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, should withdraw that statement because that is not true.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order. Sir, there no point of order. The very best that the hon. gentleman can claim for his position is that it is a difference of opinion. I am giving my interpretation of what I heard him say here in this Committee. I have not misquoted him. I have not accused him of anything improper within the parliamentary sense and all he is doing, Sir, is abusing the points of order procedure to try to enter into the debate. Well, Sir, I say that he should be told that when his turn comes he may debate it, until then he should not debate it and he should desist from raising specious points of order, Sir.

MR. ROWE: I said the same thing last night.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Hon. members on a considerable number of occasions arise on what they consider to be points of order which the Chair ultimately rules to be explanatory points. I would think that this falls into that category and I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition if he would continue his remarks.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The point I am making is that the Minister of Health attempted, I am not saying deliberately, I do not know whether he knew what he was doing or not, I can only judge from the words that I heard spoken. The Minister of Health attempted to portray Dr. Sellikof as being a - the minister did not say, "Oh well we are against people," or anything, or Dr. Sellikof is not interested in people. He would have it appear that Dr. Sellikof's only motivation for coming here was that we had an interesting little research problem down here. We had an asbestos mine that has been going for ten or twelve years and boy that is something we have not looked at before. Well I think that is a disservice to Dr. Sellikof and to the Mount Sinai School of Medicine. The minister said that the rich and wealthy school as if somehow they did not need research assistance. Sir, where does the minister think places get research funds. Why did the

MR. ROBERTS: United Steelworkers have to retain Dr. Sellikof to make the investigation into the Tetford Mines, the asbestos mines in Quebec and I am not sure if the United Steelworkers, no the CNTU, the National Trade Union Confederation, the French Language Union Federation retained him.

MR. NEARY: This is the same union down in St. Lawrence.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from LaPoile, this is the union that represents the workers at the fluorspar mines in St. Lawrence. And you know unless they get research funds they are not going to be able to operate. They have not come to the government on bended knee. No. They have said they will not accept help from the company or from the union and that is right and proper. My friend from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) dealt with that point and dealt with it admirably.

So I say to the minister that I am going to vote for this motion not that I feel it will carry and indeed I do not particularly want to deprive the minister of his salary. But it is the only way I can express my lack of confidence, my contempt for the way in which he has approached this question. All he has to do, Sir is stand and say if Dr. Sellikof and his crowd need money, if they can show a need we will entertain a request from them for a grant. And let him not hide behind anything else. No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. member agree that that is exactly what the government are almost certainly doing even if they do not say openly and publicly that they will?

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Chairman, I would not agree with the hon. gentleman. I would remind him a coalition has not yet come. He does not need to speak for the government. The government have not yet said that. That may well be what they do. But all I want is the minister to say it and if the minister

Mr. Roberts.

would say that. Mr. Chairman, if the minister would give us that undertaking that if Dr. Sellikof and his crowd, his fourteen or fifteen doctors and technicians will come and say, "Could you give us \$5,000 to help defray the hotel expenses while we are here and a car or two to travel around in?" then I would ask leave to withdraw the motion. If that were granted well and good. If not I would be prepared to vote against my own motion. I have that right. I would ask my colleagues to vote against it. I put the motion down because I believe these men, Dr. Sellikof and his associates, deserve some assistance. I think it is proper the government give them that help. And it was only after the minister rejected the request which had been made by my colleague, with Dr. Sellikof's knowledge, not in Dr. Sellikof's behalf, with Dr. Sellikof's knowledge, and as I explained it to the Committee, we volunteered. We said, "Doctor we will try to help. We will try to get some money." It was only after that that we raised the matter here. If the minister will make that commitment now here in the Committee I will ask leave to withdraw the motion and if it is not granted, if we do not get unanimous consent for it, I will vote against my own motion. I will be happy to do it. I have no quarrel with the minister as an individual. I have every quarrel with the way in which he has handled this question. I think it has been callous, cold, heartless, and well beneath what a minister should be doing. The gentleman from St. John's Centre spoke of the Minister of Health's compassion, I do not argue with that. All I say is, here is an example to prove it, a few thousand dollars to show to the men who work in Baie Verte and to the people of this Province, a few thousand dollars, \$5,000. It would not even cover the travelling expenses of some of these ministers.

We have ministers over here, Mr. Chairman - (We do not ask. As an opposition we have taken the decision not to request ministerial travel allowances, because we are not so sure that that is really what the House should be doing. It is picayune. It is petty stuff) - but we have ministers over here, Mr. Chairman, who spend \$5,000 or \$10,000

Mr. Roberts.

a year just travelling, just travelling hither and there, What did the European jaunt cost? I bet it cost \$10,000 or \$15,000. A first-class air fare over, first-class air fare back, that is \$1,000, and there were five or ten ministers -

AN HON. MEMBER: Five ministers.

MR. ROBERTS: Five ministers, was it.

- and a handful of officials who went. We are not asking a lot of money. All we are asking is the government show a little concern, put a little money to support their words. We have had it from the lips out. Now let us reach into the government's pocket and put a few dollars on the table. That is all we are talking about.

Mr. Chairman, I have just been given a cutting from the Globe and Mail, the Toronto Globe, for Wednesday, April 28, which is very recently, an item written under the by-line or over the by-line whatever the correct phrase is, of Ms. Joan Hollobon, who is the Globe and Mail's science reporter as I understand it or medical reporter, a very skilled and knowledgeable journalist. I think it is worth reading. I will read it all if people wish. If not I will read some of the, what I consider to be, relevant abstracts, because this is very much in point. The headline is, Lung Cancer Produces One Out Of Five Deaths Of Asbestos Workers. And I read this to show exactly how serious is this potential problem and that series of the problem shows why there must be an independent investigation and the need for an independent investigation shows why the government should pony up a few thousand dollars.

"Lung cancer is the cause of one in five deaths among asbestos workers according to Dr. Irving Selikof of the Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York. New figures show that the death rate climbs as the lapse of time from first exposure lengthens. One day's exposure may be enough to produce lung cancer - and now I am in trouble, a word I literally do not know how to pronounce - mesothelioma."

Mr. Roberts.

Is there a doctor in the House? Your Honour is a medical man, when Your Honour is not presiding here. Does Your Honour know how to pronounce that word? Could Your Honour help me?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may not ask the Chair a question. With the agreement of the House I would be glad to answer the hon. gentleman.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I literally do not know how to pronounce it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mesothelioma.

MR. ROBERTS: Mesothelioma.

I thank Your Honour, and if you want my MCP number, I will send the card in, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: In any event, "One day's exposure may be enough to produce lung cancer and mesothelioma twenty or thirty years later," Dr. Sellikof said. "A recognized expert on the effects of asbestos on health, Dr. Sellikof's report to the American College of Physicians in Philadelphia is reported in the current issue of the Medical Post, a journal published for Canadian doctors." It goes on, but it does not really add very much. It expands upon what has already been said in the opening paragraph.

Sir, that is the case quite simply. All we want is an assurance from the minister that he will, if asked, and if a significant case is made. Dr. Sellikof told me on the phone on Friday night past when we spoke that all they are looking for is some help. All they would accept is some help with their expenses in Newfoundland. They will have to hire a couple of cars I guess. They are coming into Deer Lake, and going from Deer Lake up into Baie Verte by car, and they will be around for two or three weeks. They may have to come into St. John's. The university are helping them. A number of the doctors there have - I do not know if assigned is the word - have agreed to work with them and to give them

Mr. Roberts.

technical advice. They are going to be doing, not only tests on the asbestosis, they are going to be doing a complete physical on every man there. They are going to do the complete blood tests. It used to be SMA 12, but I gather they are now up to SMA 25 which is the type of blood fractionating machine they will be using, and so the men in that mine will get what amounts to a complete physical, and it may pick up things completely unrelated to asbestosis. There may be men there who have a diabetic condition. Well that would be picked up or the other things that can be picked up from a regular physical. That in itself should be worth \$10 a head to the government. Indeed if Dr. Sellikof were licenced to practise medicine in this Province, which he is not, but if he were, he could presumably send the bill into Medicare for his general physical assessment of each of these 500 men, and that would be - what is a general physical now, fourteen or fifteen dollars in the fee scale? I forget what it is. But that in itself would probably amount to the money. So all we are asking is the Minister of Health to be what we consider to be reasonable and to show the compassion which he is alleged to have, and which I am prepared to concede he has.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of other points I want to make with respect to the Health estimates, but if the minister wanted to deal with this asbestosis question I will yield to him, but, you know, I want to come back into the Committee. There may be other members. I would have to compete with them for Your Honour's eye and be recognized. But, you know, I said some harsh things about the minister's conduct of office, and I make no apologies for that. I believe they were warranted. The minister obviously does not agree. I would not expect him to agree, and I am glad one or two of his colleagues rose to defend him. That is a good thing too. But I am deadly serious.

MR. NEARY: Does the Leader of the Opposition know if there has been any great conflict between the minister and Dr. Sellikof.

