

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
2:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 1978

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would like to welcome to the galleries four young students, two from Newfoundland, two from the Province of Quebec. The two visiting students are Robert Golan and Michael Bernier, the two Newfoundland students are Cyril McCormack, Jr., and Micheal Pidding. These students are part of an exchange programme organized by the Canadian Conference of Christians and Jews, the Quebec students visiting Newfoundland now, Newfoundlanders visiting Quebec later on, Je voudrais particulièrement accueillir a l'assemblee legislative les jeunes etudiants Quebecois.

I know all hon. members join me in welcoming to the House of Assembly the Newfoundland and Quebec students under this exchange programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great privilege to present a petition on behalf of 650 students, approximately, from Memorial University, students from every community just about in the Province of Newfoundland, and the prayer of the petition is that the students, the petitioners here, support the recommendations for change in current student aid policies as presented to the federal and provincial governments by the Presidential Task Force on Student Aid.

Mr. Speaker, in this brief presented by the Presidential Task Force, they have made fifteen recommendations, all related to student aid, fifteen recommendations.

MR. NEARY: All ignored by the government.

MR. LUSH: That is right. Plus an appendix with two recommendations from the Union of the Student Council of Memorial.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the time does not suffice for me to go into all of the fifteen recommendations, fifteen recommendations related to making more monies available to students, making a university education more accessible to the students of Newfoundland, and I would only hope that all members will read these recommendations, this brief presented by the Presidential Task Force because I am sure that it will tell us something about student aid that we did not know, the difficulty of getting student aid, the complexities now involved, making applications this sort of thing and the various financial factors that are taken into consideration when allocating monies to students.

But let me comment just on a couple, Mr. Speaker. The first recommendation is asking that borrowing be kept to a minimum. And this obviously, Mr. Speaker, is an objection to the government's proposal of requiring students to borrow \$700. The brief says that borrowing for students should be kept to a minimum and certainly a student should not be required to borrow more than \$450 per semester, \$450 per semester. The new system is requiring the students to borrow \$700, thus causing the student to go \$250 more in debt per semester and the Presidential Task Force is objecting to this. They believe that this is reducing the enrollment at Memorial, denying the opportunity of many students to attend university, particularly students from low income families, and, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to deny our young people in this Province the opportunity to develop themselves, the opportunity to get a good education. And this proposal by the government now requiring students to borrow \$700 is certainly going to deny many students in this Province the opportunity, the right to an education. And this must be reversed.

The reason, Mr. Speaker, why we should not require our students to borrow this amount of money, the reasons are

MR. LUSH: rather obvious. One, many of our students are forced to borrow because of the high unemployment in this Province. Students cannot get Summer jobs to assist them in getting enough savings during the Summer to get back to univeristy so they are forced to borrow because they cannot make the money. Secondly, at the end of the tunnel, when they graduate that the job prospects are not good and these two things combined, the difficulty of getting employment during the Summer, the difficulty of getting a job after graduation, these two things combined militate against or discourage our students from borrowing. They do not want to see themselves saddled with \$7,000 of a loan at the end of graduation, and no prospect of a job to pay for this amount. And therefore,

Mr. Lush: for these reasons that the loans in Newfoundland, the Canada Student Loan programme should certainly reduce student loans, should not be putting up the amount by which students have to borrow, and putting a tremendous financial burden on our students.

Point number two, Mr. Speaker, again recommendation number two relates to or is asking the government to establish a bursary programme. Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of years we have had scholarships and bursaries reduced in this Province substantially, by 50 per cent, I think. And this was always an opportunity for bright students to get to university, to continue their education by getting these scholarships. Now these are cut by 50 per cent.

So here are two very repressive moves, Mr. Speaker, the one of jacking up, raising the student loan from \$450 to \$700 bringing a tremendous financial burden on our students, and at the same time cutting out, slashing out scholarships and bursaries thus as I said before, denying students of ability, capable students, of getting money to further their education.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this be placed upon the Table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates. And I certainly hope that the minister will take a good look at this, and be able to come up with some positive answers today with respect to the prayer of this petition and supporting the recommendations for change in the current student aid policies as presented to his government and the federal government by the Presidential Task Force on Student Aid.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: Are you going to Table this resolution?

MR. LUSH: Oh, yes. Table the resolution. Table all of it.

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

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the member for Terra Nova district (Mr. Lush), a petition signed, Sir, by 650 more students from Memorial University which, when combined with the 2,000 or so who signed the last two

Mr. W. Rowe: petitions which were presented in this House brings it up to between 2,500 and 3,000 students who have now signed petitions concerning the drastic cutback in aid to university students and to the University, and the increased costs which will have to be incurred by students if they wish to start with or carry on with their university studies.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know where any notion got abroad that was apathy among the student body at Memorial University because, Sir, this support for a very worthwhile, a very meritorious concept indicates to me the very opposite of apathy, shows interest by the students in the education system particularly that aspect of it in which they are directly involved, as can well be expected.

Mr. Speaker, as has been said on numerous occasions here, the last thing we should cut back is education. No matter how badly off the government may feel itself to be, we should not cut back spending on education. We should spend more money on education and certainly we should find more money to spend on the study of education and see what is gone wrong with our education system. But, Sir, that is merely reiterating important points which have been made on numerous occasions before.

I would like to refer specifically and directly to one or two of the recommendations which were referred to by the hon. member when he presented the petition. There are some fifteen recommendations, I believe, plus an appendix, another two or three there, so seventeen very serious, very important recommendations made to the governments of our country and Province as to what should be done with regard to university education.

Recommendation number one, Sir, is that borrowing be kept to a minimum. And it states that it is recommended that the Government of Newfoundland continue to do its utmost in keeping to the minimum the amount a university student is required to borrow to finance his or her education. And it goes on to recommend that it should be no more than the \$450 Canada Student Loan per semester, with the balance of the student's need being met by government paid tuition and an non-repayable

Mr. W. Rowe: grant. And, Sir, in the discussion on that recommendation some interesting facts come out which have been glossed over, and which have not been stressed by members on the other side when they talk in terms of our financial aid to students now being among the best in Canada, Sir, because we are comparing apples and oranges

MR. W. ROWE: or chalk and cheese. There is no basis for comparison in many aspects of our education system compared to what goes on on the Mainland. For example, in the discussion, the second paragraph makes mention of the fact that it is also a fact that in other provinces Grade XII and Grade XIII are in existence, these two grades, which are free or as free as the other grades in, say, Grade XI, Grade X, Grade IX and so on in high school, Mr. Speaker, whereas in Newfoundland, students who go to university after Grade XI have to meet the expenses that are incurred on going to university, whereas students in other provinces - some other provinces, at least - can continue on, continue their high school education beyond junior matriculation on to senior matriculation and Grade XIII and so on and get university credits for those studies, Mr. Speaker, and then go on and maybe spend two or three years at a university as against the four or five that may have to be spent in Newfoundland. So, Sir, that point must be taken into consideration, too, when the minister gets up and says, 'Oh, we have a better system now of financial aid to students.' We should bear that in mind, that we are comparing two different systems and once you compare the things on a realistic basis, compare apples with apples rather than apples with oranges, you will see, Sir, that our financial aid to students is not nearly as good or as satisfactory or acceptable as the Minister of Education and the Minister of Finance a couple of days ago tried to indicate to the House.

Mr. Speaker, another recommendation is the establishment of a bursary programme. "In the case of well qualified high school graduates from low income families, it is recommended that special bursaries be established so that such students will not have to face the possibility of incurring a large debt at the outset of their university career" and so on and so forth. And also in the

MR. W. ROWE: discussion under that recommendation, Sir, it indicates that, to me, Sir, heinous fact of this government's administration of education - when was it? - a couple of years ago they sliced the scholarship programme drastically?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, that is right.

MR. R. ROWE: Government has reduced by one-half the number of centenary and electoral scholarships available. And this fact they mention in the discussion has no doubt had an effect on some needy and well qualified high school and university students who would otherwise qualify for such awards.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse in a province such as ours where we have a long way to go in education for an administration, except an administration which wishes to defend the rights of an elite in society, to cut back on scholarships, of all things, Sir, which I would say - they are a little bit soft about it here in this discussion - I would say had no doubt whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, that the slicing in half of the scholarship programme has had a definitely adverse effect on the ability of many capable and qualified individual young men and women in Newfoundland in the last couple of years and has, in fact, kept them from attending university.

There are a number of other recommendations, Sir. I hope that some of my colleagues will feel moved to get into this discussion and refer to these recommendations, because they should become part of the record of this House, Sir.

I support the petition ably presented by the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), Sir, and I hope that the students at the university make their voices heard even more loudly in the future outside this House and inside this House, Sir, because they are on to a good thing and they deserve more consideration from this government.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for

LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

I accept the hon. the Leader

of the Opposition's invitation, Sir, to stand and support this petition. This is the third day in a row now we have had petitions, I believe, signed by about - what? 2,700 -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes, about that.

MR. NEARY:

- from 2,600 to 2,700 young

Newfoundlanders, young men and women in this Province who are very concerned about whether or not they and the young men and women who are coming behind them graduating from our high schools will be able to get a university education. It is a terrible thing, Mr. Speaker. It is terrible when young people have to sit down and figure out, 'Now can I afford to have a university education?' And when they look at the facts that are staring them in the face the answer is, No, they cannot afford it.

Mr. Speaker, it must be horrible for young people to have to go into the university and then when they come out the other end, when they graduate after hard work they come out the other end owing

MR. NEARY: ...anywhere from \$8,000 to \$10,000 to \$12,000. I often wondered to myself, Mr. Speaker, and I do not know if this is a fair comment or not, but I often wonder to myself, Sir, about the young ladies who attend the univeristy who come out owing \$10,000 and \$12,000. What happens the day they graduate if they fall in love and a few months after they want to get married? The young man that they have fallen in love with will say, well first thing he will say is, "How much have you been loaned and how much do you owe for getting your education? I am not going to marry you because I have to pay off your bills."

MR. DOODY: The dowry.

MR. W. ROWE: The reverse of a dowry.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is an anti-dowry.

MR. NEARY: It is, Sir, it is a very serious consideration and the same thing applies to the young man, and he has to, if he decides to get married after he graduates, he has to think about getting furniture and a home for himself and here he is with an \$8,000 or \$10,000 or \$12,000 debt hanging over his head.

So, Sir, I would say that students who graduate from that university are very, very careful about romance for several years after they graduate because they cannot afford to fall in love and get married and settle down like everybody else. Whereas the graduates of the vocational schools - I am trying to bring it down to earth so that the Minister of Education will understand it. I am putting it in baby talk for the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

AN HON. MEMBER: The population explosion.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as opposed to this, Sir, the graduates of the vocational school and generally speaking the graduates of the College of Trades and Technology and the graduates of the Fisheries College, come out debt free. They have no debts. They have gotten their training, they have gotten their skills, they can go

MR. NEARY: out in the world and start to earn a living without this debt hanging over their heads.

MR. W. ROWE: That is the way it should be.

MR. NEARY: My hon. friend says that is the way it should be, Sir, and I would say to that hear, hear!

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman yesterday when he stood, the hon. Minister of Education stands up and piously says, "I support the petition." And then the hon. gentleman does nothing about it. Well, how can the hon. gentleman be so hypocritical as to stand up in this House -

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has come up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: I have a sneaky suspicion, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is ranging into the realm of debate which is not allowed in the support of petitions and therefore I ask that the hon. gentleman be so instructed.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman merely said he suspects, Sir, he has suspicion. But I have not done it yet so I would say, Your Honour, I can carry on.

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the allegation of hypocritical and I think that is as far as I would go now and would point out the hon. gentleman may not proceed with political debate.

MR. NEARY: I would gladly do that for Your Honour, Sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman yesterday when I ran out of time, I was pointing out to the hon. gentleman that in the other provinces of Canada the grant comes first. The hon. gentleman shakes his head and says no. The loan is the last thing on the list, the loan. Yes, Sir, it is and the hon. gentleman should read the Presidential Report and carry out some of the recommendations of that report. It is done in this order, Sir,

MR. NEARY: grant first, tuition second, a loan last. In this Province it is just the reverse, and as I indicated yesterday, Sir, it is virtually impossible for students - it is true, my hon. friend knows; and my hon. friend can nod his head and say no but it is true - that it is virtually impossible, Sir, for students in this Province to get the maximum grant. Say your entitlement is \$1,000, the maximum they can get is around \$700. It is virtually impossible to get the \$1,000. My hon. friend knows that, because the way the formula is worked out it is meant to dupe the students inasmuch as the tuition is deducted from it.

MR. HOUSE: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Yes. Oh the minister said yes. But the minister says they are going to get \$1,000 maximum grant. In other provinces, as I said, first of all -

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has come up.

MR. NEARY: Where is Hickman when we need him?

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, Standing Order 97 says, "There shall be no debate on a petition," and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for LaPoile is in the realm of debate, he is debating the issues about government student aid policies and he is just not limiting his remarks to the number of signatures on the petition, to the prayer of the petition, but he is ranging into debate which is disallowed under Standing Order 97.

MR. SPEAKER: Standing Order 97 does require that hon. members speak to the material allegation of the petition and the Standing Order one or two removed from that points out that there may be no debate. In speaking to the material allegation obviously one is not restricted to repeating merely the number of names and verbatim the allegations.

Mr. Speaker: what is in the petition. I think what is precluded is debate on specific issues, and I would not at this period to be in a position to say the hon. gentleman is out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman does not want to hear what I have to say, Sir, but I just want to end up by saying, because I am sure my time is almost up, Sir, that the University calendar also states that all students should be prepared to spend at least \$150 for books and supplies. And the other thing is, Sir, that the students would like the minimum wage applied to the formula that is used in calculating their assessment on their income that they earned during the Summer, if they can get a job. And therein lies another problem, Sir, they cannot get jobs so it makes the situation even worse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of the petition and I do so because one cannot help but realize from the names that have already been submitted in the forms of petitions, and with the students who have met with members opposite from time to time in their plea to find some kind of financial alleviation so that they can acquire an education, and with members on this side as well, that they have come to the conclusion who is really concerned about our problem? Is it worth more than the flippancy and the jokes that apparently go back and forth in the House from time to time? Because it is much more serious than that for the students concerned. I mean, where is the hope that is held out to them, not only to get a good education but to remain in this Province?