MR. ROBERTS: Not to my knowledge, but I mean I have not asked Dr. Sellikof nor have I - I am not privy to any. Dr. Sellikof got in touch with me, because I wrote to him -

MR. NEARY: I remember.

MR. ROBERTS: - three or four years ago. I saw an article in a magazine and knowing, and we raised it here in the Committee, we talked about it in caucus, and I wrote to him out of the blue, and I said, "Do we have a problem? Do we have a potential problem?" And he wrote back, and he said, "Yes, you very well may. You have an asbestos mine." And then we started raising it here in the Committee, and in the House and on debates, and my friend from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has quite properly made it a major effort right from the day -

MR. NEARY: Excuse me, but I would assume that if Dr. Sellikof comes to Newfoundland that he will get in touch with the Minister of Health or somebody?

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know.

MR. NEARY: As a matter of courtesy if nothing else. And then the whole thing could be probably thrashed out.

MR. ROBERTS: I have no idea. I know he has been in touch with the minister's officials.

MR. NEARY: I see.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister told us that, and Dr. Sellikof has told me, and he has been in intimate association with the university. That would be one research outfit to another research outfit. But I said, "Where are you getting your money?" - when he first told me three or four weeks ago or a month ago whenever it was that he was coming. And he said, "Well, we have some funds. They are limited, but we have some research grants, and we could use them." "Well," I said, "what about the company?" And he said, "No, they are paying for X-ray plates, because they are general physicals as well, but that is all." "Will it take any money?" And he said, "Why?" I said, "What about the union?" He said, "No." It was for the same reasons. And then I said, "What about the government?" He said, "Well, we have not asked them."

Mr. Roberts.

"Well," I said, "I cannot speak for the government."

MR. H. COLLINS: They have not asked.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that is true they have not asked. I am not disputing that. I said that last night, or yesterday afternoon. My friend from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) said it.

MR. NEARY: So the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting now they voluntarily get involved.

MR. ROBERTS. Yes, I think the government should come forward.

Well let me go on. I went through the narrative yesterday or last evening, but I will go through it again.

MR. ROBERTS:

Let me - a note I am just given - Dr. Sellikof told my friend from Bala Verde-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) in a phone conversation that he himself gets no salary out of this. I mean let that not be that we are looking for money to pay, you know, a man's salary, no. I said, "Well look Dr. there is no reason the government should not kick in a few bucks. Would you take money if the government were to make it available?" He said, "Yes. They are neutral, they are independent." I said, "Well I feel they should do it." Then I said, "Have you approached the government?" He said, "No". "Well," I said, "would you mind if I did?". I said, "I am not the government", and I went through a little constitutional lecture.

MR. NEAPY: Yes I know. I heard all about it.

MR. ROBERTS: I in fact asked my friend to write and that is why he did write as the member for the district and as a man who is so interested in it. So all I want is the minister to give us an assurance. I will then call Dr. Sellikof or the minister can and say, "Look if you would like to send in an application, if you would like some help, send us a letter. Tell us what you want it for, how much you want and, you know, we are prepared to do it if you can prove a case." I do not think that is unreasonable. That is essentially the request which the gentleman for Bala Verde-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) made in the letter which I read to the Committee yesterday. You know if the minister got up and said, "Yes we will do it. Tell Sellikof to get in touch with us", that would be the end of it.

MR. WHITE: Very reasonable.

MR. ROBERTS: I think it is eminently reasonable. Now, Mr. Chairman, the minister has slipped out, I hope not for a cigarette. But if the minister wants - and I say that because it is such a terrible health menace - but if the minister wants to deal with this asbestosis thing I will gladly yield to him and let him because we can come back. I have a number of other points I want to deal with and one or two of them I think are very major. If the minister wants to speak I will yield to him, Mr. Chairman, and then let him deal with this asbestosis thing and

MR. DORRIS:

then go on from there. But I do feel very strongly about it, Sir, and that is why we made the move we did. My friend from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Pideout) feels equally strongly and I think most members of the Committee do. If the minister would just tell us that the government are prepared to give the money, if a case can be made and the case would be for accommodation and for travel and for expenses incurred within Newfoundland, within this Province. Most of the money would, I suppose, stay in the Province in the hotel and in the car rentals or whoever is involved like that. I will ask leave then to withdraw my motion. If that would not be granted - it would take unanimous consent as I understand the rule - then I would be prepared to vote against it when it comes to a vote. That is whatever the Committee decided.

But all I want is to see that the government do something to help that study. That is the sole and single purpose of what I am up to. So I will yield to the minister. I understand he wants to speak. I will then come back. I want to talk then about the Health Sciences Center in Carbonear and some other things. But let us take care of the asbestosis matter first, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the Leader of the Opposition was in his seat last night when I re-emphasized again our position with regard to Dr. Sellikof's proposed study of the asbestosis problem in Baie Verte. I said last night and I will try and recall exactly what I did say and that was this, that while we had received no direct communication from Dr. Sellikof, no formal request for any monies, we did receive a request from the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Pideout) indicating that he had been in touch with Dr. Sellikof and Dr. Sellikof thought that we, the provincial government, should contribute something in the order of \$5,000.

This was discussed very carefully by people down in the department and in fact by some of my colleagues as well. In view of

MR. COLLINS:

information which we had which indicated that Dr. Sellikof was a bit careful, he did not want to be beholding to anyone in his study, he did not want it to be said and certainly we would not want it to be said that any particular party - and three parties possibly could be involved, the unions, the company and the government - he wanted to come in and do an independent study and be beholding to no one.

Now last night I also said that we have had several meetings in the department, Dr. Colohan and Mr. Tom Sellars, the Deputy Minister, Dr. Klippert, my assistant deputy minister and other people in the department, all very knowledgeable, capable and dedicated civil servants. We have agreed - there has been consultation with the company, with Dr. Black who is the chief of staff, chief of medical staff at the Boylen Hospital in Base Verte who incidentally does a lot of the work for the company, when I say for the company for the miners there - we have all agreed and I have directed my staff to leave no stone unturned and I think that is a term I used last night - to leave no stone unturned in terms of assisting Dr. Sellikof and his staff wherever possible. If it means purchasing and it could very well mean purchasing some additional types of more sophisticated types of equipment than we now have, if it means that we will certainly do it. We will make all of our records available, everything. The sky is the limit.

Now I also said last night that in the event after Dr. Sellikof comes in, in the event that it can be shown - and I am sure he might be able to show it - that there is a need for some financial support I will only be too glad and I am sure the Province will be only too glad to do what we can to assist him. Mr. Chairman, that is a repeat of what I said last night. I cannot say anymore than that until Dr. Sellikof arrives and we can sit down and have a discussion as should be done. I want to be very careful of what I am saying. Dr. Sellikof is not here yet. He has made statements that he does not want the company to participate financially, he does not want the union. I am not sure at this particular time if he would want us but I still do

MP. COLLINS:

not doubt the sincerity and the truthfulness of the hon. member for Baie Verte's (Mr. Rideout) request. But I can reassure him again that anything we can do in equipment, in co-operation, with staff, with vehicles and with money if necessary we will do it to make sure once and for all that we get to the bottom of this problem in Baie Verte. I hope and I believe that we will get a good report from Dr. Sellikof.

Mr. Chairman, there is not much more I can say. I can talk all morning I suppose but not say anymore than I have just said now regarding the asbestosis problem in Baie Verte and Dr. Sellikof's trip and research study, whatever we might call it.

Now, the hon. Leader of the Opposition last night requested that I would table the contracts between the government and Scrivener Newfoundland Limited with regard to the Health Sciences Complex and the Carbonear hospital. I indicated at that time that while the money for the Carbonear hospital was in my estimates, and it is, and there is a reason for that which I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition remembers because he was Minister of Health I believe at the time when that project was beginning to get off the ground as it were, I believe that it was at his suggestion that the supervision for the construction of the Carbonear facility would come to his department he being the minister.

MR. ROBERTS: No, not Carbonear.

MP. COLLINS: Not Carbonear.

MR. ROBERTS: Scrivener came first. Carbonear came afterwards.

MP. COLLINS: Yes, okay. It is a case of location.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. COLLINS: We are dealing with the same people but it is a case of location. That is true. But that was changed after the people changed the government.

MR. ROBERTS: What was the change?

MR. COLLINS: Well the responsibility for construction reverted back to public works.

MR. ROBERTS: Now it has moved back to health again.

MR. COLLINS: No, it is not in Health.

MR. POBERTS: No, Health was never responsible.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking in terms of what my officials tell me in the days of the - anyway it is not important really. It is not important. I do not mean to make any further points on it. But what I am saying is that the Department of Public Works is the agency of government which goes out and does all construction. The fact that the monies are in the Department of Health has got no real bearing on it.

MR. POBERTS: Pousseau does it.