My hon. friend referred to the employment situation as it applies to students. The situation right now is - and I have raised this point in questions to the Minister of Industrial Development as to where the jobs are in terms of the 40,000 that we have heard referred to by this government - the situation now is that when our friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) refers to the fact that they are going to end up \$8,000 or \$10,000 in the hole, and that, in fact, if you will pardon the language, is exactly where they are going to be having completed their

Mr. Nolan: education. This is a substantial building lot. You can buy a building lot out in Newtown, I would suggest, right now for about that figure or slightly more in some instances. But this is what you are talking about. I mean, this is what most young people - all of us, have we not, is this not what you work towards -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: - trying to get sufficient funds to put the down payment in, and you have to have the land to put the house on it or to go to the bank or to the mortgage company to get sufficient money and so on. So here you have this first mortal, economic blow. What a way to start off in life!

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. NOLAN: You know, our friend, we can laugh at our friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), you know, that you cannot afford to fall in love, but that is exactly what it amounts to is it not? You know, I mean that is a dowry in reverse.

AN HON. MEMBER: Bringing up would-be families.

MR. NOLAN: Yes. I mean, I have heard of planned parenthood, but this is going to hell with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: The fact is, Mr. Speaker - pardon me, Mr. Speaker, but the fact is that this situation is one now that the students are asking for at least some understanding. They are not suggesting that we can all come up with the economic answers. We know we have economic problems and so on. But what they are saying is if you are going to stand up on Youth Week and Education Week and all the other weeks, saying youth is our most important resource, they are the future of this Province,

AN HON. MEMBER: Education is a right.

MR. NOLAN: Education is a right. If you are going to come off with all those platitudes, you have got to put something in the way of policy where your mouth is. It is as simple as that. They are not prepared to accept grandiose sounds from any politician no matter what his political stripe any more, any more, because they have gone from one extreme, if you like, to the other. Here they were just a few years ago being paid for going to the university, having their

Mr. Nolan: tuition paid and so on; now it is gone full circle, and they feel disenfranchised; they feel, My God, what have we done to deserve this? How come the guys and gals five years or so before us had this going for them, and all of a sudden we get the double whammy. Now that is what is happening.

And here is the situation that they are now faced with, a situation where they have to decide, and I suggest to you that where we have students, and we do, who intellectually in every other way have the wherewithal to go into that university, if they are being barred because of discriminatory economy policies they are going to be bitter. Would you not? Would I not? Of course, you would. They are not lazy. They want their education. And who is more responsible than all of us in this House, who have talked about it either in the media or in this House over the years, go to the University, go to the Trade Schools, and so on. Get yourself a good education. Their parents are pumping it at them,

MR. NOLAN: we all have and now we are putting up road block after road block after road block. I am not saying the students are perfect and that we have to give everything and they nothing; no one is suggesting that including the students. But what I am saying is that we have got to take a whole new look at the whole educational thing as has been suggested by any number of people on this side of the House and from time to time on the other side as well. We have a situation now where it is economically intolerable for them to go into the university and to come out in a financial state that could cripple them for the rest of their lives. Let us assume, and I cannot do the mathematics very quickly, but if you come out of the university and supposedly end up on the minimum wage, how long will it take you to pay back, I believe it is \$91.00 per month somebody told me that you are required to pay back, \$91.00 bucks a month as I mentioned here in the House yesterday?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) mortgage on a house.

MR. NOLAN: \$91.00 per month is what I paid for a one bedroom apartment when I was married some years ago. I paid it for a number of years to the St. John's Housing Corporation incidentally and I thought it was very good accomodation. I paid not \$91.00 per month, I think it was \$126.50 at the time but this continued on for a good number of years and I thought it was good value for the money at the time. I only mention this now to try to acquaint it with the \$91.00 per month that you are going to slap on a young student, boy or girl, coming out. Now, if they want to go on from that, to go to be a lawyer or a doctor or whatever, I mean how can they do it? I mean how many families do we know in my constituency or in the hon. member's opposite who can take on this kind of a thing? Do they not have the same needs and aspirations for their children as anyone of us? Of course they do. So all I am saying is that while there is no educational economic Utopia, there has got to be something better than what we have now. There used to be on this side of the House when some of my friends opposite used to be here a great bandying about of priorities. Now I am asking where the priorities are as far as the students are concerned? It is not something

MR. NOLAN: we can put off, it is not something that can be delayed, it is something that has to come into effect now with the coming of the new educational year beginning in September. And September, by the way, is too long to wait unless you intend in this Session in the Fall, if there is one, to bring in in the Throne Speech a programme that will be retroactive beginning the first of September or whenever it is feasible and so on. This is the only way that students right now who are contemplating going into the university, it is the only way they can dream of even applying to go in; they are not going to be barred because of their intellectual ability or any other reason, the reason is here within the government. We are now looking for leadership and it is time that we has some. Not only that, but a great programme for employment for students and also the wherewithal - we have to now come in with the programming and in fact we should be applying ourselves to it before this House closes now. Let me suggest to the minister that perhaps he might today consider, with consultation from the Premier of course, setting up a Select Committee of the House of Assembly to go to work now. We do not need Summer holidays, let us go to work now with a committee. The former Minister of Finance may want to apply himself to this task and the Minister of Education; let us set up this Select Committee to take a look at the situation so that we will have something in place now.

MR. DOODY: I will do it in my spare time.

MR. NOLAN: Well I cannot speak for the minister's spare time but if he has very much of it I suggest he could spread some - What is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Calcium chlorode.

MR. NOLAN: Calcium chlorode -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sodium chlorode -

MR. NOLAN: Sodium, yes, Calcium chlorode on Dunn's Hill Road where they are being covered in dust out there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sometimes referred to as grease.

MR. DOODY: Strong on the Sodium.

June 29, 1978

Tape No. 4945

AH-3

MR. NOLAN: Strong on the sodium. Well, maybe it is wishful thinking, you know.

Anyway I will close, Mr. Speaker, by pleading, begging, anything that appeals to the members opposite, to set up this committee now, right now in this session of the House, Let them work throughout the Summer even if the House closes and get to work on this what is really a priority item for the young people of this Province who have promise, who have the ability, they have it all but they are not getting much encouragement from this administration. I certainly support the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte. Before he starts, perhaps I should point out that in the House of Assembly it has been the practice for some time, although it is not in most legislatures, where there is a five minute time limit, hon. members get a one minute warning; when there is a forty-five minute time limit they get a five minute warning. In most legislatures the practice is people are expected to time themselves and the Chair just then interrupts when time has expired.

MR. SPEAKER: It appears to me that, the system of giving one and five minute notices is preferable but if hon. members prefer not to use that system then obviously we do not have to.

I make that point for obvious reasons. That is done because it is thought that that is of help to members. We will continue with that but I was not sure it met with everybody's agreement.

Hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: I am sure the suggestion made with respect to and what has been the practice with respect to giving warnings is very acceptable. When a member is speaking he has enough to worry about much less than worry about whether he is going to run out of time or not and I am sure it will be good to keep warning us about that.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support the petition presented by the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) signed by over 600 university students again today, Mr. Speaker. It is surprising with the number of headaches that are being placed on students that they are so peaceful and so kind in bringing in petitions to the House of Assembly rather than trying to take matters in their own hands again. Because, Mr. Speaker, the students, as is demonstrated in their recommendations, are being hit from three sources at the moment, three direct sources, they are being hit square in the face from those three particular sources. I will outline them briefly: number one, Mr. Speaker, the students have been forced because of the Budget brought down in March by this government to borrow more money, to go in debt. Before students at the university still had to buy their degree, so to speak, the poor students had to buy their degree, so to speak. ^{Now} they have to pay more for their degree. The price of their degree has gone up tremendously; it has gone

MR. E. WHITE: up by about \$4,000. At one time a student who came from rural Newfoundland, who came from a poor family could come to the university, spend four or five years and realistically expect to spend \$5,000 or \$6,000 to get a degree. Now the price of a degree has gone up by \$4,000, considerably more than the price of cars and houses and everything else have gone up in recent years. Number two, Mr. Speaker, in recent years, in the number of years past, students could expect to get jobs in the Summertime and would invariably get jobs in the Summertime to help them over during the Winter months and of course this was taken into consideration with Canada Student Loan. The Canada Student Loan people always expected that students would make money during the Summertime and therefore that was calculated on the basis of how much money they would have to borrow. So that is number one, Mr. Speaker being forced to borrow more and, number two, no jobs available so that they cannot get money during the Summertime to help them out during the Winter.

And number three, Mr. Speaker, and that is contained in recommendation number nine in the report tabled in the House here today, if a student now, a bright student, a student who works hard to try and get a scholarship or a bursary, he is penalized if he gets a scholarship or a bursary. Now that is number three and that is absolutely shocking and it is absolutely ridiculous - the student is penalized. Instead of that amount of money, \$500 or whatever the scholarship or the bursary or the award is that the student gets, that amount is deducted from the tuition or allowance portion of the student's funds and that is absolutely scandalous, Mr. Speaker, regardless if the student is bright and the student is talented and the student works hard to get a scholarship or an award and if he gets a scholarship or an award that is taken from his allowance and he is still required to borrow the same amount. Now what the students are asking is that the amount of the scholarship or the award be deducted from the amount he has to borrow which is very simple, very plain and very straightforward and, I think, Mr. Speaker, very, very sensible. So we have those three or four major points going against the students at this particular time.

MR. F. WHITE: I support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that the government would give some attention to the single largest and single most important groups in society today the students who are coming-up who hopefully will try to make this Province a little more better than it has been in the past. So I support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I was just reflecting there for a moment and realized that I have been involved directly in education for a total of thirty-one years if you count my own university training, teaching at the university and teaching in high school and actually going to school myself. So, Sir, it is with special interest and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to support this petition signed by 650 more students from the university relating to the Presidential Task Force.

Mr. F. Rowe:

Sir, I think back to, I think it was around 1965 when we had this great Thinkers' Conference at Memorial University when we had the likes of Kenneth Galbraith visit this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Galbraith.

MR. F. ROWE: Galbraith according to my friend. We had Rene Lesvesque, who was then, I believe, a Liberal Cabinet minister, and Sir, we had other great thinkers, local and foreigners and Mainlanders come to this Province as a sort of a think tank, and the one theme that came out of that Thinkers' Conference, Sir, was that the best investment a province could make is in education, and particularly in higher education, Sir. That was one of the main recommendations or one of the main themes that came out of that particular conference a great conference, great men, great women contributing to that particular conference.

And, Sir, it was in the area of higher education that they suggested that the new provinces such as Newfoundland, an investment in higher education, that is the way to get a new province, a young province like Newfoundland, moving again. Because it is these people who graduate from the university, Sir, who represent some of the potential leaders in our society in the professions of, say, dentistry, law, engineering, etc. I am not saying, Sir, all of our leaders have to be university graduates; some of our best leaders are people who have learned on their own; you do not have to go through university. But, Sir, the fact of the matter is a good investment in higher education means a great return, return to the development, the economic development and social development of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: That was proven, Sir, and stated quite clearly by these men and women who came to that Thinkers' Conference, and nothing has changed, Sir, in the last twelve to thirteen years, an investment in the education of our youth, particularly at the university level, is a wise investment by any province, Sir, a very wise investment for the future, social, and economic, development of our Province.

So, Sir, this government's policy is certainly one

Mr. F. Rowe: of being penny-wise and pound-foolish when they see fit to try to save a few pennies by crucifying the students, making it more difficult for the students to go to the university. Sir, I mentioned yesterday and I repeat it again because I think it is very important, that it was indicated to me by a group of students that the greatest - it is not so much concern, for example, on the Avalon or in St. John's about this programme for obvious reasons, and I say that we are going to end up with an elitist university, a university for the rich, and/or a university that should be renamed the University of the Avalon. It is as simple as that. Because it is the people off the Avalon and from the Coast of Labrador who find it most difficult to get to the regional college and to the central university here in St. John's. So the government, I repeat, is penny-wise and pound-foolish in not making a greater investment in the youth of this Province, because when these students, Sir, come out of the university and they decide to go on to do graduate studies or decide to go straight into the work force, Sir, these students are going to make a very valuable contribution to the economic aspect of our society and they are also going to make a very valuable contribution to the social aspect.

So, Sir, cutting back on student aid and forcing them to borrow more money may save them a few pennies in the long run but the development of this Province will suffer down the line if they save a few pennies in the short run but they lose in the long run, Sir. So with that, Sir, I support this petition whole-heartedly.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Carbonear followed by the hon. gentleman for Baie Verte-White Bay .

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I like to rise again for the second day in a row and support this petition and in so doing supporting the cause of the students of Memorial University.

MR. R. MOORES: Having been-or I am a graduate of Memorial, having been involved greatly in student aid and the recommendations relating to student aid since 1970, I do know a little bit about them. And I know enough to know that of the fifteen recommendations submitted by this Presidential Task Force of the university and the Students' Union combined, eleven of them, eleven of the fifteen were recommended in 1973 in a less sophisticated and elaborated form. Now that is not to take anything away from the present student union executive. I know the present student president, a young man by the name of Trask from Gander, one of the finest young men this Province has produced thus far. I have known him for years and I know that he has no provincial politics, not to my knowledge, and I know that he has the desire, the welfare and the interest of the students at heart first. That is not to take anything away from that executive, but in 1973 the then president of the Students' Union also submitted a task force recommendation to this government with eleven of the fifteen recommendations now being submitted. Not one of those recommendations were enacted or acted upon and I predict that not one single one of them will be acted upon this time. What they did in 1973, this government, what they did in 1973 was to buy off the president of the Students Union and make him the executive assistant to the Premier - sold out the students of Memorial University and the government perpetrated it, buying him off. Mr. Speaker, it does not surprise me at all -

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The statement by the hon. member for Carbonear that the government bought off the former president of the Students Union at the university, to me, Mr. Speaker, smacks of breaking the rules of this House, number one, and I think that the hon. member should retract that. It is an allegation imputing motive on the government's part. Number two, Mr. Speaker, those kinds of statements are provocative and are debatable and therefore are out of order as it relates to the supporting of petitions. So I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Carbonear be asked to withdraw

MR. PECKFORD: that statement that the government bought off a former president of the Student's Union, at university and that he also be instructed to be in order in his support of a petition.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: It is perfectly in order, Mr. Speaker, for a member in this House to talk about political pay-offs. There is nothing wrong with that, Sir. That is parliamentary and the hon. gentleman is referring to a political promise or pay-off that was made to a former president of the student union. We understand now that Mr. Rex Murphy, who is to be the candidate in Bonavista-Trinity-Conception, will soon end up in the Premier's office as a special or executive assistant. That is a political pay-off. There is nothing wrong with it, Sir. There is nothing in Beauchesne or May that says it is unparliamentary. I ask Your Honour to ask the gentleman to restrain himself or get the Government House Leader back so my friend can continue with his discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Just to reiterate, the statements or petitions should confine themselves to a comment or a summary of the statement made by the petitioners, a comment on the number of signatures or supporters of the petition and a comment on the material allegations in the petition. As far as I recall the petition there was no allegation in the petition to the effect that former students or presidents had been enticed into government service or any similar matter like that. So that allegation was not in the petition, therefore I would have to say that it is not a matter for proper comment at this time. I think that is as far as I need go.