MR. COLLINS: Now I did not say a word when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking. I just sat here and listened and said nothing about it. I undertook last night to discuss the tabling of the contracts with Scrivener with my colleague, the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services. I also said that I would discuss it with my colleagues in Cabinet if that were necessary. That we did last night after we left here and this morning. I also checked with my own people down in the department and we have nothing down there to table. It is in Public Works. As a consequence of further meetings with my colleague here and with some of my other colleagues we have decided to table - I will table it now - the contracts between government and Scrivener Newfoundland Limited. We have only one copy my colleague tells me but the fact that we are tabling it, I am sure that he can get more copies if we want them.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do not know what else I can say about the asbestosis bit. I have responded on three occasions to it and the Leader of the Opposition indicated last night that this was one of the most important documents and he would not move in his position at all without the tabling of that. Well there it is.

MR. NEARY: Could the minister get copies made? I would like to have a copy.

MR. COLLINS: The House can get them made. Let the House make them is probably the best thing.

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

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the minister, and I had not said the contracts were the most important documents. I said the matters to grow out of the contracts are, in my view, among the most important ever to come before this Committee. And I thank the minister for tabling the contracts. I think that is the right decision, and it will certainly make, I would hope, matters go more quickly. As I said to him I knew that he was not in possession of them ministerially, but I explained why we had to ask him, partially because it is his money in the parliamentary sense. He is asking the Committee to vote the monies, I think, it is \$6 millions or \$7 millions to be spent this year. And even more importantly it looks as if the Public Works estimates will never come up for discussion, it will go through, it will slip through under the guillotine, the closure rule, the seventy-five hour time limit. And so there will never be any discussion of the matter unless we raised it here now.

Now I thank the minister, as I said I would, I will ask leave to withdraw my motion, if it is granted well and good, if not, then it has to be, you know, voted upon when it is the appropriate time. But as I understand the rule, Mr. Chairman, I need unanimous consent to withdraw a motion, so I would ask or I ask Your Honour to ask or whatever is correct if that is the wish of the Committee. I feel that our purpose has been achieved, I will be in touch or I will ask my colleague and friend the gentleman from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) to be in touch with Dr. Sellikof to relay the minister's words as they were given here in the Committee a few minutes ago.

MR. COLLINS: Dr. Sellikof knows them already.

MR. ROBERTS: We will get the extract of the Hansard. Well I do not think that Dr. Sellikof knows them already. Although -

MR. COLLINS: I cannot say for sure, but I expect he does.

MR. ROBERTS: Well he may, I mean I have not spoken with Dr. Sellikof since Friday evening last. That is seven days past, I do not know what has gone on in those seven days of course, but then

Mr. Roberts:

we will go on from there. And so if that is in order, if I could have a look at the contract, Your Honour, it has been tabled, but there seems to be a lamentable delay in getting material from the table of the House to the member.

MR. NEARY: They are getting them done today.

MR. ROBERTS: Are they?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: But then I would like to have a look at it any way. You know, for example, that letter that the gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) tabled last week from Mr. Andrew Crosbie, I have never seen a copy of it. It has never been sent to my office or here that I am aware of.

MR. NEARY: I got a copy of it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the hon. gentleman -

MR. NEARY: I have it here.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. But I mean things are supposed to be distributed automatically, and some times it takes a while for them to get from the table.

But any way I will ask leave to withdraw that motion, if it is the wish of the Committee, and then we can go on and talk about some other matters on the Health estimates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! If the hon. minister would just permit me one remark. On the point brought up by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I would certainly undertake to see what the hold-up is in the circulation of the documents and papers tabled.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. ROBERTS: All I asked was for leave -

MR. CROSBIE: I believe I have the right, Mr. Chairman, to speak in the Committee the same as the hon. gentleman.

MR. ROBERTS: Why not? Mr. Chairman, it has nothing at all -

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman is finished his remarks.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I have not. No. No. No I have asked -

MR. CROSBIE: If you have not -

MR. ROBERTS: - leave to withdraw a motion, if it is granted well and good, if not then well and good equally.

MR. CROSBIE: I want to ask some questions before.

MR. ROBERTS: Well he can ask all of the questions he wants, except as a minister he is not allowed to ask questions of the ministry.

MR. CROSBIE: I want to ask questions of the hon. gentleman, that is all.

MR. ROBERTS: Sure.

MR. CROSBIE: I have a question for the hon. gentleman.

MR. ROBERTS: Sure. But let us get the motion out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The rules indicate that a motion on the Order Paper or a motion put, proposed to be put can be withdrawn with the unanimous agreement, and I would ask the House is it the unanimous agreement that this motion be withdrawn?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, you know, before this matter comes up I want to ask the hon. gentleman a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand the unanimous agreement is not given at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. CROSBIE: I mean the issue is not dealt with yet. Surely before unanimous consent is given we can discuss or ask a question.

MR. ROBERTS: You can ask any questions you want, but I mean if leave is not given -

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

MR. CROSBIE: The question does not arise yet, because it has not, you know, I just want to ask this question. I had missed the debate last night, why is this Dr. Sellikof and his group dealing with Opposition? and this question: Why is not Dr. Sellikof and his group dealing with the government or the Department of Health?

MR. MURPHY: Three guesses. Of course -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I will do my best to respond to the hon. gentleman.

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

MR. ROBERTS: - for legitimate reasons, he was not here last night at all. Dr. Sellikof, although the hon. gentleman's memory would serve him if he would cast it back, I approached Dr. Sellikof three or four years ago.- 'Tom' pass me that file - I read the odd book or magazine, I suppose we all do. Is it in here?

MR. RIDEOUT: Oh yes!

MR. ROBERTS: And I came across an article in a magazine called Saturday Review, I believe, and it had quite a long piece about asbestosis. I said, "Well we have an asbestos mine, maybe we have an asbestosis problem," So I took my handy little dictation book and I wrote a letter off to Dr. Sellikof in July 1973, and back came an answer in due course, and all that has come out in the House before. It was extensively debated last year and other times. So Dr. Sellikof called me one afternoon three or four months ago now to say that they had decided to come. And he had not been in touch with me before because he had been in touch with the company to see if they would co-operate, and they had agreed, and to be in touch with the union to see if they would co-operate, and the union had agreed. And that is why he has been in touch with me. He has also been in touch with the minister's officials, he has also been in touch with the University and I know not with whom else. I mean Dr. Sellikof is not approaching the government through me. Dr. Sellikof is approaching me in my capacity as a member who showed a lot of interest in this problem three or four years ago and since.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Well then, Mr. Chairman, on that point, you know, this whole debate appears to me to be extraordinary. You know, it is used for political reasons, that is all this is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: It is completely political. Dr. Sellikof has never approached the government officially, he may have talked to the government officials. The only request to the government for any financial assistance for Dr. Sellikof's study came from the member

Mr. Crosbie:

for - the district is called Baie Verte now - in a letter from him.

MR. ROBERTS: Who better to approach the government?

MR. CROSBIE: Who better to approach the government? If Dr.

Sellikof is coming down to do an independent study with his group one would expect that if Dr. Sellikof needed financial assistance, wanted to be independent of the company and the union that he would discuss it with the government and make his own request to the government not do it through an Opposition member or do it, and then if the Opposition member or the Leader of the Opposition wanted to support his request and so on, fine. But the request has never formally come to the government from Dr. Sellikof, simply a letter from the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout). There is a committee of ministers -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The minister will surely agree that an American doctor up in New York would not know anything about the party presiding except through a member of the House.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. the doctor from New York knows that there are governments and there are Oppositions. I am not criticizing the hon. doctor, I do not know what he knows or does not know. But a motion of censure is being moved on the Minister of Health by the Leader of the Opposition, you know, a completely trumped up and spurious motion attacking the Minister of Health. And Dr. Sellikof in this important visit that he may make and so on is being used for a political reason, a political attack on the Minister of Health and nothing other but that. And Dr. Sellikof as the Minister of Health has said or any other group of competence and independence who what to examine the asbestos question or any other will have the support of this government, will get any assistance it can from the government, would get financial assistance if that is required, and so on in the normal channels.

I remember there was a committee of three Cabinet ministers, the Minister of Health, the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations and myself who are on the Committee looking into the whole business of

Mr. Crosbie:

health and safety in mines in particular, and in industry generally in the Province. And this question came up and it was discussed at that meeting, and the decision of the Minister of Health was the one that we agreed on at that meeting. So you know the motion of censure should be moved against the three of us or, you know, the government generally or whatever. And as far as health and safety in mines and in working places goes, Mr. Chairman, the record of this government is so far ahead of the record of the last government that it is completely unbelievable. There was no Director of Environmental Health in the Department of Health in the days when the Leader of the Opposition was the Minister of Health.

MR. ROBERTS: Nor in the days of the hon. gentleman.

MR. CROSBIE: Exactly. In the days of the hon. gentleman either. This is a new departure that has come in with the last Minister of Health and his predecessor, Dr. A. T. Rowe. And there has been more attention paid and more done in the field of improving health and safety in mines and industrial plants in the Province in the last several years than ever before. And there is a Committee of the Cabinet now considering it and making recommendations to Cabinet, a Committee of officials has met with the unions, and

MR. CROSBIE:

Dr. Sellikof is quite welcome and the Minister of Health has said that he will get any assistance we can give. If he makes a submission to the government and says that he needs more assistance in this particular study he will get very sympathetic treatment. But it is a distinct disservice that Dr. Sellikof and his study, for this to be made a cheap, political issue in the House of Assembly and used as a means of a cheap political attack on the Minister of Health. That is all it is. Because if the Leader of the Opposition was genuinely desirous of seeing that we assist Dr. Sellikof, he would speak privately to the Minister of Health or speak to the government and arrange it and if we need any urging, urge it and so on. Mr. Chairman, the whole thing I think, is contemptible and all it is is damaging to the prospects of Dr. Sellikof's study.