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, because of that irresponsible interruption my time is up. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, once again I want to have a brief word or two to say in support of the prayer of this petition so ably presented by my colleague on behalf of 650 or so students at the University. It brings to about 3,000 now, Your Honour, in the last three days, university students who had seen fit to petition this government with regard to their policy in student aid cutbacks and so on.

However, Sir, the prayer of the petition is a little bit more narrow than that today in that I think it addresses itself mainly to the Presidential Task Force Report that has been submitted to this government and to the Government of Canada. And it is with that report that I - or in connection with that report that I want to make a few brief remarks. My colleagues have referred to a number of the recommendations and I am more concerned at the moment, Sir, with regard to recommendation number eight which specifically deals with the Corner Brook campus. The Corner Brook campus, as the House well knows, will provide the first two years of university training for 95 per cent or 96 per cent of the students from my district as well as a number of the other West Coast districts, and the Presidential Task Force Report makes a very specific recommendation with regard to the establishment of a Corner Brook campus Student Aid Division.

Now, Your Honour, in the three years that I have represented that particular part of the Province in this House, in September of each year there is no end to the problems that I encounter with the Student Aid Division in St. John's attempting to serve the Corner Brook campus of Memorial University. There was some harangue and hurrah in this House a while ago about telephone calls and credit card bills, and I would say, Your Honour, that in September you would find that 95 per cent of my phone calls will be to the Student Aid Division in St. John's trying to straighten out on behalf of students in my district attending the Corner Brook campus of Memorial University. There is just no end to the bureaucracy and the red tape that those students encounter. So much so, Sir, that I know of half a dozen cases over the past couple of years - the minister

Mr. Rideout: knows of a couple because I brought them to his attention - I know of a half a dozen cases over the last couple of years where students have had to leave, they have had to leave the Corner Brook campus the West Coast College at Corner Brook and go back home. They could not stay there any longer. The University could not keep them, or the campus could not keep them any longer because of the regulations, and they just could not get anywhere with the bureaucratic Student Aid Division in St. John's attempting to handle from 300 or 400 miles away the student aid problems that had cropped up out on the West Coast where there are some 500 or 600 or more students attending that college. It is just unbelievable, Sir, that that kind of roadblock, that that kind of stumbling block would have been thrown in front of our students, first and second year students, Sir, first year students in there for the first time who do not know the problems of the University life and so on, running up against that type of roadblock is just absolutely unbelievable, that the Department of Education have not seen fit to establish a full-time Student Aid Division out on the West Coast campus. That is one of the prime recommendations in this report, in the Presidential Task Force Report. It is one that I certainly whole-heartedly support, Sir, and I would hope that the minister will address himself to it and would tell us that coming this September the students from my district and the other West Coast districts who will be attending the Corner Brook campus will not have to go through the bureacratic red tape and frustration that they have gone through in the past three or four years with regard to getting their student aid cleared up so that they can stay at the Corner Brook campus.

Mr. Speaker, I whole-heartedly again support the prayer of the petition and would hope that the minister will do something about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. the member for St. John's West.

DR. KITCHEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to support this petition and to compliment the people who have presented it and who have spoken so far. This generation of

DR. KITCHEN: students can truly be said to be a picked on generation. Six years ago, I think it was six or seven years ago when this hon. group came to power, the first thing they did was cut the mothers' allowances affecting the same group of young people.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

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

DR. KITCHEN: And now there is no work.

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

I feel the hon. member may be getting into an area of debate and I would bring this to his attention.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. KITCHEN: It is not a matter of debate that the mothers' allowances were cut six years ago by that side, but perhaps it is not really related to student aid.

This is also the same group of young people who have no work,

DR. KITCHEN: which is a matter of economics, but more than that it is almost a matter of philosophy, the philosophy by which people operate. And we have previously in the number of speeches that have been made here, the short remarks in support of the petition that have been made here in the past several days, made a number of positive suggestions as to how the student aid policy could be implemented, could be fixed up so that this question, this problem need not occur. We mentioned the other day that we could look at the education budget both of the University and of other aspects of education and pare away some of the fat and tack it on to student aid. That is one positive way it could be done.

My colleague for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned that Grade XII could be implemented, and if we did implement Grade XII even on a partial scale it would save money in the first and second year, certainly in the first year of University, by which a person could take it in his high school at a cheaper expense to the Province and to himself, thereby saving the Province enough money to spend on student aid for those in senior years at the university itself. That is, take the first years out of the University, put them in Grade XII in high schools at a reduced rate of cash per person that would save money. Those are two very positive suggestions that we have made.

I would like now to make three more suggestions as to how this problem can be alleviated. One is this, the troublesome problem is with the repayment of the loan - it is not the loan, it is the repayment - and one of the problems is that the rate of interest is too high. I believe that the government should do something about this rate of interest. There is really no need for banks to make usury of students in this day and age.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN: The government should get involved in that and reduce the rate of interest that students can pay. Consideration might be given to having the payment amounts reduced from income tax. When you pay off your loan - a \$100 a year, whatever; \$1000 per year -

Dr. Kitchen: let that amount, supported by receipts, be deducted from your taxable income. The government can do that tomorrow. And another thing we can do, we can set up a special committee of the House of Assembly of two or three people, three or four people to look into this question of student aid and report back to this hon. House.

Thank you, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.
The hon. minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: As I understand it, the Speaker went on to the next item under the normal procedure that is on the Order Paper, called for Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees, or whatever the phraseology is, and the hon. Minister of Social Services was recognized. It was at that point in time that the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) rose to support a petition.

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave.

MR. PECKFORD: So that therefore the order is quite well established, and it is quite old in its tradition that petitions have been over and that we are now on another order of business.

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

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

MR. SIMMONS: First of all I would submit, contrary to what the minister has said, no other hon. member had been recognized, nor had I been recognized at that point in time, I might point out. But I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the only - I do not know about one, but the standard way that Mr. Speaker has determined in this House that the preceding order has been dispensed with is by calling the next order to see if there is any ensuing matter on the preceding order. And in the absence of anybody rising on the preceding order, then obviously we will proceed to the next one, and that is the only way Mr. Speaker - or rather, the House - has to exercise

Mr. Simmons: its right to speak on a given order. I rose as the next order was being called, and I feel I am fully within my right, without asking leave of the House - I do not want to do it by leave, I want to do it because it is my right to speak while the order is still before the House. The call by Mr. Speaker of the next order in an indication that he is about to move from the order we are on to the next order if there are no remaining speakers, I submit, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The point made in speaking to the point or order by the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir is a new one or a new angle to it.

MR. SPEAKER: Allow me to put it this way, that obviously when a routine order or a bill, whatever it is, is called and when an hon. member sits down, I think it is improper for the Chair to jump in as if it were attempting to preclude anybody else from speaking. But also if nobody rises, I think it is equally wrong for the Chair to wait, so the Chair then calls the next routine order. The procedure up to now has been that when the next routine order is called and an hon. member wishes to speak to the preceding routine order, he does it by leave. This happens not infrequently.

This has always been the practice and I think it would be inappropriate to change it. As I say it is a situation difficult for the Chair. The Chair obviously does not and should not take any action by calling the next order so quickly as to catch people off guard; I think it is improper as well for the Chair to wait when it looks to the right and left and nobody is standing. So all I can say is that the procedure has been that the next order is called and then not infrequently an hon. member wishes to speak to a petition and the Chair or the member asks for leave. I think I would be required to follow that procedure which we have always followed unless and until the House collectively decides otherwise. That I think would be by an amendment to Standing Orders or sessional orders or in some such appropriate way. I think it has been such a precedent and followed so consistently in this House that in order for me to alter it I would need a consensus of the House or a vote or a direction of the House. That is my opinion. I therefore put the question, with the hon. gentleman's permission whether he has leave to speak to the petition.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: But the hon. member does not want leave.

MR. SIMMONS: I wish to speak not by leave... I
want to speak as my right.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I move the House adjourn, Sir, and not
meet again until the Queen's visit.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that the House now adjourn
and meet after the Queen's visit.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour "Aye", contrary minded
"Nay", I can only say in my opinion the "Nays" have it. I can
only go by voices, I do not really know.

MR. W. ROWE: Let the House divide.

DIVISION:

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Take the bell as rung.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion please stand: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition; Mr. Strachan; Mr. Fred Rowe; Mr. Neary; Mr. Simmons; Mr. White; Mr. Lush; Dr. Kitchen; Mr. Callan; Mr. Flight; Mr. Canning; Capt. Winsor; Mr. Nolan; Mr. Rideout; Mr. McNeil; Mr. Jack Winsor; Mr. R. Moores.

Those opposed to the motion please stand: The hon. the Minister of Education; the hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation; the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture; the hon. the Minister of Health; the hon. the Minister of Social Services; the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment; the hon. the Minister of Industrial Development; the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy; the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications; the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing; Mr. Lundrigan; Dr. Collins; Dr. Twomey; Mr. Wells; Mr. Goudie; Neil Windsor; Mr. Cross; Mr. Patterson; Mr. Carter; Mr. Woodrow; Mr. Power; Mr. Dawe.

I declare the motion defeated by a vote of twenty-two to seventeen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I said the hon. minister, so I will hear the hon. gentleman to my left on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: A point of privilege of the House then, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), Sir, made a very nasty and rude remark that is unparliamentary and I believe that

MR. NEARY: if Your Honour allows it to stand on the record it is going to do nothing but lower the decorum and the dignity of this hon. House per se. And I ask Your Honour to ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the nasty, rude statement that he made or Your Honour name him and have him removed from the House.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of privilege, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of privilege. At most it is a very specious point of order that the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) used the point of privilege, abused the point of privilege so that I would not be able to get up on a point of order. It is not a point of privilege and it shows once again the contempt that the hon. member and the hon. gentlemen on the other side have for this House, who cried out to have it open and are now trying two days in a row, deliberately trying to close this House so that we cannot debate the issues of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! On the point before me, I have endeavoured to inform myself of what the hon. gentleman said, and if what is reported to me is correct it was unparliamentary and I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw it.

MR. WOODROW: It was a general comment, 'traitors'. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, 'God guard thee, Newfoundland'. I withdraw what I said, but I still say, 'God guard thee, Newfoundland.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: That disposes of the matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I want to rise on a matter of privilege. It is something that I would have risen on earlier but there were some intervening matters, and it relates to my wanting earlier to speak to the petition. It is not a matter that can be dealt with now, Mr. Speaker. It is a matter that I will just put to Mr. Speaker for his deliberation and perhaps he can give us some comment or ruling on it later. But, Mr. Speaker, the precedent that is evolving in this House as articulated by Mr. Speaker in ruling as to whether I had the right to

MR. SIMMONS: speak a few moments ago on a petition is, in my view as a member of this House, quite an unfortunate practice and it only applies really to the calling of orders. If you look at other proceedings in the House such as second reading on a bill, for instance, Mr. Speaker at the appropriate time gives notice to the House that if a minister is speaking then the debate has come to its conclusion. There is no such procedure, Mr. Speaker, in getting us from one routine order to the next and that has worked to our disadvantage and I give you an example, not the one of myself today, but the example of going from one petition to the next. We have had instances in this House this session, Mr. Speaker, where a member has risen, presented a petition, there have been a number of supporters, and then another member has had another petition and Mr. Speaker has called the next order and the member, who could not have risen before because the other petition was being spoken to, he rose at the first opportunity and yet he had to get the leave of the House to present his own petition and there are one or two cases I believe in this session where he was denied that leave, Mr. Speaker. Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is wrong and there ought to be some other way of giving notice - I put it that way, perhaps the Chair giving notice that we are about to move from one routine order to the next and perhaps I may suggest one way to do it would be for Mr. Speaker to ask if there are any further speakers to a particular petition and then to call if there are other petitions before we move to the next routine order. And I point out again just to reiterate that there have been a number of examples where we have had discussion on one petition and then before a member could rise in his place and present a second petition we had already moved to the next order of business and only reverted because the House had given leave, and I think of one case where leave was not granted. I do not believe this is a matter of leave or a matter that should require leave, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a matter of right for the members of the House to present petitions and to speak to petitions under the appropriate order of business. I do not believe a member should be prevented from doing so just by the split second of timing that it takes for Mr. Speaker to call the next order of business,

MR. SIMMONS: It ought not to be accidental; it ought to be a very deliberate thing that at some point Mr. Speaker says, "Are there any further speakers to the petition? Are there any other petitions? And at that moment that becomes notice that the petition period is over and Mr. Speaker is about to move on to the next order of business. And I submit that, Mr. Speaker, for Mr. Speaker's consideration.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: In my view, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) is just muddying the waters. Now I do not know if the rest of the members of this House were paying much attention when this matter arose, but I distinctly looked at Your Honour after the last supporter on the opposite side sat down, supporter of the petition, and Mr. Speaker surveyed both sides of the House before he called the next order; he did wait to see whether any other hon. member was going to stand in his place and speak in support of the petition. It was only after Your Honour had surveyed, because I was watching Your Honour, had surveyed the environs of the legislature that Your Honour called the next order. After Your Honour called the order, then of course the hon. Minister of Social Services got up, as was his right, to present a report or whatever under that heading. Now, Mr. Speaker, there was, as I understand it, not too long ago an attempt by an hon. member on this side of the House, the hon. Minister of Tourism, to present a petition and leave was not granted and so therefore he had to present it the next day. So there is no standard precedent or consistent set of incidents which would tend to indicate that leave is being given always as it relates to petitions once another order is called. So therefore you cannot use that as an argument for now saying you can revert back to another order; that is not an argument or any substantiation towards that kind of contention. So, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the hon. member is just trying to muddy the waters. The situation is you had given time, after time was given you called the next order and to me everything is in order as it should be and as it is related and put down in the rules of this House.