Now mind you despite the fact that this is being used in a cheap political way, a cheap political attack, the Minister of Health has stated the government's position, that we will give whatever assistance we find to be required that Dr. Sellikof asks for. But I think the whole thing is contemptible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Mines and Energy would have done better to stay in Ottawa. For a man with his record of maladministration in the Fisheries Department where he presided over the goof that has cost this Province \$4 million or \$5 million and knew about it and did nothing about it, to stand up and say, Mr. Chairman, that -

MR. CROSBIE: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! A point of order has been risen.

MR. CROSBIE: I will discuss that question of the Fisheries Department right now if it is in order. If it is not in order right now I would like the Chairman to rule the comments out as irrelevant.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order. I realize that I think the point of order is well-taken. I was not intending to comment on it at all. I would like to be able to because I think it would be a fertile subject but I would like if Your Honour - I do not intend

MR. ROBERTS:

to pursue the fisheries thing although it would be very useful if we could and I hope we will - I would like to carry on in responding to the minister's remarks. So Your Honour may wish to make a ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point of order has been suitably disposed of.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Well thank you, Mr. Chairman. The minister gets up and talks about cheap political attacks. Well he is the expert on cheap political attacks as he has shown over the years in this House and outside. I find it merely interesting that the gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) and the gentleman for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), the minister, are in political bed together. Truly, as I said earlier, truly -

MR. SMALLWOOD: I hope not.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I say truly doth politics make very strange bed-fellows. When the coalition comes I wonder who will be whom. It will be very, very interesting indeed.

The fact remains, Sir, that the conduct of my friend from Bate Verte-White Bay (Mr. Pideout) has been exemplary throughout this. He approached the minister. He approached him in a letter. He approached him privately.

MR. CROSBIE: Just as it should be.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, and, Mr. Chairman, my conduct has been exactly that as it should be. The hon. gentleman may not think so but I would gladly put my record against his anytime he wants. He is **Simon Pure** to hear him talk until the facts come out about the way he runs his department, Mr. Chairman. Now he comes out and talks about cheap political attacks. We were doing quite well on this item until the hon. gentleman decided to either lower the level of the debate or raise the temperature of the debate whichever it is. I would say, Sir, he has done a distinct disservice to himself as well as to the Committee and to the party of which he is temporarily a part.

MR. LINDRICK: Do we have to listen to this?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. If the hon. minister for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) Mr. Chairman, wishes to raise a point let him raise it. Let me say that I sat here and listened to the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy launch into another of his little tirades, another of his Friday morning tirades. Early in the morning he gets out of bed and on the wrong side and he comes in and after we dispose of the matter in Committee then he gets up and he launches - and that is his right. I listened to him so let the gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) listen to my few weak, conciliatory, mild remarks made in response to the cheap political attacks which the Minister of Mines and Energy put on it. If the gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) wishes to raise a point, Sir, he above all people should know, Sir, he is not to interrupt the member who is speaking. He has been admonished from the Chair time and time again. Let him raise a point of order or one of his spurious, weak, precocious and precious points of privilege if he so wishes. If not, Sir, let him be silent. Let him be silent, Mr. Chairman, let him be silent, let him be quiet. Let him observe the rules of the House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the matter I think has come along very well. The Minister of Health after a little persuasion from hon. gentlemen opposite has gone much further than he had previously because the letter which he wrote my friend, the gentleman for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) was a rejection of a suggestion and now the minister has said he will entertain the suggestion. I am glad it is that minister and not the Minister of Mines and Energy, **Because the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, unless he thinks of an idea there can be no possible merit in it. He is the** most opinionated man I have ever met. He is sometimes right but he is often wrong. I would hope, Sir, the Minister of Health will show some compassion as I believe he will which is more than the gentleman for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) has ever shown or ever will.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I earlier asked if I had leave to withdraw the motion. The hon. gentleman for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) wanted to make a little debate and so he did and that is right and proper. I suppose I could fall into his little game and say I withdraw my request

MR. ROBERTS:

for leave to withdraw but I do not. I have achieved what I set out to. We now have a commitment and we will see if Dr. Sellikof wishes to ask for some money and if he does we will see what the result is. We also have some agreements tabled although I have not seen them yet. I do not know what the clerk's office is doing because I would like to have them for the debate. That is the whole point of it. If we cannot get them a little more quickly, Your Honour, they will not be of any use to us at all in the debate. But I would still ask for leave to withdraw this. If it is granted, well and good. If not - and any member who objects can stop it from being granted - then we should put it to a vote and we will see who votes where and we will see what the result is and that is the end of that. Then I would like to go on. I have a number of other points.

Other hon. members may very well wish to raise some points with respect to the Health estimates. We are talking of a sum of money that is about twenty per cent of the total expenditure of the government this year. It is worth a little discussion, Sir. Now, so I ask if I have leave. If anybody else wants to get up and take a crack at me, well as long as it is within the rules, have at it boys and we will go back at it from there.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member will permit, I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition wishes me to ask the House if he has leave to withdraw his motion.

MR. NEAPY: Before we proceed with that matter, Sir, I would like to have the same privilege as the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, to have a few words.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I believe our rules are silent on whether comments can be made on such a request. I would therefore, unless someone can prove to the contrary and in that respect assist the Chair, I think I would countenance some comments on that request to withdraw.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Sir, has boxed himself in, got himself in a bit of a corner. Now the hon. Leader after being severely chastised by members on both sides of the House now wants to change his position. Well that is fine. But, Sir, the only man who can really set the record straight is the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) because I understood clearly-I thought last night the Minister of Health told the Committee that he had had a number of discussions with the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), a number of discussions following the letter. So I believe it is the duty and the responsibility of the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) to get up and tell the House just what happened during these discussions. Was the minister co-operative? Did the minister tell the member that if Dr. Sellikof came to Newfoundland that the government would co-operate? Because that was not the impression that was left when the Leader of the Opposition launched his vicious attack on the Minister of Health.

I believe, Sir, that the Leader of the Opposition has done his member an injustice. The member after writing the letter held a number of discussions and surely - I mean did he come away thinking that the government was not going to help, that the minister would not co-operate? You know I am calling upon the member now in all decency and as an honourable man to get up and tell the House if the minister agrees. I do not think they were meant to be private and confidential, it was for public consumption I presume because the member could go back and tell his constituents about the discussions he had with the minister. But I believe the member should tell the House what transpired during these discussions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I understand that that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has withheld his agreement that the motion be withdrawn.

MR. NEARY: For a moment, Sir, until I hear from the member.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, a point of order, Sir. Your Honour asked for comments on that matter. I mean I would submit that the matter is not debatable. Your Honour asks for leave. Either leave is granted or

MR. ROBERTS:

leave is not granted. If leave is granted that is the end of it. If leave is not granted, that is the end of it. The debate carries on. Since leave has not been granted, that is well and good. I have no particular hard feelings about that. We will continue to debate the matter. We will press it forward and in due course there will be a vote and what will be will be. I do not think there is anything more to it than that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair understands that unanimous leave has not been granted.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right!

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, if it depends on me I will give leave. But I was hoping that before I did the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) would clear up this whole matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A ruling has been made that the understanding of the Chair is that unanimous leave has not been granted to withdraw. So the motion before the House is that subhead 1001-01 be reduced by the amount of \$14,783.

The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, I have spoken three times in this debate. I think I have - and the minister will agree with me - I have mentioned conversations with him and that is it. You know there is nothing else to say. You know I got a rejection of the letter. We talked about the letter again after and are still talking about it as far as I know. But I have not made any accusations along the line. I have spoken in debate three times. That is all I intend to say about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: I have tried three times. With regard to the subject raised by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and just responded to by the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), I acknowledged the letter. The hon. Leader of the Opposition read the letter into the record. He read the letter to me and he read my reply. When I spoke after that I did indicate to the Committee that subsequent to the letter, my reply, my response, going to the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) he and I had had I do not know how many discussions, possibly two or three. I indicated to him then that we were most interested in Dr. Sellikof coming in, that we were co-operating in every way that we could. We did not want to let it seem that we might be taking the whole thing over. But any area which we could co-operate in we were all too happy to do it. I also indicated to him that as time moves on and Dr. Sellikof arrives if there appears to be a need which there could very well be, for financial assistance we will certainly entertain it and do what we could for it.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, a point of - not to a point of order, I mean back in the debate again. The hon. minister has given his version

MR. ROBERTS:

of a conversation and that stands. The hon. gentleman for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has said that the version is not entirely correct. Well that is fine. If we want to carry on with it, we can. But it seems to me essentially pointless. The important thing is what has been said in the Committee. The minister has made a number of comments in the Committee and they stand and speak for themselves. Others have made a number of comments. The gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) may have a genuine interest in what passed between the two men. That is fine. But I submit what counts -

MR. NEARY: Well that is what counts.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no. What counts is what each member has said here in the Committee, Sir, and it would seem to me to be completely beside the point to have one member get up and say, "Here is what I recall of several conversations". And then another member get up and say, "Here is what I recall of several conversations." Where do we get? That is reminiscent of the infamous basement meeting where I suppose history will be 100 years trying to decide whether somebody said "aye" or somebody said "nay". It seems to me utterly pointless.

The gentleman for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has said a number of times, Mr. Chairman, his position on it. The Minister of Health has equally said a number of times his position on the matter. The Minister of Health has given a version of what went on at a meeting. The gentleman for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) says that was not entirely so. Well that is fine. But I cannot think of anything less profitable to this House than going into a discussion of what amounted to, not certainly secret meetings, but conversations held by members outside the House. What counts is what is said in the House, Sir. That is why we are sent here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the Leader of the Opposition wants to withdraw, I agree. I will not hold it up, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Committee ready for the question.

It is moved that subhead 1001-01 be reduced by the amount of

MR. CHAIRMAN:

\$14,783. Is it the pleasure of the Committee that the said motion be adopted? Those in favour 'aye'. Those contrary 'nay'. I declare the motion lost.

MR. NEARY: The record notes one vote for.

MR. ROBERTS: The record does not note anything on votes.

AN HON. MEMBER: I say divide the House.

MR. ROWE: All right. Let us divide up the House sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development.

MR. MURPHY: I do not think you divide in Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Industrial and Rural Development I believe had risen. But he has sat down again.

MR. LINDRIGAN: A number of people had risen. I assumed there was going to be a division.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

The Chair cannot hear.

The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Chairman, what do you think we are standing up for. We are the three necessary or whatever it is to have a standing vote. We would like to have a standing vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

It is my understanding that in a division if three members stand a counted vote is carried out. But in Committee it is not a division and if an hon. member requests a counted vote, this will be granted. A count has been requested.

All those in favour of the motion please stand. All those against the motion please stand. "Ayes", thirty-one. "Nays", zero.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, if the motion has been disposed of we will carry on with the debate. I said quite clearly that if the motion was not withdrawn I was prepared to vote against it.

MR. MORGAN: Shameful! Shameful!

MR. ROBERTS: Well the hon. gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) says, "Shameful". Well that is his problem, Sir.

MR. RIDEOUT: His record is shameful.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman's record is shameful. Two people dead because of the negligence of the hon. gentleman's department.

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

MR. ROBERTS: What is the matter? What are you up for now?

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

On a point of privilege. Mr. Chairman, it is despicable -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: A point of order.

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications has risen on a point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, my emotions can be controlled. I heard a comment, a recent comment made a few minutes ago, a few seconds ago by the Leader of the Opposition. It is a most despicable, distasteful and irresponsible statement coming from an irresponsible individual, to play on a recent unfortunate tragic accident in this Province, to use that unfortunate tragic accident for political points to be scored in this House of Assembly.

MR. ROBERTS: There is no point of privilege. What is the point of privilege?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, the point of privilege is this, that that kind of comment, that kind of despicable comment reflects on each and every hon. gentleman in this Assembly. It reflects on the Assembly. Mr. Chairman, I beg that you ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that kind of despicable statement, that kind of despicable attitude to score political points, from reflecting on this House of Assembly and all members in this House of Assembly.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, we have seen in this Committee a deliberate abuse of the points of privilege. The rules are clear, Sir, and a point of privilege must be accompanied by a substantive motion. The only thing

MR. ROBERTS:

despicable about this is the minister's conduct of his office. He misinformed this House two days ago by saying barricades were up and yesterday after it had become public that they were not up he had to withdraw that. So if I said something that was unparliamentary if Your Honour will tell me so I shall gladly withdraw it of course.

MR. ROBERTS: The only thing despicable has been the way the gentleman from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) has been months bringing in -

MR. MORGAN: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, call order.

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I listened to him.

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Sit down!

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

I understand that the point raised by the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications with regards to a specific remark made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Leader of the Opposition has indicated that he undertakes to withdraw that remark and I understand that he -

MR. ROBERTS: If it is out of order I will withdraw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The remark as I understand it was unparliamentary and I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition if he would withdraw that specific remark.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I certainly withdraw it without any reservation at all, Mr. Chairman, and delighted to do so. My opinion stays but -

MR. MORGAN: Are you going to withdraw it because it is unparliamentary?

MR. ROBERTS: Of course I withdraw it because it is unparliamentary. There is no other reason to withdraw it. It is an accurate statement.

MR. MORGAN: It is only estimated.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, we will see when the enquiries and the reports are in. We will see. We will see, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I think the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has risen on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am not accustomed to rising on a point of order but I would submit that what the Leader of the Opposition has said has been one of the most base reflections upon an hon. member that one could possibly have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: I would submit to Your Honour, I know the hon. Leader of the Opposition has withdrawn it but, Mr. Chairman, there are adequate authorities here like Beauchesne, page 127 that one is not allowed to make a charge against a member and I think that the hon. Leader of the Opposition -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: I wonder whether he should be made to apologize to the House as well as to withdraw.

MR. ROBERTS: Order, Order. Order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I believe that the measure to which the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has been disposed of by my ruling and by the hon. Leader of the Opposition's withdrawal.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood).

MR. SMALLWOOD: The statement to which the hon. minister objected was the Leader of the Opposition's declaration that he had been the cause of the death of two women.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. MORGAN: That is the charge. That is the charge.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has withdrawn that but added that it is true. He added the words, "But it is true."

MR. DOODY: Hear! Hear!

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

MR. WELLS: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. WELLS: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Chairman has not recognized one of us yet.

MR. ROBERTS: No. That is why I am standing -

MR. WELLS: Well I am standing.

MR. ROBERTS: - so that the Chair will recognize one of us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I would recognize the hon. House Leader.

MR. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had thought, Mr. Chairman, that this had been dealt with but let us, I think it is necessary to review matters.

The charge by the hon. the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was in the hearing of everyone in this House that the hon. Minister was responsible in his ministerial capacity for the deaths of two persons. Now that is completely unparliamentary. It is an allegation made against a minister and a member of this House in the conduct of his duty.

Now I understood then that the Leader of the Opposition afterwards withdrew that. Am I correct in that?

MR. ROBERTS: Right.

MR. WELLS: Now I think that such a remark and an allegation, Mr. Chairman, should be unreservedly withdrawn and when withdrawn that nothing should be added by way of qualification or rider and I would ask, quite apart from technical rulings, I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition as a man and a member of this House to make it clear to the Committee that no such allegation of any kind is intended against the hon. minister, that it is unreservedly withdrawn and the truth of it is not in question because it is not true and that his negligence as a Minister of the Crown was in no way involved and he was not negligent and that whatever happened to cause these unfortunate two deaths it was not as a result of this

MR. WELLS: negligence.

MR. MORGAN: The enquiry will decide.

MR. WELLS: The courts are there. The magisterial enquiry, whatever else has to be set up will be set up and the procedures are all there anyway for this to be enquired into and verdicts will be given. At this stage it is not only unparliamentary but improper in every sense, Mr. Chairman, to try and attribute some kind of negligence or blame to the minister. The question of blame if any for this accident will be ascribed in due course by the appropriate bodies who deal with that and I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to stop and think and not to be upset or angry because of the exchange that has taken place and as a man stand up and apologize for making that kind of allegation and let the matter be dealt with in future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. WELLS: I ask him that, Mr. Chairman, not just as Government House Leader but as a man who has some pride to be a member of this House as we all do and I think it is time to put -

MR. SIMMONS: Are you speaking politics now?

MR. WELLS: No. No. I think it is time to put this sort of thing behind us and let it be brought to an end.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, if I may to that point

MR. ROBERTS:

of whatever it is. I do not think it is much of a point of order. I have no hesitation in withdrawing without any qualification, no hesitation at all. I did and I will do it again. I have an opinion which I shall hold to. That is my right. The hon. gentlemen opposite would agree with that. They may feel my opinion is a correct one or an incorrect one. But I am still entitled to hold it just, as the hon. gentleman or the hon. the minister is entitled to hold his opinion. I say further, and I agree with the hon. gentleman, that the magisterial inquiry will give us some answers. It will not, in my view as I have made clear, set forth the full situation. It will not deal with all the questions which should be dealt with. I welcome the minister's assurance and I shall hold him to it - he is a senior minister and I know he is a man of his word - that all other steps that are necessary will be taken because the problem with the magisterial inquiry is that it only deals with the cause of death. I do not just mean drowning or strangulation in that sense, but the proximate cause.

The worrisome things about the terrible tragedy which occurred West of Grand Falls two or three nights past -

MR. MORGAN: Stick to the point of order!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

SOME NON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! A point of order -

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. the minister, Mr. Chairman, was allowed to - and properly so in my view - to make a few brief remarks. Am I not to be allowed the same?