June 29, 1978

Tape No. 4953

AH-3

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I do not think that there would be any benefit to be derived at this time in proceeding any further. All I will say is this, that I, and I suppose every speaker, follow certain patterns, procedures, precedents. Obviously when there is a second reading of a bill and substantive resolutions,

MR. SPEAKER: The House is always informed that if an hon. member who introduced the bill speaks again at that time he closes the debate, and this is a warning. The procedures and precedents which we have inherited and which to the best of my knowledge are identical with those of other parliamentary assemblies is that there is no such formula, for example, with respect to amendments if nobody gives up, or sub-amendments, or with respect to the routine orders.

I am inclined to think that if there is to be a change in our precedents here that it should be done by motion, which alters the Standing Orders, or by a resolution which expresses the House's view that such and such a practice not be regarded as a precedent and that a different and specified formula be introduced. I am inclined to think it should be done in the formal manner and that formal manner is outlined in the House of Assembly Act. Otherwise, to tinker and to alter outside of the prescribed way of changing our precedents, to do it in another way would, I think, tend to put precedents and procedures in doubt or make them ambiguous when they are not now so. Hon. members are obviously free to alter rules and the procedures are set there, but I do think that that would be appropriate way to do it, but I do not think there is anything else much that I or the House can do at this stage.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a Directory of Community Services which was compiled by the Community Services Council of St. John's.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

MR. H. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question number 91 in the name of the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). The question is to ask the hon. the Minister of Health to lay upon the table of the House the following information: 1) What are the names of those persons who as of the current date are members of the Board of Management of the hospital at Corner Brook, showing in each case a) the date on which he was appointed; b) the term of his appointment; c) the title of the position held, being that of chairman, vice-chairman, member or otherwise; 2) What is the value of amounts payable to members of the board in respect of a) per diem allowance; b) travel, meal and accommodation expenses; c) annual salary in connection with the performance of his duties in this respect. And the answer, Mr. Chairman, is that the names which I will now read are people who have been appointed for two years. The chairman of the board is Mr. J. N. Mullins; members are Mr. E. P. Poole, Mr. Keith Fillatre, Mrs. Agnes Fitzpatrick, Mrs. Millicent Slade, Ms Joan Wiseman, Mr. E. D. Giannou, Mrs. Jean McGinn and Mr. David Tizzard. That is the answer to part one. With regard to part two, per diem allowance, travel, meal and accommodation expenses are paid in terms of out-of-pocket travel expenses when there is any travel, and salaries paid is nil. The next answer, Mr. Chairman, is to question number 83 beginning with the names of the members of the Board of Management of the hospital at Buchans. The second part of the question is the same as the one I just gave. There is no per diem allowance, there is no salary. Out-of-pocket expenses are paid. The members of the board at Buchans are the chairman, Mr. Kevin Beresford; the members, Mr. Paul O'Brien, Dr. R. F. O'Driscoll, Mr. Andrew Ricketts, Mr. Edward Hamilton, Mr. D. W. White, Mr. Angus Lane, Mr. Carl Powell, Mrs. Lillian Blundon, and Mr. James Merrigan, Jr.

ORAL QUESTIONS

- MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.
- MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker would the Acting House Leader mind telling us if the Premier is expected in today?
- MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.
- MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would be only too happy to indicate the whereabouts of the Premier. Yesterday the Premier had to leave and because of weather conditions drive to Grand Falls to speak to the Fire Chief's Convention which he had committed himself to speak to a couple of months ago. This morning he hoped to get back in St. John's and was unable to be here for Question Period because of the weather and he had commitments in Corner Brook tonight so he drove on from Grand Falls to Corner Brook this evening to be there tonight for commitments that he made to the senior citizens and the recreational people of the West Coast.
- MR. S. NEARY: Commercial (inaudible)
- MR. PECKFORD: So that is where the Premier is. The Minister of Justice is in Edmonton -
- MR. S. NEARY: We know where he is.
- MR. PECKFORD: - on an Attorneys General meeting and that is where both gentleman are. They are about doing the business of government -
- MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker what is all this now?
- MR. PECKFORD: - keeping commitments and promises that they had and carrying out the affairs of the Province as is normal.
- SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!
- MR. S. NEARY: The Premier should get on Newfoundland's finest and he would here for the Question Period.
- MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.
- MR. W.N. ROWE: That is the greatest news we have heard yet, Sir, that the Premier has decided to keep a few promises.
- SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, well then let me ask a question of the Minister of Transportation who I believe is still responsible for the linerboard mill. Is he not? Is the minister responsible for the -

MR. DOODY: Are you satisfied?

MR. W.N. ROWE: I am wondering if he is still responsible? Mr. Speaker, would Your Honour mind sending an urgent message off to the House Leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: I just want to clarify how the Question Period operates, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has asked the question of whether the Minister of Transportation and Communications is still responsible for linerboard mill and I thought that the leader should sit down then and stop asking Your Honour questions so that the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications could answer whether in fact he is still responsible for the linerboard mill or not.

MR. S. NEARY: What a jackal.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I can fully understand the look of disgust on Your Honour's face at that specious abuse of the processed of this House. Mr. Speaker, I assume Your Honour assumes, like everyone else, there is no point of order. I will sit down in case Your Honour wants to discipline the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think there is a point on which the Chair can rule. As long as the hon. member does not get out of order in asking his question, the method of so doing, whether he was waiting for an oral answer or nod or that would not be a matter on which I would feel inclined to make any ruling.

The hon. minister.

MR. SIMMONS: Laughing stock of the whole country,

MR. DOODY: The Chairman of the board of Labrador Linerboard Limited, Sir, the applications for the position have not been to numerous so the Premier has managed to persuade him to stay on.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

There is a sensible minister. If all the other ministers, Sir, had one quarter of the maturity and common sense of that minister the province would not be bankrupt. The supplementary, Sir, directed to the hon. minister who is in charge of Labrador Linearboard is this, prefaced by a preliminary statement, Sir. Everyone in the Province, seems to be under the impression-I have heard it on high authority, Mr. Speaker - that a deal is imminent between the government and another party with regard to the sale of Labrador Linearboard. Sir, I have heard this from reliable sources and most people around the Province have heard it as well from other sources, and the people of Stephenville are wondering and speculating about it, Sir, I wonder if the minister would care to indicate to the House whether in fact a deal is in the works, how close it is to being consummated, and when we can expect to have an agreement signed for the sale of Labrador Linearboard to a third party?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY:

Mr. Speaker, everyone in the Province is not of the opinion that a deal is imminent. There are not very many people who know otherwise. As I have explained to the House on several occasions during the past two weeks in answer to questions from hon. gentlemen opposite, the Province is in the process of negotiating with the last answer I gave was three interested parties. The ante is upped a little bit now and we have four groups who are showing an active interest and concern in taking over the mill either in terms of management or purchase or some other arrangement. There is no deal imminent. We have not come sufficiently close together in terms that are acceptable to the Province or acceptable to

MR. DOODY: either or any of the four parties with whom we are discussing. It is impossible at this point to indicate to the House at what time a deal will be consummated. There are far too many unanswered questions on both sides to allow us to make such a commitment or such a promise. It could very well be that there will be no deal and I sincerely hope that that is not so. If we can manage to interest a group who will be responsible and capable of operating the mill over a long-term period, then certainly that is the object of the exercise and that is what government is interested in and I sincerely hope that we can manage that. But at this point in time it would be premature to intimate that a deal is around the corner; it is far from being around the corner. I sincerely hope that we can change that over the next few weeks or next month or however long it takes and we will continue to actively pursue the options that are open and hopefully we will come up with a solution to the problems in that particular area.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: Could the hon. minister, Sir, indicate whether the government is trying to sell the mill to these parties? Is this the course of the negotiations going on, to sell the mill to one of these four parties with whom the government is negotiating, or is it attempting to enter into a long-term or short-term, for that matter, contract for the operation of the mill or is there some combination of both envisaged? Exactly what is the government's aim and objective, Sir, in negotiating with these parties? Is it the sale of the mill or the operation of the mill?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: The question would appear to answer itself, Sir. Obviously it is in the interest of the Province and the interest of the people of the area to sell the mill to a reputable operator who can guarantee us that they will continue to operate the mill as an integral part of the economic well-being of that particular area over a long period of time. That is the ultimate object of the exercise and that would be certainly the most beneficial end result of the discussions and that is the area in which we are aiming. It may very well be we will have to settle

MR. DOODY: for something less than that, but I sincerely hope that we do not. The object would be to sell the mill to a company who will give some return to the Province immediately in terms of the value of the asset but more importantly to give some return to the economy and the well-being of the area of the Province directly affected over a long-term period. That is the ultimate objective, that the optimal objective and that is what we are aiming for, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. McNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I am not clear on the answer you gave to the hon. Leader of the Opposition with regard to the four interested parties for the Linerboard mill. Is the minister saying that there is an offer to purchase which has been received by the sales agents, Woods, Gordon, from the four companies? An offer to purchase, has it been received by the sales agents or is it just negotiations?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I thought I made it abundantly clear but apparently I did not. The Divestiture Committee, the group that is actively pursuing the sale or the disposition of the mill, are currently engaged in discussions with four interested parties. I did not at any time indicate that we had four offers on the table; I certainly would not want to give the House that indication. I have not indicated that we have three offers on the table, nor two nor one. I have said, and I want to make it abundantly clear, that we have conversations ongoing through the Divestiture Committee with four reputable companies who are showing a very active interest in acquiring the facility at Stephenville and I sincerely hope that we can come to a satisfactory conclusion with one of these groups.

MR. McNEIL: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. McNEIL: Since the new owner, or when we ever get one in place, will be concerned with a cheap supply of wood and since the transportation of that wood has been one of the major factors for the Linerboard mill to close, could the minister indicate to the House if the wood transportation study that was commissioned last year has been completed and if so when will it be tabled in the House?

DR. KITCHEN: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: First I would like to deal with that rather gratuitous aside from the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) and comment to the House that I would much rather be concerned with pious hopes for the people of Stephenville than with cynical asides such as the hon. gentleman just uttered. I might also say that the woods study, the transportation study is available, available to the Divesture Committee, it is an intricate part of the selling package that the people are dealing with. I do not think that there would be any great merit nor any great disadvantage in making that information or the contents of that study available to the hon. member if he so desires. I will certainly check it out with the people who are actively engaged in

Mr. Doody:

the discussions, and if they indicate to me that it will not jeopardize the discussions or the conversations, I will only be too happy to make the contents available. I certainly see no reason off the top of my head why it should not be. There may be some thing of which I am not aware; if so, I will reserve the commitments and make enquiries.

Thank you.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I would like to ask the minister, Sir, if the Harnett report on the controversial severance pay problem, if that report is yet in, and if the government intends to follow the recommendations of the Harnett report?

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

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the report of the Harnett group. To the best of my information, knowledge and belief it has not been forwarded to government. It is not in our possession, nor is it in the possession of the management of Labrador Linerboard Limited. When it does arrive we will certainly study it and look at it. Before we do that obviously it would be rather silly to commit ourselves to complying with the recommendations of a report, the contents of which are unknown to us.

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

MR. SIMMONS: I have a question - the minister can relax, the conscientious -

MR. DOODY: I am perfectly relaxed.

MR. SIMMONS: That is what we like about the minister, he is so relaxed.

MR. W. ROWE: Especially between the ears.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: Another first for the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industrial Development. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the

Mr. Simmons: House whether he was aware of this much talked about preferred list of contractors which was used, according to senior civil servants, to farm out work involving offices of various departments of government going back as far as 1972 or 1973 when he was the minister of another department. I wonder if the Minister of Industrial Development would indicate whether the preferred list of electrical and mechanical contractors was used with his knowledge to give out work without tender to various contractors?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Industrial Development.

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, I will be delighted to answer that question. When I went into that department first there were a few people getting all of the work. It was wide open, if my memory serves me correctly, for six months to a year, then we put name after name on a list until I think it rose to a number of about seventeen or sixteen. At no time did I discuss, if I remember the last part of the member's question exactly, tell anybody specifically, you know, which direction to go in or who to go in at that time. I am not quite sure what the last part of the question was. Would you repeat it, please, for me?

MR. SIMMONS: Was it used with the minister's knowledge was the question?

DR. FARRELL: I beg your pardon?

MR. SIMMONS: The entire question was whether the list was used with the minister's knowledge.

DR. FARRELL: Oh well, I just answered it.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary?

MR. SIMMONS: I have a supplementary or so, Mr. Speaker, for the minister. Did he at any time direct any of the civil servants to give work to any particular contractor without reference to tenders?

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

DR. FARRELL: No, Sir; I am delighted to say at no time.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister is aware that his statement contradicts testimony given publicly by senior servants of that particular department.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary ; did the minister originate the preferred list of contractors - sixteen or seventeen I think he has mentioned as being the number - did he himself originate the list?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Industrial Development.

DR. FARRELL: No, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I did not. It was not done unilaterally by any means. It was done collectively, by MHAs, people who felt that they had not had any chance to get any work in previous years. And we put them on, we put people on - we took people off that we found inefficient - and treated everybody pretty fairly, we felt.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister has mentioned there were sixteen or seventeen contractors on the list. Is he satisfied, or was he satisfied at the time, that each contractor of the sixteen or seventeen, got a fair share of the work that was available?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Industrial Development.

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, on this one, I was away for most of this period, and I did not know that at that time. It was not until - these facts or figures, by the way, which I initiated - when I went back to that department

DR. FARRELL: was it discovered that there were certain areas where it was - But it was explained to me that they were giving good service, the people who got this work, and at that time that is what was told. But the point was that at no time did I know exactly how much work was going to any individual up to that time and that was before I ended up. - I was only in the department a short while at that time when my eyes started giving me trouble.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, for the same minister. Is it not true that the minister received direct instructions that work be given without tenders to certain contractors and that those direct instructions came from the Premier to the minister?

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

DR. FARRELL: No, Sir. I am delighted to say no to that question, and I will certainly be saying it at a later date as well. At no time did I get any orders from the Premier to give special attention to any individuals.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the minister has answered one of the supplementaries I had so I shall go to another. Did the minister at any time receive an offer, was he ever offered any gifts by representatives of the contracting firms which were doing untendered work with the government, or any such offers of gifts from the principals of those firms?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works.

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, I cannot even remember the number of offers I got. I must have gotten thousands but I did not receive or take any of them.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the minister has partly answered the question but I would like to put it directly to him so there is no

MR. SIMMONS: doubt about the answer he is giving the House: Did the minister, Mr. Speaker, at any time ever accept any gift or gifts from any contractor, their representatives or the principal of the contracting firms doing untendered work with the government? Did he accept any such gifts at any time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

DR. FARRELL: Sir, are you talking about bottles of liquor that were mentioned?

MR. SIMMONS: I am talking about gifts, talking about gifts.

DR. FARRELL: Is that a gift?

MR. SIMMONS: That is for the minister to say. Perhaps he bought it, I do not know.

DR. FARRELL: Well, I feel - is that a gift or not a gift? I have it and I have received it. And there is no doubt about it at Christmas time I received bottles of liquor; I received no gifts to my knowledge. My wife apparently received one gift which was broken in the mail, something like that, of some - what do you call it? - glassware of something on a couple of occasions, but I personally did not receive any gifts. But I did without doubt receive some liquor. I remember when we came into this government first, Sir, we received a gift of a case of liquor each. We were informed that that was the habit or proceedings that went on for years in the Board of Liquor Control. We cancelled it that year, Sir. But prior to that every Minister of the Crown received a case of liquor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: That is a lie. That is not true.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

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

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Take that back because it is not true.

DR. FARRELL: Well, that is what we did, Sir.

MR. NEARY: It is not true.

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

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: It is not true, Mr. Speaker. Be a man and take it back, it is not true.

MR. SIMMONS: They are getting tender now, Mr. Speaker, getting tender now.

A supplementary for the same minister, Mr. Speaker. Well, let us get away from what the minister has talked about, the Christmas time gift, the bottle of liquor or the small item in the mail, let us put a floor on it, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister to his knowledge ever accepted a gift from these contractors, their representatives or the principal of these contracting firms, ever received a gift, say, of a value of \$100 or more to the minister's knowledge?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has come up.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think if the hon. member has any evidence of any wrong doing on the part of the Minister of Industrial Development that he should lay his cards on the table. Mr. Speaker, if the member is allowed to continue this line of questioning, which inherently suggests wrongdoing on the part of the minister; it is not a matter of raising a general question so that it gives the minister a chance to answer it, it is a matter of suggesting criminality, wrongdoing, immorality, unethical behaviour on the part of the minister. Now this line of questioning, Your Honour, is going to get into all kinds of difficulties in this Legislature and I suggest if he has any evidence of wrongdoing lay it on the table. Do not get up and nit-pick and raise questions of immorality, and raise questions about the member's family, raise questions about the member's behaviour unless, Your Honour, he has any evidence. And I suggest he should be brought to task for this particular line of questioning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Opposition.

The hon. the Leader of the

MR. W. ROWE: As usual, Sir, the hon. the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) does not seem to know what a point of order is. This is Question Period. If the hon. minister had had whatever it takes to stay on as minister, he would know it, Sir, because questions would be directed to him. This is Question Period, these are questions which my hon. colleague is raising, and asking the Minister of Industrial Development, as he asked the Minister of Labour and Manpower yesterday; ministers, Sir, who have had their names mentioned in a public inquiry going on and certain allegations made against them, ministers, Sir, who have not seen fit to honour their responsibility to this House of Assembly and make either a complete ministerial statement or to make a statement of any kind, Sir, to acknowledge their responsibility to the House and to clear up the implications and the allegations which have been made in this public inquiry. I would submit, Sir, that my hon. colleague is well within his rights to ask questions of this minister, what he did or did not do, what he is doing or is not doing as a minister of the Crown, Sir, and I would humbly submit, Sir, that he be permitted to continue the line of questioning.

MR. NEARY:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

On the point of order, I think that the area in which the hon. member to my left has submitted his point of order and on which comment was heard by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, relates to the area in Beauchesne, page 147, which states: "A question oral or written must not:" - and there is a whole list. There are three which are particularly relevant here, I believe, one being "1) contain imputations;" one being "q) contain or imply charges of a personal character;" one being

MR. SPEAKER: "n) reflect on or relate to character or conduct of persons other than in a public capacity." I realize that this is a difficult area with respect to the precise application of the rules. I am not, however, in a position to state that the questions are not those which relate to public duty and performance thereof. They are not, in my opinion, questions with respect to one's role as personal citizen, but that there is a relationship to the discharge of public duty and responsibility. So I think it is an area in which hon. members obviously aware of the rules and their application here, but to this moment my understanding of the questions has been that the questions are related to the hon. gentleman to my left in his public capacity and performance of his public duty and therefore I recognize the hon. gentleman for a supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying, of course, that it was in that capacity that I was addressing the question. It is not my business what gifts the minister gets as a personal individual and I would not for a moment wish to ask him unless he wants to talk to me privately as a friend and we would exchange information about what we got for Christmas, but that is another issue. What I am interested in is those gifts or the possibility of gifts which may have related in some form or another to his public capacity, and I think the minister was accepting the questions in that spirit. Certainly that is the spirit in which I was giving them. But leave it to the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) to muddy the waters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the supplementary I add for the minister - and again I say to him that one of my reasons, if he wants motivation, one of my motivations for asking the question is that there is now in the public record, as the minister is aware, statements to the effect

MR. SIMMONS: that he had been the recipient of gifts above the value of \$100. That is why I put it to him, to give him an opportunity to clarify the issue. And I ask him directly, Mr. Speaker, the question I was putting to him -

MR. NEARY: The Terry White accusations. Terry White said the minister got a television set.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, but also now - hold on now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Also I am referring in part but not in whole to some testimony to the effect that there was a cabinet which I understand to be more than \$100, just to give an example. There is a statement that my colleagues referred to in which there were items over and above \$100 alleged to have been given to the minister. And so I am asking the question to give him an opportunity to clarify it for us and I put it this way one more time, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister indicate to the House whether he has ever received from contractors, their representatives or principals of the firms involved, contractors doing untendered work with the government during the past three or four years, did he ever receive, did he ever accept gifts having a value of \$100 or more at any time? And I just use the \$100 floor - it could be \$200 - just to get us away from the incidental gift, a bottle of liquor and so on to which he made reference earlier.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Industrial Development.

DR. FARRELL: I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that in the forum of the House I can say that I have paid for my television sets. As a matter of fact, I got one for a dollar. I won it in a raffle down at the Old Colony Club one evening, to my amazement, and long before there were

DR. FARRELL: any discussions that are going on about television sets, I had this set and it was paid for and as far as having received any other gifts I certainly did not, to my knowledge, over that Summer.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary to the hon. the Minister of Industrial Development, Mr. Speaker.

Earlier when the minister answered a question that my colleague put to him with respect to the lists of preferred contractors, he indicated that he certainly did not draw up this list himself and that there was sort of unanimous agreement. Would he tell the House who the unanimous agreement was between? Was it between all members of the P.C. Caucus or was it just the Cabinet that drew up this list?

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

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is going back quite a while. As far as I remember it was - there was a list there when I went there, Sir, with a couple of names on it. For the first, and I repeat, for the first time we loosened it right up. There was no list at all for quite a period, everybody went in. Then somebody would come in and see us and put their names on the list of whatever. A lot of suggestions came from various members. I, at the moment -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who were the members?

DR. FARRELL: I am not going to say at the moment because I cannot really recall exactly, it is so long ago. At that time, as hon. members may remember, I became extremely ill around that period. I am not making that an excuse or anything like that because I certainly was there to initiate that list. But as far as naming individuals who suggested someone, or this one or that one,

DR. FARRELL: it may come back to me but I do not remember them offhand at the moment. I did not expect the question.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: The supplementary to the minister is this, Mr. Speaker; it has been clearly established at the public hearings, the Mahoney Commission, now by testimony from civil servants and from officials in the Department of Public Works and so on that there was blatant disregard for the Public Tender Act and the indication is that the minister was totally aware of this. Could the minister tell the House whether or not he ever gave any instructions to circumvent the Public Tender Act or knew that it was happening?

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

DR. FARRELL: Sir, I certainly deny that completely, that I interfered with the Public Tendering Act at any time, personally, or had any involvement in discussing with any official of that department the breaking of the Public Tendering Act in any way whatsoever.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MR. NEARY: During the Oral Question Period, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Industrial Development levelled a charge, Sir, and I am sure the hon. gentleman made it probably with tongue in cheek, he was probably beside himself, that before the administration took over that ministers in the previous administration were delivered a case of liquor from the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation at Christmas.

MR. NEARY: Now I happened to be one of the ministers in that government, Sir, and I want to tell the minister that I did not get a case of liquor from the Liquor Commission or anybody else in my life and I want Your Honour to direct the minister to take back that statement if the hon. gentleman is man enough to do it. It is not true and the hon. gentleman knows it is not true. It is no good of putting up a defence by blaming something on innocent people. The hon. gentleman knows that is not true, Mr. Speaker, and I ask Your Honour to direct the hon. gentleman to take it back and apologize to the members - to the ministers.

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

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding at that time that that was the occurrence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) but you cannot remember who.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DR. FARRELL: I am saying it again, I am not quite sure. I am saying it was my understanding. If my memory is failing as far as that is concerned, fair enough. I think it has been failing since I came in here anyway, in many ways. It was my understanding that that was said at that time.

MR. NEARY: It is not true.

DR. FARRELL: Well, if you say it is not true it is not true.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I do not think the Chair can go any further on this matter. As I understand it, the allegation was the hon. minister

MR. SPEAKER: to my left was of the impression that hon. members to my right received 'X' from a public commission, the Newfoundland Liquor Commission; we are dealing with a public body. Hon. gentlemen to my right said that this was not true. The hon. gentleman to my left said, "Well, if it is not true it is not true." I think we are in the area of personal explanation as outlined by May, page 343, and both hon. members, the hon. gentleman to my right has made his statement, hon. gentlemen to my left has made a brief one and I think that is as far - there is certainly no allegation of bribery or harrassment or condemnation or collusion or anything like that. I think it is a matter of personal explanation which the hon. gentleman has made.

MR. PECKFORD: Order 7, Bill 50.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of personal privilege.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: I, like the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), was surprised to hear the hon. Minister of Industrial Development state in the Question Period that it had been the habit for members of the government of that day to receive cases of liquor from the Board of Liquor Control. Well, Sir, I want to tell the minister and I want to tell this House and I want to make it pretty clear that I never did in my whole political career ever receive a case of liquor from the Board of Liquor Control, from anyone, not a case of liquor, not a half a case of liquor, nor a quarter of a case of liquor. I do not use the stuff, Sir, and I would appreciate if the hon. minister would exclude this and take this statement back because, Sir, it does have a reflection on the character of all members, and ministers especially, of the government of that day.

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

MR. W. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister apparently does not intend to take back the slanderous and scandalous accusation he made against members of the former administration, including, Sir, myself.

MR. NEARY: He has a great memory when it comes to that.

MR. W. ROWE: It has put everyone of us here in the position of having to stand up, Sir, and to dispute and refute that scandalous accusation, an amazing show of memory, Sir. -

MR. NEARY: No memory when it comes to lists.

MR. W. ROWE: - for a man who cannot remember what happened two years ago, or three years ago but has a tremendous memory of what happened seven or eight years ago when he came into office. But he cannot remember any lists or preferred lists or anything or names of people that he was instructed to put on the list and so on, Mr. Speaker. He cannot remember any of that. All he can remember is some scandalous and slanderous accusation against me and my colleagues here who were in the former administration and people outside this House, Sir, whose reputations are impeccable in their administration of public duty.

Now, Sir, let me join my colleagues by way of a point of privilege or personal explanation or whatever, because I do not care whether that hon. minister withdraws it or not, but let me say for the record that I have not received cases or liquor or a case of liquor from any public body, Sir, or private body at any time when I was Minister of the Crown for this government. And if I had received it, Sir, it would have gone back from whence it had come. And Sir, I feel embarrassed to have to stand here and to make that statement, Sir, to defend myself against a slanderous and scandalous accusation thrown out by a minister, Sir, seeking to obviously drag a red herring across other very important matters, serious matters, Sir, of allegations and imputations and accusations against ministers of the present administration,

MR. W. ROWE:

not the former administration.

MR. NEARY:

Your Honour should protect us over here.

MR. NOLAN:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I am charitable enough to believe that the hon. minister opposite was terribly misled, maybe in a number of instances but, I mean, I believe that someone must have said, or inferred to the minister that such was the case; Therefore I am now prepared, and I feel I am speaking for others, to have that person come before this House and let him state his case right there and then. Because I do not know of any cases of liquor that were delivered to any member when I was in Cabinet, I just do not know of it, from the Liquor Commission. So therefore I am trying to go at this in a reasonable fashion. I can only believe that the minister, perhaps in an intemperate moment, blurted out what he did. But he also indicated quite clearly that he was led to believe, so therefore I can only assume it was either directly or indirectly by someone associated with the Liquor Commission of that day. So surely I think this matter is important enough to have the air cleared on it one way or the other. I do not think that any member opposite or any member here, to the best of my knowledge, ever received a case of liquor from the Board of Liquor Control. Never, to the best of my knowledge. In fact, I am sure that they did not. So all I am saying is that I would hope that the minister has some word of explanation and perhaps if he has been misled in this regard that he might be good enough to inform the House. Otherwise he is leaving a rather unpleasant atmosphere surrounding the whole matter because it would appear that the -

Mr. Nolan: well, if the liquor came from the Liquor Corporation, as he alleges, then that came from that one body which has been charged with dispensing or selling liquor as an agency of government. So I would ask the minister if he can to explain the situation, and if he is wrong, as I know he is, to please withdraw.

MR. LUNDREGAN: Mr. Speaker, on that question could I just have -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I was about to interject.

Hon. members will recall how this matter developed. An hon. gentleman to my right rose on a point of privilege, which I heard. The hon. gentleman to my left then spoke. I said at the time I could not rule that in a technical sense there was a breach of privilege, the prima facie situation, and indeed that is the fact. I cannot and do not so rule. When I am recognizing hon. members it is under that general area of personal explanation because hon. members to my right, who were members of a Cabinet at a particular time, feel aggrieved and I feel have the right to state their opinions.