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I am not debating anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. Leader of the Opposition is commenting on the second point of order. I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition has he completed his remarks because I will then let some other member speak?

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Chairman, I have not. I am just simply saying that the problem - and I am commenting upon a remark made by the minister. That surely is both proper and appropriate - that the problem with the magisterial inquiry is that it will not deal with, as I understand it, the advice I have, with the real problems which are the Price problem and the question of environment and highways and things that I cannot debate now because it would not be in order. I welcome the minister's assurance that a broader inquiry will be granted if necessary, because I believe one will be, and then we will get the report. The Minister of Justice, I think, will make it public although he refused to give us that assurance the other day in the House. Then we will see what we will see and the matter will be settled.

Now let me make one further comment on the point of order, Sir. The whole incident arose because the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) insists upon interrupting -

MR. MORGAN: No such thing! No such thing!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Bonavista South insists upon interrupting speakers. He persists in it despite repeated admonitions from the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: He does it time and time again, Sir. That is not a reason. If I have been lead astray it is my fault for going astray. But, Sir, let it be said that the hon. gentleman at the very least leads us astray. If I am in error for having been lead astray he, Sir, is equally at fault for leading people astray. He is doing his very best to destroy this House, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The point of order before the House arose from remarks that were ascribed to the hon. Leader of the Opposition,

MR. CHAIRMAN:

subsequent to the ruling on the first point of order. These remarks, in the view of the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), tended to qualify his withdrawal. This was the issue in the second point of order. I understand from the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he has undertaken to withdraw any suggestions that they do qualify his withdrawal of his remarks concerning the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications. I would take it therefore that this second point of order has been disposed of.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now I will proceed with the Health estimates. First of all, I want to ask the minister if he could tell us what is proposed to be done this year at Flowers Cove, which is in my constituency in the Straits of Belle Isle? The minister, I think, is relatively familiar with the matter. There is now a doctor at Flowers Cove. He is employed by the I.G.A., paid for out of Medicare in one way or another. There is also at Flowers Cove a nursing station which has been there I do not know for how long, but as long as I have any recollection, and that is ten or twelve years. I suppose it was there long before that. So that is the medical services available to the people of Flowers Cove. Those are the only medical

MR. ROBERTS:

services available between St. Anthony, which is seventy miles of execrable road to the North, and whatever is happening, and the minister might care to tell us a little more of what is proposed to be done, at Port Saunders, which is about eighty miles to the South. Flowers Cove, a large and a very pleasant and very prosperous and progressive community is about midway between St. Anthony and Port Saunders. I understand it is proposed to make the Port Saunders Public Health Center, as it has been for three or four years past, into a hospital. It has been put out under a board.

MR. H. COLLINS: I will bring you up to date.

MR. ROBERTS: That is what I am saying. I quite genuinely would like to know, because all the advice that I was ever given as Minister of Health, and I am sure all the advice that the Minister of Justice got when he was Health Minister, or that the Minister of Mines and Energy got when he was Health Minister, and I am reasonably certain all the advice which the present minister gets from his officials and his expert advisors is that to build a small hospital at any place where it can be possibly avoided is bad medical practice, bad hospital practice, and bad everything practice. So I would hope that we are not going to see a hospital in Port Saunders.

Now I suppose I could talk of definitions of hospitals. But by a hospital I mean places where surgery is carried out and where - you know, as opposed to a public health center where you have a few beds and if a patient needs to be admitted for a few days for observation or for some treatments it can be carried out there and not have to go the 150 miles to St. Anthony. But I am not so much concerned with Port Saunders at this moment. That is in an adjoining constituency. The member for St. Barbe (Mr. Maynard) I know is interested in it, and I am sure has raised the matter on occasion, but I am concerned with Flowers Cove.

To bring the Committee up on the matter, and I think the minister will allow me to do this, there has been agitation for some

MR. ROBERTS:

time to have a public health center built at Flowers Cove. There has been one at Poddickton that was put there while I was Health Minister. Then we have had the one developed at Port Saunders. When I was Health Minister we built a similar health center in Deer Lake, a very active committee there in the Humber Valley constituency, a very active committee headed up, I believe, by the bank manager, Mr. Douglas Elliott, I believe it was - I think he has gone on since then to another post with the bank - but Dr. MacDonald and a number of the leading citizens of the community - the minister himself had not strayed into politics in those days - and it was serving just Deer Lake instead of a larger area. But they raised a lot of money and we, the government, the Health Department, put up a certain amount of money. Together that produced what I believe to be a first class facility. I believe it is serving the people of Deer Lake very, very well and it has worked out admirably, certainly far better than it would have been if a small hospital had gone in in Deer Lake.

You know, given the factor of thirty miles from Corner Brook and the massive, magnificent new Western Memorial Hospital, which is in service now in fact, all of that together, you know, gives the people of Deer Lake and Pasadena, and I suppose for that matter Howley and Cormack, a far better medical service than they would have had had we followed another route.

But anyway that takes me a little away from my point in Flowers Cove. I am speaking in behalf of those people because they are probably the worst served residents of my district medically. And the district of the Straits of Belle Isle, although it is geographically at a more remote part of this Province, is in many ways very well served medically. St. Anthony and the nearby communities have access to a magnificent hospital - by a hospital I do not just mean the buildings. They are the least important part - the staff, the doctors, the nurses, the technicians, the paraprofessionals, magnificent people who provide a level of health care that is comparable

MR. ROBERTS:

to that available anywhere in this Province.

The people on the Labrador side have a more difficult problem because they are isolated, and in due course I want to see a doctor set up over there. But there is an interesting thing happening on the Labrador side now in view of all the fuss with Quebec. We are really seeing an inter-border exchange because the people in the Newfoundland part of the Labrador Coast, communities from L'Anse-au-Clair on up to Red Bay, more and more are going to Blanc Sablon where there is an incredible hospital. It is eighty beds when about forty would be adequate, the hospital is nowhere near fully utilized. It is staffed by three or four doctors. Of course, they are English speaking because most of the people in that part of Quebec Province, I guess they have their mother tongue as English but their original mother tongue was English. They are not French by decent. If they speak French now, if they are French it is by the process of osmosis. But really the community of Long Point and the community of L'Anse-au-Clair are sister communities in many ways.

So the people on the Labrador side are going more and more to Blanc Sablon for their primary medical care. There are three doctors there and a dentist and good facilities indeed, facilities I suppose comparable, say, to those available in Labrador West. The Jackman Hospital in Labrador City does not have any better facilities than Our Lady Of Lourdes, I think it is called, the hospital in Blanc Sablon, built under the aegis of the late Dr. Camille Marcoux, a very fine man who lost his life in a helicopter accident on the Straits. Interestingly enough, the Blanc Sablon hospital area then refers back to St. Anthony. So we get quite a mutual back and forth. Indeed the doctors of Blanc Sablon, several of them, the head doctor, Dr. Annie Law, worked for many years at St. Anthony as a medical officer, and I am not sure what the exact relationship is but there is a very strong working

MR. ROBERTS:

relationship between the Quebec North shore and St. Anthony in the medical sense.

It has some unusual side effects. The Quebec government pay transportation costs and our government of course do not, you know, other than the air ambulance type of thing. So a person from Blanc Sablon who wants to go to St. Anthony for treatment has his way paid. If he has to go on the airplane, as he has really, there is no other way across, he has his way paid. Whereas if a Labradorian or a Newfoundlander living in L'Anse-au-Clair or Red Bay wants to go to St. Anthony, or has to go for medical reasons, he must pay his own way. It is a glaring inequity which is caused by virtue of the fact the Quebec Province is more generous in that sense than the Newfoundland Province is. And because you have the two side by side, it is causing some trouble. People understand it, but it is hard to accept.

But in any event the Labrador medical problem I do not think is as urgent. And particularly if we can pry out of the Ministry of Health a few dollars to set up a nursing station at Red Bay, and Nurse Taylor who has been at Forteau for many years would like to move into Red Bay, and then that would give us a nursing station at Red Bay and one at Forteau and with access to the hospital at Blanc Sablon things are not too bad. But on the Flowers Cove side the problem is different and I think more serious.

The Flowers Cove public health center has been in the cards or on the table for a long time. I am told by my friend from St. Barbe North, who represented the district previously, that the minister's predecessor, Dr. Fowe, promised it if the Port Saunders clinic proved to be a success. Well the Port Saunders center has obviously proven to be a great success. It is being expanded upon. It has been put under a board and presumably will work very well and we all hope so.

So the time has come now for Flowers Cove, and what I ask of

MR. ROBERTS:

the minister is if he could indicate what is going to be done this year, what needs to be done. It is not more staff. I think there are probably adequate staff, given the fact the travelling doctor is now based at Flowers Cove and he does there and across the Straits as well, and given the fact that there are two or three midwife-nurses maybe one or two Canadian girls there, we may need a technician or two, a combined lab and x-ray technician, but that should not be an obstacle. What is needed is enough money to provide accommodation for the doctor and his family, it is always a necessity in these matters, and I would think really a new building for the clinic. That building should have in it doctor's offices and waiting rooms, and it should have examining rooms, and it should have a treatment room, and possibly one or two beds for holding purposes only for emergencies, and it should have x-ray and laboratory facilities on the scale available at, say, Roddickton or Port Saunders, the normal and proper and appropriate facilities for that type of complex.