I do not feel I have the authority to direct the hon. gentleman to withdraw the allegation he made. I do feel, however, that it would be appropriate for me to give him an additional opportunity to so do. That is, I think, as far as I can go, and that is why I did not recognize anybody immediately. If he so wishes, I will give him the opportunity to so do.

The hon. the Minister of Industrial Development.

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, that was my understanding; you know, whether it is right or wrong I do not know. As far as my memory serves me correctly, that is what I was informed. And I believe I can say, you know, that I do not know whether it was done or not, but it was my understanding and I cannot go any further on the explanation.

MR. NEARY: This is a very dangerous precedent, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Can we proceed with Orders of the Day? There is no one on his feet and I should like to call Order 7.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I do not think the Chair can go any further on this mater matter.

MR. NEARY: I would like to move, Sir, if it is in order, I would like to move, Sir, that the hon. minister that made the serious allegations and charges in an attempt to smear members on this side of the House, to defend the scandalous goings on of the administration, that the minister be forced, be compelled, be ordered by this House to bring the person before the Bar of this House who made these scurrilous statements about the ministers in the former administration, bring witnesses before the Bar so that we can question them.

If we let this go, Mr.

Speaker, it is just going to develop, it is going to deteriorate and develop into something that we will not be able to control, Your Honour. "It is my understanding," "It is my understanding," Sir, just look at the serious consequences of that, "It is my understanding." Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the House should be very happy to be able to have an opportunity to bring before the Bar of this House the person who made that statement so we can put an end to the personalities and the smear tactics and the character assassination that we have seen going on in this House over the last couple of months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Who has been getting?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Who has been getting? The hon. the Premier is the King of the smear artists.

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

I cannot accept any motion now, A relevant motion will have to be under Notices of Motion, Only with a finding of a prima facie then obviously there is a motion-that is the affect of that - a motion that then receives priority and comes before everything, A motion would have to get on the Order Paper in a different route, through Notices of Motion or some appropriate route.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: Order 7.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 7. The adjourned debate on bill 50.
The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible) one hundred thousand bucks.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

DR. FARRELL: On a point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

DR. FARRELL: The member for -

MR. SIMMONS: Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir?

DR. FARRELL: - Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, that
mobile mouth over there, just made a remark that I want
retracted immediately.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. FARRELL: I do not know what the remark was,
he mentioned the sum of \$100,000 and I would like to have
it retracted. I do not know what he was referring to but I
want to hear an explanation.

MR. SIMMONS: To that point of order or privilege
or whatever, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order. The hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: Perhaps the simplest and most concise
way of saying it to the House and particularly to the minister
is this, now the shoe is on the other foot.

MR. WHITE: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister had a full opportunity
to withdraw the scandalous and scurrilous thing and he
excused it, Mr. Speaker, on the grounds that he could say it
because it was his understanding. Well I say to the minister
I have certain understandings and using the precedent that
he has established in this House, unless he withdraws the
former remark I shall start saying what are my understandings
too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: Do you want to hear a (inaudible)
old buddy? Stick around for a few days.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am no Stanley Knowles and I would be the first to admit it, but this afternoon, Sir, I rose on a question of order and I quoted the fact that no member is allowed to rise and make a comment or ask a question which reflects on a person's character, contains inferences, contains imputations and the like and my point of order was not accepted.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is precisely what happens when members are allowed to edge their way into an area, Your Honour, of personal abuse. Now the minister stood up and in answering his question indicated, Your Honour -

MR. SIMMONS: Get to the point of privilege you are making.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, is there any way? I have listened now for a full half hour to three of four of those privileges -

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

MR. WHITE: Do not be making a fool of yourself.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognized the hon. gentleman on a point of order and I will ask him to come to that point of order.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, the point of order is quite simply in support of the comments made by my colleague. The hon. minister indicated that if he was wrong he was wrong. He said that ten or fifteen minutes ago. It was his understanding, he threw it out in the heat of debate. "If I am wrong I am wrong." That to me was a quite gentlemanly thing to say. He might have been wrong. Maybe the information was incorrect. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are getting charges laid from across the way about the character of the individual in question, the minister. Mr. Speaker, there has to be some abatement of this kind of attempt on the part of the Opposition to indirectly scandalize the minister. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that his point of order be upheld and that that

MR. LUNDRIGAN: member be asked to withdraw the allegation which he has made.

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: I rise to speak to the point of order, the spurious point of order, Sir. My hon. colleague from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir is alleged to have said, I did not hear it myself, is alleged to have said that it was his understanding that the hon. the minister received something or other. Well, Sir, we have already established a precedent in the House, Sir, that you can say anything.

MR. NEARY: That is right, as long as it is your understanding.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Scurrilous, unparliamentary, grossest accusations of all kinds against ministers or members or former members, as long as you say it is your understanding.

MR. WHITE: Let her go.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, assuming he did say, without admitting, what he is accused of saying by my friend across the floor there, I am sure my hon. friend is quite willing to stand up and say the same thing as the minister said, namely, that I may be wrong but it is my understanding. Now, Sir, if that is the precedent which is set in this House for allegations and accusations of all kinds then sobeit, Mr. Speaker. But the hon. minister has made his own bed and he must now lie in it. Or as my friend said, the shoe is on the other foot and he does not like it.

Now, Sir, if he is man enough to withdraw without qualification the accusation he made, Mr. Speaker, I am sure we will bring an end to this kind of proceedings altogether.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. W.N. ROWE: But, Sir, if a precedent has been set in this House that you can say anything under the guise of it being your understanding, and then say, 'I may be wrong, mind

MR. W.N. ROWE: you and lash out all kinds of personal accusations of the grossest nature, then, Mr.

Speaker -

MR. WHITE: At ministers and former ministers.

MR. W.N. ROWE: - let that be the rule, but let it not be the rule for one side and not the rule for the other side.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The point of order as I understood it, and I did not hear what is alleged to have been said, was with reference to some statement from the hon. member from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) to my right. I am not aware that anything of any sufficient specific nature was said that I can take any action on.

There have been some references made by hon. gentlemen to my right and to my left about the precedents, the possibility that the rules have altered. The references to the Question Period and to what may or may not have resulted from them and what hon. members may come to expect in the future, all I can say is this, that the rules are the same today as they were yesterday. It is a very technical, specific area which I have authority to enforce, a very technical, specific area of parliamentary law, parliamentary procedure, parliamentary custom. It is in the Standing Orders, in the precedents and it is in the authorities thereon and in some cases it is Ottawa precedents and we go there. It is a very technical and precise one and that is all I can do.

In the other area of mutual courtesies, in the other area of courtesies that hon. members may wish to extend to one another, I cannot oblige them to extend courtesies. They do or they do not. I can only enforce the rules but not that much broader area of courtesies which hon. members may or may not extend. My area of responsibility is limited to that specific area but I do want to emphasise that that has not changed, that particular area, and the rules applicable are the same now as they were yesterday or last week. In that broader area I can encourage and hope but I cannot impose and I do not attempt to do the impossible.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: By leave, the hon. minister can withdraw.

AN HON. MEMBER: How are you going to withdraw by leave?

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, maybe the second attempt will be a bit lucky and I will get to finish the few remarks that I began on Tuesday evening on Bill 50. Before we had adjourned at eleven o'clock on Tuesday night I had started a few remarks on bill 50, "An Act To Establish The Northeast Avalon Urban Region," and I have but a few minutes left so I would like to get on and conclude those few remarks.

Now, Sir, as I was saying on Tuesday evening, regional government in itself, which is the concept and the principle of this bill, regional government in itself is certainly, as far as I am concerned, a noble concept and one worthy of consideration. In fact, Sir, I would go so far as to say that personally - I do not want the minister to get overjoyed yet - but personally I find the concept of regional government quite exciting. I think the concept of regional government, the principle of regional government is certainly exciting and challenging and can do many things for many parts of this Province.

In fact, I would go so far as to say, Mr. Speaker, that regional government could be one of the cures, or possibly the cure, for many of the municipal ills that we have in this Province. It could be the answer to municipal council problems in certain areas of the Province I am think, for example, Sir, of areas that are as closely knit as the Baie Verte Peninsula, areas that might be as closely knit as the Burin Peninsula, certain parts of the Northern Peninsula and so on. Regional government in that context and in those areas could be part of the answer to many of the regional municipal problems that we have.

MR. RIDEOUT: But I have to hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that having said all that, having said that I find things exciting about the concept of regional government, I have to say again as I said on Tuesday night that I do not believe the answer is in this bill 50. I do not believe that the answer, the regional government answer, the regional government concept as I see it is in this albatross that the minister has attempted, in this monster that the minister has attempted to hang around the necks of municipalities and unincorporated communities in the Northeast Avalon region. Bill 50 creates an albatross, Sir, that will not, that will not, I say to the minister, carry out the principles of regional government as I see them or as I envision them. This is just another layer of political bureaucracy, that is what it is.

This regional government, bill 50 that the minister brought before this House at the last moment in the latter part of May will just

MR. RIDEOUT: set up another layer of political bureaucracy that will further isolate the provincial government from the people. That is exactly what it will do. There is another layer of political bureaucracy that must be paid for. Now the minister gets up, Sir, and he assures us on his word that there will be not one cent increase in taxation in that Northeast Avalon region. 'There will not be one cent,' he says, 'of increase in taxation.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that has to be the heights of foolishness. The minister knows the difference of that. He is not going to convince anybody in this House that that is true and he is not going to convince anybody in the Northeast Avalon region that that is true. The minister goes into a long harangue that the people will pay on a user pay concept, that if they get the services then they will pay for the services. Well, that is alright, as I pointed out on Tuesday night, that is alright for water, for example. It might be alright in a community that comes under this 'umbrella,' I suppose, for want of a better word, but Mr. Speaker, there are a half dozen or so communities on this Avalon Peninsula that are coming in under this bill without any choice whatsoever. Whether they like it or lump it - the minister said that in his opening remarks a couple of weeks ago - whether they like it or lump it they are coming anyway. They have no choice, they are coming. They have not been consulted. There has not been the consultation with them. And I would say to the minister, Mr. Speaker, that there are other alternatives keeping in mind the regional government concept, because I find the regional government concept exciting and I say that there are other alternatives. There should have been other alternatives explored and it is obvious to me from what the minister has brought before us that that has not been done. The minister had an idea, he had a brain wave a year or so ago that, with the help of eight or ten Tory St. John's members, has now grown into a

MR. RIDEOUT: monster. That is what happened. The minister down in his office had an idea- maybe based on the Henley report or something - but the minister had an idea.

AN HON. MEMBER: What are the alternatives?

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, there are other alternatives in that report and the minister has thrown them out. He has chosen not to implement them.

So the minister had a brain wave and he had an idea, and then they started having those secret meetings, Mr. Speaker, a year or so ago, that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) admitted to in the House a few days ago, and each one of them began to tack on his own little bit to that idea that the minister had. And the result, Sir, is the monstrosity that we have here before us today. And I still say to the minister that the concept of regional planning, the concept of regional control and regional services are excellent concepts. He will not find any argument from this side of the House about the concept, but he will find argument about the vehicle that the minister has chosen to develop in order to achieve those goals. And that is the critical, important thing.

MR. J. CARTER: Let us hear (inaudible)

MR. RIDEOUT: You are going to hear it now if you keep quiet for a minute. I am glad to see that the member is back from his savory patch this evening so I will give him a few lessons on it.

MR. WHITE: The weather is bad.

MR. RIDEOUT: The weather is bad this evening. It is not a good day for planting savory.

As I suggested, there are, I believe, other alternatives. And I think the first step would have been to bring together in the Northeast Avalon

MR. RIDEOUT: region a regional council that was made up in the first instance from the elected councils in the Northeast Avalon region.

MR. WHITE: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: That, I think, would have been the democratic first step, to bring together a regional council made up of the representatives of the elected councils in the Northeast Avalon region.

MR. DINN: What about the (inaudible)

MR. RIDEOUT: Hold on now! Let not the minister jump the gun. I believe that would have been the first step, and let that, Sir, be the foundation. If the minister had wanted to do it in a democratic fashion, if the minister had wanted to do it with the consultation and the full will of the elected people then that could have been the first step and that could have been the foundation. The minister could have built from there, and he could have had then once this group was set up, plebiscites maybe, in the non-incorporated areas, saying, 'Do you want to come in? Do you want to avail of the regional water system? Do you want to avail of the regional services like fire protection, garbage collection?' or whatever. You know, this regional council drawn from the elected representatives of the people on their various municipal councils could have been the vehicle to do that. But no, Sir, that was not done. The minister had to go headlong, eyes closed, full-fledged into this monstrosity that we have here in Bill No. 50 today and he will not take any advice, Mr. Speaker. The minister has come into the House with an harangue that almost borders on his being a maniac when he introduced this bill. He has come in with an harangue, Sir, that would scare you to death. He does not intend to take any advice from the House. He does not intend to take any advice from anybody. And, Mr. Speaker, let not the people in the Northeast Avalon region be convinced about

MR. T. RIDEOUT: talks of amendment. Let them not think very many amendments are going to be made to this bill in committee stage on the floor of this Legislature. I had the experience of amendments, Mr. Speaker, only a month or so ago on one of the most important pieces of legislation that ever went through this House and that was the Occupational Health and Safety Bill, and I proposed, having done research from health and safety acts in every province of Canada, every province of Canada that has them, after months and months of research and talking with the unions and so on, I proposed thirty-one amendments to that bill. And what did I get accepted by the gentlemen on the other side? Two paltry amendments that made a couple of word changes. So let not the people in the Northeast Avalon region, Sir, set their hopes and let not those councils who have given qualified support to the minister, that "we are supporting you on the grounds that there are going to be amendments," let them not keep their - let them not hold their breath, Sir, waiting for amendments from this minister because he is not going to take any advice from the House, he is not going to take it; he may take some advice from his own member maybe but he is not going to do this on the floor of this Legislature. I can assure you that he has no intention of doing it. So I still say, Sir -

MR. DINW: Make some positive suggestions.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: I gave the minister a very positive suggestion: the minister should throw this bill out the window and let the wind take it and blow it down around Quidi Vidi Lake somewhere. That would be the first suggestion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. RIDEOUT: The second suggestion would be to form a regional council made up -

AN HON. MEMBER: Nonsense!

MR. T. RIDEOUT: I believe regional government is good but the way to do it I would think would be to form a regional council made up from the elected representative of the councils in the area. And then you go and build on the other areas; non-incorporated ones would have a plebiscite to see if they want to come in on it. If they do not, you

MR. T. RIDEOUT: are not going to force it down their throats. But that is what the minister is doing under this bill; he does not care if they want it or not, he does not care if they like it or not. And then he has the gall, Mr. Speaker, and the nerve to stand up in this House and say I can personally guarantee that there will no increase in taxes in those areas, the minister said that time after time.

So, Mr. Speaker, it does not jibe.

The minister says there is no more authority in this bill than there is in the Local Government Act. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have already punched that attitude full of holes; we have already made that out to be the lie that it actually is. Section five, as I referred to the other night, says, "Except as is necessary for the regional council to exercise the powers," "except as where necessary." So that means there is not enough authority in the Local Government Act; this umbrella is over it. They can do what they like, Mr. Speaker, that is what it boils down to. Now I am turned on greatly and find very encouraging the concept of regional government but what I am objecting to, Sir, is I am afraid that this monster, this monstrosity that the minister is working on now, and is going to put through this House because they have the majority, they are going to do it anyway, this monster that the minister has here is going to create in the Northeast Avalon region, Sir, is going to grow and you are going to see it forced into other areas of this Province. You are going to see it forced into my area whether the people want it or not because that is the minister -

MR. PECKFORD: No way.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) has not received his honorary doctor of letters yet so he should keep quiet. That is what he has in mind, and it will be forced into the Burin Peninsula and it will be forced into any area that the minister wants to force it into in exactly the same.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: way that he is doing it here. Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister talked about consultation. Well, we know we know what consultation is then. There has been consultation with the St. John's Tory MHAs, that is basically what it boils down to. And every council in the region, where many of them, as I said the other night, Mr. Speaker, have changed since November, those people have not been consulted; and then the communities that are not incorporated, those people have not been consulted. So, I say, Sir, that the amendment to read this bill six months from now is a very appropriate amendment. The minister should not get his back up too much; the minister should take the criticism that has been - and the minister know this, too - the criticism that has come to him from his own members. There has been criticism; the member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins) was not all happy with the bill, he is looking for amendments; the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) was not happy with the bill, he is looking for amendments -

MR. J. CARTER: When did you hear that?

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Well, go to Hansard and look it up. I heard their speeches there a few days ago.

MR. J. CARTER: Who said that?

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Look, the minister has a research staff down there, let him go and look it up. But I did hear them

MR.RIDEOUT: say they are not happy,they are expecting amendments., so the minister knows they are not altogether happy with the bill. So I would say to him, Mr. Speaker, do not be so stubborn, do not get his back up to the point that he is going to make a fool of himself and a fool of what could be a good concept. There is nothing wrong with the concept of Regional Government but there is a lot,however, wrong with the way this minister has chosen to implement it, there is a lot wrong with the way that this minister wants to do it. So, Mr. Speaker, the minister ought to allow for the proper consultation, he ought to allow for the people to study the implications, people in non-incorporated areas, the new councillors, the new councillors and new councils that were elected only a few months ago in November, he ought to allow time for that to happen. And he ought to allow time, Mr.Speaker, for the people of the Northeast Avalon Region, having seen this monstrosity,to be able to sit down for themselves and rationalize," Whatis this going to mean to me as a taxpayer in this region?" He should allow time for that, Mr. Speaker, and he has not done it. There are people in the Northeast Avalon region who will not know what hit them when the increased taxation comes about that my colleague from Lewisporte (Mr.White) referred to the other day- and it has to come, it has to come, Mr.Speaker. The minister made a fool of himself on Tuesday night saying that those people would only pay for what they get. Well,they are in this area now: are they going to pay for their share of all the other services that this bill envisaged like regional fire departments and this kind of stuff? Are they going to pay their share in that?

MR. DINN: What sections say that?

MR.RIDEOUT: Mr.Speaker, the minister is suppose to know all about the bill so he can go back and look up the section. So,Mr.Speaker, I think the amendment to - Pardon!

MR.J.CARTER: Do you know anything about it?

MR.RIDEOUT: I know quite a bit about it.Look at Section 5, I have already referred to it; look at Section 111, I have already referred to that; and when they go to clause by clause study the minister will have sections enough coming at him that he will think the head has blown off him so do not be getting on with such foolishness about what section.

MR. RIDEOUT: You read out a number of sections over there the other evening and my colleague from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) read back a number to you, so I hope you noted them, did you?

MR. J. CARTER: I noted them all.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have read the bill; I do not know if the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) got out of his savoury patch long enough to read it or not. It does not appear he did. I do not believe he has spoken on the bill yet, has he? I do not believe the member has spoken.

AN HON. MEMBER: It must be raining today.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, it is raining. I will assume, Your Honour, that the member will speak today because it is not a good day in the savoury patch, so he will, I would say, speak today, and I would say, Sir, that he will probably support the amendment that the bill be read six months from now. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that is about all the time I have. I certainly cannot support the bill, but I like the principle of Regional Government, I like the concept of Regional Government but I think that the minister has gone about it in too high-handed a way. I do not think he has looked at the alternatives to this thing that he has brought in here and I believe there are sensible and reasonable alternatives to it. I think it can be tried on a much more reasonable and on a much more manageable scale than the minister is attempting to do with this Northeast Avalon Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no hesitation in supporting the amendment to the bill.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman -

MR. W. ROWE: He has already spoken on the amendment.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman already spoke on the six month hoist. Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment so ably presented by my hon. colleague the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White), Sir, and I really and sincerely and truly believe that this bill, Sir, should get the six month hoist,

June 29, 1978

Tape No. 4967

AH-3

MR. NEARY: that it should not be rammed through the House at this particular point in time. We have heard a lot of speeches, Sir, on the bill in the last couple of weeks; we will probably hear more when we dispose of the amendment that the bill get the six month hoist. We will go back to the original motion, the second reading, I may have another few words to say on this particular bill. But my hon. colleague who just took his seat, Sir, raised some very interesting points in connection with this bill and all the other speeches that have been made, Sir - and the House has been deluged with speeches from members on both sides of the House and citizens from the communities outside the House who are affected by this Bill 50; they pointed out the financial stupidities, the extravagance and the waste of the taxpayers money by implementing another layer of government, another bureaucracy. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, but most people agree that I have spoken to, and I think most people in this House agree because they have expressed grave concern about the fact that the basic principles of representative democracy are being violated with the implementation of this bill and I refer to the appointments

MR. NEARY: to the so-called regional government that the hon. gentleman is going to establish.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion Bill 50 is being foisted upon the people in the North Avalon area as an extra, unnecessary level of government and as a burden upon the taxpayers of the entire Province, because a lot of the cost, Mr. Speaker, of this regional government, another layer of politicians, this bureaucracy that is being created, a lot of the cost of it, Sir, will have to be borne by people who live outside the area, by the taxpayers in other parts of the Province, by the taxpayers in Labrador West, by the taxpayers over in Carbonear and by the taxpayers on the southwest corner of this Province.

Since, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. minister knows this, since the cost of this regional government will have to be borne out of general revenue, it will have to be paid for out of the general taxes of this Province. And that is a very important point to remember, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman, for instance, knows now at the present time that the police protection and the fire protection in the city of St. John's is paid for by the taxpayers in other parts of the Province. And the hon. gentleman shied away from that particular service, these two services, when the hon. gentleman was talking about expanding services that they have in the city of St. John's to areas outside St. John's. The other gentleman did not tell us whether or not the people who live in the area, and the boundaries have not yet been defined, who live within the boundaries of the regional government area, whether or not the services of the Newfoundland Constabulary will be extended to police these areas, and if the fire protection that is now provided to the city of St. John's will be provided to people who live within the boundaries of the regional government area. The minister has not clarified that position. Will they receive the same treatment as St. John's or will the service be foisted on the people without their having any say in it at their

MR. NEARY: expense or at the expense of the people who live in the regional government area?

Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague who just took his seat a few moments ago pointed out the lack of research, the lack of input, Sir, by the people who live in the regional government area which is unknown to us at the moment. There are no boundaries defining the area under which the regional government will have control and I believe Your Honour, speaking in his capacity as a member, the other day expressed grave concern about certain aspects of this bill, including the fact that there are no defined boundaries. We have no idea at the moment what communities are going to be in and what communities are going to be out. All we know is that Bell Island and Holyrood will be outside the boundaries. And if they ever wanted to start the third world war then, Mr. Speaker, if they had put Bell Island inside the regional government boundaries then I guarantee you the guns that they had over on the cliffs of Bell Island during the Second World War would have been reactivated. Nobody but nobody would be allowed to go across the Tickle who had anything to do with regional government. And the minister knew this and I was the one who fought it when I was the member for Bell Island. And I was the one who convinced Mr. Henley on Bell Island at two or three meetings that we held over there, plus a couple of meetings down in Portugal Cove, that Bell Island should be left outside of the regional government area, that we wanted to have nothing to do with it and I did not realize at the time that I was doing the Minister of Transportation, the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doody), such a favour.

AN HON. MEMBER: You definitely did.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am against Bill 50. I am for a type of metropolitan government, the same kind as they have in the city of Toronto. The whole trouble is, you see, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen have not

Mr. Neary: Looked at the alternatives. The hon. gentlemen are so anxious to create another layer of politicians, to create another bureaucracy so that they can find another senate, a Newfoundland senate in which they can appoint some of their buddies, that they have not looked at the alternatives. And what are the alternatives, Mr. Speaker? The alternatives are these, the minister could have done the same as they are doing in the City of Toronto, the Metropolitan Toronto area which has withstood the test of time, they could have set up boroughs.

MR. DINN: Do not be so foolish. The City of Toronto is all built up. There is no vacant land, no barren or unoccupied land.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what difference does it make? We could have set up, for instance, the communities in Conception Bay South to comprise one borough; down in St. John's East Extern you could have had another borough; over where my hon. friend represents, towards Kilbride, you could have had another borough; and in the Portugal Cove-Mount Scio Road area, in that area you could have had another borough. You could have five or six boroughs; and these boroughs would be represented by people who would be elected and not appointed.

AN HON. MEMBER: How would you go about it?

MR. NEARY: Well, there are two ways to do it, Sir, you could come from the existing municipalities, they could be elected from the existing municipalities to the Metro Board; or there could be a general election and let the people at large elect the people to the Metro Board. But at least it would be done in a democratic way; no appointments, no appointments, Mr. Speaker. There is the first objection to this bill.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible) conscience.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MURPHY: There were fifteen people nominated in the main (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Fifteen? No, Sir, the only appointment - I have it here - the only appointment that was made on the Metropolitan Board in Toronto, the only appointment that was made was the Chairman. I am just trying to find his name here now; the appointed member

MR. NEARY: of the council, Fred Gardiner, Mr. Fred Gardiner was the first Chairman of the Toronto Metro Board. He was the only appointment that was made; all the others were elected, each borough elected its own members for the Metro Board.

MR. N. WINDSOR: You are not objecting to the ten who are being elected?

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. N. WINDSOR: You are not objecting to the ten who are being elected?

MR. NEARY: I want to see them all elected. Well, I tell you this, Mr. Speaker; I would not even object to Mr. O'Dea being appointed Chairman, and all others elected. Now if the government -

MR. N. WINDSOR: Just so that we will know - (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, no, Mr. Speaker, these members would be sent by the people or they would be sent by the town council, and all they do is that they just get together to manage the region. There would not be another level of politicians or another level of bureaucracy. They would be told what to do by the people who live in the borough, and not dictated to by the minister. There is the weakness in this bill.

MR. N. WINDSOR: You cannot have it both ways. You are saying that, you know, there should not be another level.

MR. NEARY: No, that is right.

MR. N. WINDSOR: You are saying that this level should be elected. Which is it?

MR. NEARY: There should not be another level of politicians, I am saying, another level of bureaucracy.

MR. N. WINDSOR: So they should not be elected, they should be from the councils -

MR. NEARY: They should be elected - come from the councils, be elected from the councils to the Metro Board or be elected by the people at large.

MR. N. WINDSOR: And this is what you are getting.

MR. NEARY: No, they are not, Mr. Speaker; they are being appointed by the minister. And that is one of the big objections to the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. gentleman wants to control the regional government, wants to control it like puppets on a string.

MR. DINN: It was recommended in the Henley Report.

MR. NEARY: The Henley Commission, Sir, recommended a number of things including a concept of expanding the City of St. John's. Well I can see, Sir, that this would not be very wise politically or psychologically for that matter, especially in view of the fact, Sir, that we were told the other day that the population of St. John's has dwindled since 1972, and will continue to dwindle, according to the recent census that was taken and according to the checking that I did recently on Statistics Canada.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe the first thing that we have to taken into consideration is the fact that this bill is foisting on the people who live in the North Avalon area a form of government in which they have no say. They have no say. Mr. Speaker, they have no say, it has been foisted on them. First of all the very first thing we have to do, the basic, fundamental principle of democracy is to give the people themselves a chance to determine whether or not they want regional government or a metro government or an expanded City of St. John's, what form of regional government they want or what

MR. NEARY: form of Metro government they want. The people should decide this. And the hon. gentleman will get up and say, 'Oh, we are not going to run this Province by plebiscites or referendums - we are not going to do that. Well, Sir, I might accept that if we were talking about an industry. If we were talking about establishing an industry, for instance, the oil refinery in Come By Chance, if we were talking about that sort of thing I would say, well, of course not, the government have been elected to govern and let them make their decision; or if it came to establishing an industry in Labrador I would say, sure; or if it came to a mining policy I would say, sure, let the government govern. But, Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about, we are talking about an organization, we are talking about a set up that will regulate the lives of people, the everyday lives of people. We were talking about a set up that will lay down rules and regulations, regimentation that will -

AN HON. MEMBER: Would you rather it be Metro board?

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Would you rather Metro board take it?

MR. NEARY: Would I rather what?

AN HON. MEMBER: That Metro board take it?

MR. NEARY: I will come to that shortly, Sir. We are talking about the kind of a set up, Sir, that affects the everyday lives of people who live in the Northeast Avalon area and that is a different situation, Sir. These people should have an opportunity to vote for whatever kind of set up they want, not have it foisted on them by the government, and let them elect their own representatives. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, who has all the power under this bill, will not be elected by the people who live in this area. It is almost, Sir, the equivalent of taxation

MR. NEARY: without representation.