So really that is my question to the minister. I know he is familiar with it. Although he has not been there himself he has had his officials down and we appreciate that very much. Dr. Klippert and Mr. Cover, I believe, were there, two of the minister's senior advisors, and I have not heard what their report was. I know what they said at the meeting. No, I do not. I have been told by the other parties at the meeting what - Mr. Steadman Mitchelmore in Green Island Brook, and I received a report from him - as to what went on at the meeting and it seemed to go very well. But it was only an interim meeting and so we are now at the point where I would ask the minister what is going to be done this year. Are we going to get the \$50,000 or \$100,000 that is necessary to enable a new facility to be provided at Flowers Cove?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Certainly Flowers Cove is one of the places in Newfoundland where something has got to be done, and got to be done just as soon as possible, in order to bring about the improvements which are so necessary in terms of delivering health care to the people of the region. There are two places in Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, I suppose some hon. members could mention more, but there are two places where there is a dire need for facilities, and that is Flowers Cove and Trepassey. A move has been made in Trepassey on the Southern tip of the Peninsula here to provide them with a proper clinic, a health clinic.

As the hon. member mentioned, as a result of a request from Mr. Steadman Mitchelmore in the area of Flowers Cove, two of my top staff went in there to a meeting some time ago, not that we wanted to go to be apprised of the situation, we knew what it was, but we were requested to go in, and of course we sent two of our best people in there. As I said there is no doubt in anybody's mind about the need there. And I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that something will be done this year, I am pretty sure we cannot complete the job this year, because it is a year of restraint and constraint, but we are making a start, because we have to. It is a place -

MR. ROBERTS: But it has all got to be done.

MR. COLLINS: Well, first of all, the people in the department are looking at what has got to be done in terms of planning the type of facility which is suitable. I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition, not because it is in his district or anything like that, but because it is the place where we just cannot permit, you know, the present circumstances to continue, because it is, not a threat, but it is certainly not conducive to bringing about or providing the health care to the people of that region.

MR. ROBERTS: With the tunnel construction you will need a lot more people.

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes.

Now with regard to Port Saunders, last Fall the Health Committee in Port Saunders received a substantial Federal grant under the Local Initiatives Programme. And while the facility there was in reasonably good shape, it was said that it was not large enough, and some extensions were needed in terms of providing lab services etc. Now the request was made of this government to make a financial contribution in terms of the capital grant. It is a very difficult position to be put in, Mr. Chairman, when the Federal Government indicates that \$100,000 is available, but it is contingent upon the Province making a commitment, it sort of puts the Province under pressure, and that happens very often where LIP applications are made. Now this Province did provide \$50,000 to that community, to that Committee, and they have proceeded to enlarge and extend and improve and renovate the facility which they had. They had some, when I said 'they,' the Committee had some very good ideas, some big ideas. They were going to construct a facility of about twenty or twenty-four beds. And after a lot of meetings with the people involved, and with I.G.A., too, I might say, who were operating the facility prior to now. I forget the exact number of beds, but we have reduced the size of it considerably whereby it is not a hospital, it could be called a hospital, but it will be a fairly substantial health clinic with x-ray and lab facilities, and I believe when it is finished it will be a great addition to that particular unit and certainly go a long way towards solving the needs of that particular area of the Province.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Excuse me! Mr. Chairman, I will take up two minutes of the House, if I may, if I could have leave to say something about Forestry? It will be just for one second.

MR. ROBERTS: Is it a ministerial statement or what?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, just a short one. I use this hoping that the press will pick it up, Mr. Chairman, in case I do not have an opportunity this afternoon. With the House sitting we do not get many opportunities, and we have some concern this weekend that I would like to express to

MR. ROUSSEAU:

the people, especially in Central Newfoundland.

MR. ROBERTS: About forestry?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes. And to some extent as well in Eastern Newfoundland.

We are ready, we are putting our extra crews on, but the high winds during the past couple of weeks have dried up the land much faster than we thought it would. We have no rating system yet, but we are concerned about the possibility of fires, especially in Central and also in Eastern Newfoundland this weekend. And we will be making more statements on that. We certainly would hope that the people who are using the forests for hunting or fishing or recreation this weekend will pay a great respect for our forests. Certainly we would not like to see the same situation occur this year as last year. But, as I say, the hazard is of concern to us, and we would ask the people, especially in Central and in Eastern Newfoundland, because of the high winds during the past couple of weeks, we have had about five grass fires out in Central Newfoundland in the past couple of weeks, because of that concern we would ask them to display extreme caution in the woods especially this weekend, and of course not only this weekend but in the coming months.

So I just wanted to say that in the opportunity that I hope the press will give me some free advertisement on it for the good of the forest of the Province.

MR. ROBERTS: Are the fire bans in effect yet?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, not yet.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I was not sure whether the minister had - I was not sure whether he yielded it to his colleague. He said what he wanted to say on the point then. Do you want to raise anything else on the minister's salary?

MR. ROWE: No.

MR. ROBERTS: No, okay, well that is it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 1001-01 carry?

On motion, 1001-01, carried.

On motion, 1001-02 through 1004-04-02, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 1005-01 carry? The hon. member for Bay Verte-White Bay.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: In this section, District Medical Care, I want to say a couple of words and probably direct a question to the minister with regard to the nursing station at Englee. That nursing station, as the minister is aware, was without a nurse for a number of years up until this past Fall. The Public Health nurse, as I understand it, was taken and placed in the clinic and operated out of the clinic for a number of hours a week, or on certain days of the week. That has created a problem in the sense that she was the Public Health nurse and therefore she is not now able to carry out the other duties related to her capacity as Public Health nurse, I am thinking in terms of school visitations and that type of thing.

So I want to ask the minister what plans exactly his department has for the nursing station at Englee, whether or not they are prepared to keep it open, and if so, properly so, properly staffed, and not taking a Public Health nurse away from her other duties. That is what I am concerned about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, as I understand if the nursing station at Englee is operated by the International Grenfell Association. I do recall some discussions with that organization with regard to Englee, but for the life of me the details of it I have not got before me. But I will certainly get it for the hon. member of what the plans are there.

MR. RIDEOUT: For the hon. minister's information I might point out that the nurse was placed in there through the Department of Health, not by I.G.A. So you could look at it in those terms, too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 1005-01 carry?

On motion 1005-01 carried.

On motion 02-01 through 1007-06-03, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 1007-06-04 carry? The hon. member for Bay Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: This subhead, Newfoundland Medical Care Commission, it is interesting to note that the estimate is down from \$9,813,000 down to \$9,100,000. I was wondering if the minister would explain that, just explain how come the subhead Medical Care Commission is down by about \$700,000 from last year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes, just a second, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COLLINS: If you want to call I will make a note and come back to that. There is a reason for it which -

MR. PIDEOUT: But we will come back to it?

MR. COLLINS: Yes.

MR. PIDEOUT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. COLLINS: There will be no need to come back but I will give you the information.

On motion subheads 1007-06-05 to 1007-06-07 carried.

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

MR. SIMONS: Under dental health, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a comment here. The description of this Head is - and I quote it from the estimates - free dental care to children up to their eleventh birthday. Mr. Chairman, that should be worded a little more specifically to say free dental care to children up to their eleventh birthday provided they live in one of the urban areas of the Province. This free dental care programme, Mr. Chairman, while in theory is available to all children up to their eleventh birthday in practice is not available in the more rural areas.

Now, Mr. Chairman, without getting into great long arguments just let me make a statement which involves some presumptions but I believe they are presumptions which may well be shared by most members of the Committee. It is in the rural areas that this kind of service is particularly needed because of the infrequency of dental visits, the unavailability of a dentist or dental services on an ongoing basis, that kind of thing. That is what I am alluding to. But without getting into a protracted argument now I will just ask the Committee to accept what I am saying, that first of all the need is probably greater in the rural area than in the more urban areas without at all trying to play down the need in the urban areas.

Mr. Chairman, in this context and because of my concern that dental services ought to be made available in the more rural areas, I wrote a letter to an official of the minister's department in the last - I think I wrote it on April 15 as a matter of fact - I made a suggestion to the department through this official that in order to make

MR. SIMMONS:

dental services available to the small communities in my district - I am thinking particularly of Grey River, McCallum and Francois which are accessible only by water or air - In order to make services available to these people, dental services to the children of these communities the government might consider involving the use of the helicopter based at Milltown. The helicopter is there engaged on a month to month or year to year but an ongoing charter. It is used as an air ambulance as Mr. Chairman will know and also used for other government reasons, such as the wildlife chores or duty and that kind of thing.

I put a proposal that this helicopter might be used to allow students - children I should be saying - children from those three communities I have mentioned, Grey River, McCallum and Francois to fly into Bay d'Espoir. Now I have had a reply back, a rather disappointing reply because it really turns thumbs down on the idea, dismisses it without giving it any opportunity to be investigated. I will not read the letter but, Mr. Chairman, in part the letter points out that the helicopter can handle only four people. And assuming that each child is accompanied by a parent this would reduce the patient payload to two. That is true if you make that assumption. Of course you do not have to make that assumption. You could be having a teacher travel with them in which case your payload would be three. I say, Mr. Chairman, for the sake of the couple of hours or so that are involved it would be well worth the while to have that helicopter if it is not occupied doing other things, well worth the while to have the three patients brought in to Bay d'Espoir.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not in government and it is not for me to consider the feasibility of the alternatives here. It is for me as a member of a district to raise the problem. I raised the problem. I made a suggestion. All right, an official of the minister's department tells me that will not work. I have two points. One, I do not think the idea ought to have been dismissed without some investigation but I respect what the official said. I do not agree

MR. SIMMONS:

with him but I respect it. But if it cannot work - then I come to my second point - would the department look at some other alternatives or is the department contemplating some other alternative so that these children in rural areas for whom this statement about dental care being free is a joke, is the government looking at some alternative which would make dental care available to them?

Now I know we are going to hear, Mr. Chairman, the great long speech about the shortage of dentists and that kind of thing. I am aware that there is a shortage insofar as the rural areas of the Province are concerned. We still have not got a dentist in Burgeo with a community of 3,000 and a community which is close by the community of Pamea which has another 1,500 or so. So there are 5,000 or so people in that immediate area without the services of a dentist. I am not only talking about those areas. I am talking about the small areas where because of geography and sparse population you could not expect a dentist to be resident there.

I am asking the minister if some effort is ongoing right now to have a dentist visit these areas on a regular basis. Right now, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it it is all left to the initiative the enterprise of the practicing dentist. In the case of Central Newfoundland a dentist goes into Bay d'Espoir. If I were a dentist in Central Newfoundland I would go to Bay d'Espoir too because in a few months he will have a completely paved highway. He is about eighty minutes drive from the house on a nice paved road. They can be back in the evening or at the end of the week. If you are doing it as a matter of private enterprise or initiative, you tend to choose those areas which are more lucrative. That is what the profit motive is all about, Mr. Chairman. If you can go down to Bay d'Espoir and have a full day seeing clients -

MR. NEARY: What about the member for Mount Scio?

MR. SIMMONS: Oh I have great respect for my good friend from Mount Scio (Mr. P. Winsor). I am aware he is a very competent dentist and I speak kindly to him because I am going to have to consult a dentist

MR. SIMMONS:

fairly soon and I hope he treats me gently. I have a great fear of dentists I must say.

Mr. Chairman, what I am really getting at and trying to do so as briefly as I can, I am wondering now if the minister if his department has not already done so, would undertake to particularly encourage a dentist, get him on a programme for a year or two as an example or go to a private practitioner and say, "Look if you will spend twenty per cent or thirty per cent of your time going to these areas we will make it worth your while. We will give you an honorarium or we will give you a stipend to spend two months a year this coming Summer on the Southwest Coast or on the Coast of Labrador or wherever the case may be.

Now in terms of seeing patients. He will not see those many. He will not see nearly as many as if he stays in Gander or Grand Falls or St. John's. I agree with you. But I ask the minister would he consider the suggestion if he has not already done so with a view to the government, the department taking initiative to put a dentist into some of those more rural areas.

MR. COLLINS: Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has drawn attention to one of the most important problems not only in the areas which he mentioned but one of the most important problems facing us in terms of providing dental services to Newfoundlanders, the problem being that since there are not enough dentists in the Province to go around we find that in the great majority of cases dentists who are setting up a practice always want to establish in St. John's or Grand Falls or Corner Brook, Gander or wherever. However, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say - and I only have a minute to do it - is that this government during the past two years has probably done more in terms of coming up with programmes of subsidies and grants to dentists to try and encourage them to establish in the more rural parts of the Province than has ever been done by any government anywhere else in this world.

MR. COLLINS:

Now the hon. member refers to Grey River and I suspect the same problem applies in McCallum and Francois. But to fly the children out to a dentist, I do not think that is the right approach because using a helicopter - I am sure there are a number of children in all three communities - it would be almost a full-time job. I think the answer would be to fly the dentist to the communities. We are always willing to discuss with dentists something like that. I see it is one o'clock, Mr. Chairman. I will certainly come back to this topic when we start again.

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 have directed me to report some progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion Committee of Supply ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. WELLS: I move the adjournment of the House until tomorrow, Monday at two o'clock in the afternoon.

On motion the House at its rising do now adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at two of the clock.

C O N T E N T S

May 7, 1976	Page
Moved by Mr. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Wells, that a letter of congratulations be sent by the hon. House to Mr. Clyde Wells on his appointment as Chancellor of the Western Diocese.	7061
Supported by:	
Mr. Smallwood	7063
Mr. Crosbie	7063
 <u>STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS</u>	
Mr. Hickey announced his department will be strengthening enforcement in relation to illegal hunting of big game.	7064
Commented on by Mr. White.	7066
 <u>NOTICES OF MOTION</u>	
Mr. Peckford gave notice that on tomorrow he would ask leave to introduce Bill No. 33.	7067
Mr. H. Collins gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce Bill No. 54.	7067
Mr. Murphy gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce Bill No. 55.	7067
Mr. Hickman gave notice that on tomorrow he would ask leave to introduce Bill No. 53.	7068
 <u>ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN</u>	
Mr. House provided answers for questions asked the previous day by Mr. Lush.	7068
 <u>ORAL QUESTIONS</u>	
Query as to ministerial awareness of a telegram from Bay de Verde residents warning of the hazardous conditions of a rock cut. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Morgan.	7069
Total scaling of the cliff requested. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Morgan.	7070
Newfoundland Government's position on the new federal energy policy. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	7070
Query as to what is the present price for a barrel of oil. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	7073
Oil Subsidy. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	7073
Forecast sought for the next five years. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	7073
Subsidization of electric rates in the Atlantic Provinces. Mr. White, Mr. Crosbie.	7076
DREE financed roads and funds for the Trans-Canada Highway in Newfoundland. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Morgan.	7080
Origination of charter flights in St. John's. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Crosbie.	7082
Reduction of the provincial tax on gasoline. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	7086

C O N T E N T S - 2

<u>ORAL QUESTIONS (continued)</u>	<u>Page</u>
Query as to whether the Newfoundland Government, should gas and oil be discovered off Labrador, make certain that the gas and oil will not be piped into Quebec, that it will be kept in Newfoundland; and if there is anything new on negotiations for the offshore rights on gas and oil and minerals. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	7087
The time it would take to develop offshore discoveries. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	7087
Query as to whether the Minister of Transportation and Communications plans an educational campaign to make people aware of the new highway regulations. Mr. Flight, Mr. Morgan.	7088
 <u>ORDERS OF THE DAY</u>	
On motion, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.	
Head X - Health Estimates (continued)	7090
Mr. Murphy	7090
Mr. Roberts	7102
Mr. Collins	7121
Mr. Roberts	7125
Mr. Crosbie	7128
Mr. Roberts	7132
Mr. Roberts asks Mr. Chairman to ask the Committee for leave to withdraw his motion.	7134
Mr. Neary	7134
Mr. Roberts, on a point of order, stated the matter was not debatable.	7135
Mr. Chairman ruled that unanimous leave had not been granted.	7136
Mr. Neary said he was prepared to grant leave.	7137
Mr. Chairman ruled that since unanimous agreement had not been granted to withdraw, the motion before the Chair was that subhead 1001-01 be reduced by the amount of \$14,783.	7137
Mr. Rideout	7137
Mr. Roberts	7137
Mr. Neary grants assent for Mr. Roberts to withdraw the motion.	7138
The Question is put.	7138
"Ayes" 31, "Nays" zero.	7139
Mr. Roberts	7139
Mr. Morgan raised a point of order concerning certain statements made by Mr. Roberts.	7140
Mr. Roberts spoke to the point of order.	7140

C O N T E N T S - 3

<u>ORDERS OF THE DAY (continued)</u>	Page
Head X - Health Estimates (continued)	
Mr. Chairman ruled the remarks unparliamentary.	7142
Mr. Roberts withdrew the remarks.	7142
Mr. Roberts (continued)	7148
Mr. Collins	7154
By leave, Mr. Rousseau made a ministerial statement about the danger of forest fires.	7155
On motion, 1001 through 1004-04-02, carried.	7156
Head 1005-01	
Mr. Rideout	7157
Mr. Collins	7157
On motion, 1005-01 through 1007-06-03, carried.	7157
1007-06-04	7157
Mr. Rideout	7157
Mr. Collins	7157
Additional information requested.	7157
On motion, 1007-06-04 through 1007-06-07, carried.	7159
1008 - Dental Care	
Mr. Simmons	7159
Mr. Collins	7162
On motion, the Committee rose, reported progress, asked leave to sit again, and was ordered to sit again on tomorrow.	
<u>ADJOURNMENT</u>	7163