So first of all, Sir, we are all for giving the people who live in the Northeast Avalon region an opportunity to vote on the form of regional government that they want. Now how can hon. gentlemen on the government side object to that? How can the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) object to giving the people the alternatives, put it before the people and let the people decide what form of regional government they want? What is wrong with that? Is there anything wrong with that? If my hon. friend were over in his native Ireland they would be forced to do it. The people would not allow themselves to be dictated to. And that is why we are getting such an uprising and such -

MR. DINN: Did the people have a chance to speak at the hearings?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I attended more of these hearings than the hon. gentleman did.

MR. DINN: No, you did not.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon, Sir!

MR. DINN: No, Sir!

MR. NEARY: I attended more hearings than the hon. gentleman did.

MR. DINN: No, no!

MR. NEARY: And only a handful of people turned out for most of the hearings.

MR. DINN: No, Sir!

MR. NEARY: Only a handful.

MR. N. WINDSOR: You did not come close.

MR. NEARY: I think probably the biggest meeting we had - there may have been a big one down in Kilbride - but I would say the biggest meeting of all was the one that was held on Bell Island. They were hanging out of the rafters, she was blocked to the doors.

MR. N. WINDSOR: I admit I missed that one.

AN HON. MEMBER: They were there because you were there; that is the reason.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, they were not there because I was there, they were there because they wanted to have nothing to do with St. John's and they thought that what was going to happen, that Mr. Henley was talking at the time, making noises that the city boundaries were going to be expanded and they were going to take in Bell Island. And all you have to do is think back to the hockey days - they would not touch St. John's over there with a barge pole, as my hon. friend knows.

MR. N. WINDSOR: You did not answer the question though. You did not answer the question whether they had the chance to speak at the hearings?

MR. NEARY: Did they have a chance to speak at the hearings?

MR. N. WINDSOR: Did they have the opportunity to put in their suggestions at the hearing?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned the Henley report was a waste of time and money.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Who is talking about that? I am talking about the hearings that came after.

MR. NEARY: If the government is talking about governing, what they should have done was work out the alternatives. They should have got their officials together and said, 'Look, we are going to do this in a democratic way, in a democratic fashion, and we are going to let the people of the area decide

MR. NEARY: what it is they want. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is as natural as eating blueberry pie, is it not? No appointments. You might even be able to sell me on appointing a chairman. You might get away with that one. I have nothing against Mr. O'Dea. I think he is a fine gentleman. I think he is doing a good job. You might even be able to sell me on that, appointing the chairman. But certainly there is no need to make any other appointment outside of the chairman. That is what they did in the city of Toronto.

Every councillor, as I understand it, in the city of Toronto, was elected to serve on his borough and then they get together and they send their representatives to the -

MR. DINN: How would you choose a representative in an area metro board in some of the ones you mentioned where there are five or six councils? How would you choose a representative from a council then?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman will get permission from the Premier to make me Minister of Municipal Affairs, and pay me the salary that the hon. gentleman is getting -

AN HON. MEMBER: That will never happen.

MR. NEARY: - I will go over and solve the problem for the hon. member.

MR. DINN: No suggestions.

MR. NEARY: And I will work out the formula. It so happens, Sir, that we are not the government at this particular moment. If we were the government then I would show the member how to do it.

MR. DINN: That is why.

MR. NEARY: It is so simple, Sir, so simple to do.

MR. DINN: No alternatives.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is your job, boy.

MR. NEARY: Look, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants me to lay it out for him I will lay it out. Phase one, call elections

MR. NEARY: in the unincorporated areas within the proposed region. Okay? Does that make any sense? Phase two, under the already appointed regional chairman, and I would even go along with that, call a meeting of representatives of each already elected council and of the new elected representatives of unincorporated areas. How is that? Does that make any sense?

MR. MURPHY: How will the candidates be nominated?

MR. NEARY: How do the hon. gentleman get nominated? You would have a mover and a seconder.

MR. MURPHY: In the district of St. John's Centre, right? What about St. Phillips? You have eleven small places and there are only four to come in.

MR. DINN: What are you electing in the unincorporated areas anyway?

AN HON. MEMBER: Nonsense!

MR. NEARY: Phase three, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman would just follow me for a moment, phase three, let the interim regional council bring forth a plan of combining the communities outside of St. John's into boroughs the same as they have in Toronto. Perhaps six or seven or whatever number is necessary depending on the population distribution and the geographic area that you are talking about.

And phase four, Sir, let boroughs and city elections then be held once every two years, not four years. Hold elections every two years.

MR. DINN: Your colleague was just complaining about the cost of elections.

MR. NEARY: The first election then could be held in the Autumn, say, of 1979.

AN HON. MEMBER: I just said it was going to cost money, that is all.

MR. DINN: Your colleague wants to have twice as many.

MR. NEARY: This may sound like an over simplification of an approach to the problem of establishing regional government, Sir.

MR. J. CARTER: A bedtime story.

MR. NEARY: But I believe, Sir, this is the only way to successfully stave off the storm of protest which has hit Bill 50.

MR. W. ROWE: What a storm. Here it is. Where is it?

MR. NEARY: After all, Sir, as I said, this is the way they did it in Toronto. This is the way they did it in Toronto and it has worked out in the city of Toronto for twenty-five years.

MR. J. CARTER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, that is something I do not have to do in this House is read a speech. I do not have to do it. That is something I have never had to - yes, I did it once when I first came in here.

AN HON. MEMBER: You did not (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: No, the hon. gentleman does not do it. The hon. gentleman has not done it for, I would say, fourteen years, read a speech in this House. And so, Sir, the first real objection to Bill 50 is that it is undemocratic, that apart from the government selling the idea of appointing a chairman, that we feel that all other members of the board should be elected. And probably the simplest way to do it at this particular moment is to elect the members of the Metro Board from the existing municipalities, have them send their representatives in.

There is no point in the minister standing over there, Sir, and telling us that we have to have this Bill 50 in order to

MR. S. NEARY: clear up the dump down in Robin Hood Bay because that is not true, Sir, The government had before them three years ago an opportunity to clear up that dump.

I heard the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) stand in this House yesterday and talk about, Oh we have to get the incinerators down there as quickly as we can. Putting the incinerators down there is not going to solve the problem. The government had the problem solved. The solution to the problem I believe was offered to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment two or three years ago if that gentleman was the minister then, but whoever was the Minister of the Environment -

MR. MURPHY: For Robin Hood Bay.

MR. S. NEARY: Did not the hon. gentleman go to the mainland to look at recycling garbage, the way they recycle garbage, and was the hon. gentleman impressed with it? And why did the hon. gentleman not adopt that. -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not economical.

MR. MURPHY: He did not have the millions to do it.

MR. S. NEARY: He did not have the millions to do it.

I see. The only thing that stopped the hon. gentleman was not the fact that we did not have regional government at the time, the hon. gentleman did not have the money to do it. If the hon. gentleman had to have the money there would have been no need for regional government to clear up the dump down in Robin Hood Bay or get rid of the rats down here by the Janeway Hospital. The only reason was the hon. gentleman could not get his colleagues to give him the money that is the only thing that stopped him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: So the hon. gentleman went away to the mainland, looked at a plan they had they were using in other provinces of Canada and down in the United States. I believe the hon. gentleman went to Boston, went down to Boston to look at that. No?

Well, the hon. gentleman had a proposal from a group in Boston, the government did, had a proposal to clean up the dump. And they would not have had to go in and start controversy and start wars in other areas on the Avalon Peninsula because the people did not want their area turned into another Robin Hood Bay or turned into a dump. Recycling of garbage is the way to do it and the hon. gentleman could not get the money to do it. And now, how does the hon. gentleman expect to get the money now? By socking it to the taxes of the people who live in the area of regional government? Is that where the hon. gentleman is going to get the money to clean up Robin Hood Bay?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible) if you want to talk about recycling and burning they are poles apart, millions of dollars apart.

MR. S. NEARY: They are millions of dollars apart.

MR. MURPHY: Recycling or incineration.

MR. N. WINDSOR: We do not have the volume here for recycling.

MR. S. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. N. WINDSOR: We do not have a big enough volume to make an economical recycling operation.

MR. S. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, we have just heard from another expert, the member for Mount Pearl arena, who tells us we do not have the volume.

MR. N. WINDSOR: That is right.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, Sir, the people who made the proposal to government, and if the hon. gentleman will just go down into the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment or the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the hon. gentleman -

MR. WINDSOR: Do you think that I have not?

MR. S. NEARY: - will find a proposal that was realistic, that was economically feasible to recycle the garbage in the greater St. John's area.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. S. NEARY: The proposal was there, they had it before them and they did not have the initiative to go ahead with it. And now the hon. gentleman is telling us the only way they can clean up Robin Hood Bay is to get Bill 50 through the House. What happens, Sir, when Bill 50 goes through? What happens then? Are they going to move the dump then in on the Ruby Line? Not on your life, they are not! Are they going to move the dump down in Foxtrap, on the Foxtrap Access Road? Not on your life they are not! Are they going to move it down in St. Philips?

MR. N. WINDSOR: LaPoile is the place.

MR. S. NEARY: Are they going to move it up on Mount Scio Road? Are they going to move it down in Portugal Cove or Torbay or Bauline?

MR. N. WINDSOR: No, LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Not on your life they are not, Sir. The hon. gentleman tells us we have to get Bill 50 through the House so that we can get rid of the dump down in Robin Hood Bay, but he did not tell us how he is going to get rid of it.

MR. DINN: Wrap it up and burn it.

MR. S. NEARY: Wrap it up and burn it? Well that is what they do in recycling, by the way, and the hon. gentleman in his simplicity has hit right on the formula for recycling garbage. You wrap it up.

AN HON. MEMBER: And burn it.

MR. S. NEARY: And you take the bales away and you bury the bales; then you take the bottles and you send them in one direction, you take the paper and you send it to the paper mills, and you take out other things, iron and steel you take that out and send it to the scrapyards and what you have left over you bale it up and take it away and bury it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, that is, I would say, the big objection to this bill. The big objection is that it is undemocratic and the people should have an opportunity to mark their Xs because, Mr. Speaker, once this bill goes through, Sir, once the bill goes through and the people realize the monster that is being created, they will have to wait, they will have to wait for another year or two before they can get an opportunity to get to the ballot box to give this crowd the works for foisting this bill on them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: They will have to wait too long, they will have to wait a year or two - maybe less, if things keep going the way they are going - and so, Sir, I support the amendment made to withdraw the bill or to give the bill the six month hoist. There is too much uncertainty about this bill, Mr. Speaker. Most people at this time of the year, kids are getting out of school, off camping, you can hardly go down the Trans-Canada Highway these days but you find all the gravel pits, the parks, all filled with people who are on vacation; people are on the move, people are out gardening, setting their few vegetables and so forth, and that is the time that the government picks to ram this bill through the House, trying to lull our people into a sense of complacency. They figure the people would be apathetic towards the bill at this particular time.

MR. J. CARTER: You fellows blocked up the House for most of the sitting.

MR. NEARY: We blocked up the House, Sir, for no part of the sitting. The member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), I believe, told us some time ago that the government has stalled - the government has stalled! What an admission for the hon. gentleman to make! The hon. gentleman has criticized now just about every party on the face of the earth.

MR. F. ROWE: Last weekend he attacked both sides.

MR. NEARY: The next thing he is going to tackle the Vatican.

AN HON. MEMBER: Opportunist.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You are an unclean spirit.

MR. NEARY: And, Sir, the hon. gentleman told us that the government stalled; the government has been stalled, he said, for the last three or four months; they cannot do anything only defend themselves against the attack of the Opposition, try to weasel their way out off the scandals that they are involved in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: They are stalled, they cannot do anything. So the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) now tells us that it is all our fault that Bill 50 did not come before the House sooner.

AN HON. MEMBER: Before the end of May.

MR. NEARY: Who calls the order of business in this House, Mr. Speaker? Who calls the order of business? The Government House Leader, the government calls the order of business in this House. The government decides what we are going to debate and what we are not going to debate in this House. So far, Sir, this session we have seen the government bring in two of the most unpopular measures that any government has ever brought into this House, one being the spruce budworm spray programme and the other Bill 50 to establish Regional Government, two of the most unpopular measure, Sir, ever brought before this House. And this one happens to be brought in at a time when the government thought we were tired and weary, we wanted to pick up our pay cheque, the weather was getting fine and members wanted to go home, that people are on holidays and everybody is apathetic and there is nobody going to worry too much about the bill, ram it through the House when nobody is looking. What a jolt they are after getting! What a jolt they are after getting, Mr. Speaker! And the hon. minister gets up and says, Ah, the members from St. John's, the corner boys have decided that this is alright, this is a good piece of legislation, the lawyers and the doctors have helped to draft it, they had input into it, the snobs and the aristocrats forced it down the throats of the ordinary people.

AN HON. MEMBER: The bluebloods

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: They are not worried about the taxes that will be involved, they are not worried about whether the people want democratic

June 29,1978

Tape No. 4973

AH-3

MR. NEARY: government, they want to elect their own people to this board, they could not care less about that. If we have no bread give them cake, that is what they say.

AN HON.MEMBER: Give them taxes.

MR. NEARY: Sock it to them. Give it to them.

So, Mr. Speaker, the corner boys have told us, "Look, this will be like the harbour development," they said. I have heard the argument come from the other side, how naive, how stupid do people think we are? How naive do they think the people are? "It will be like the harbour arterial road," they said, "once it is in. And once it is put there, and they start to see the benefits of it, oh they will all be over kissing the hem of our garment." What a lot of garbage! "It is like the harbour arterial road." What a lot of garbage, Sir. They have themselves convinced that the protests are going to die down.

MR. F. ROWE: Elizabeth Avenue even talks about it.

MR. NEARY: -that the protests will subside. Oh! The hon. member for Sarasota is asking what protest.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible) not one protest.

MR. NEARY: Not one protest, the hon. gentleman says, not one protest. The hon. gentleman must be completely out of touch with reality because all the hon. gentlemen from St. John's -

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible) I will guarantee you that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. gentleman realize that I am standing here today, I am standing here speaking on this Bill 50 and -

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Get a doctor, Dr. Twomey, just check him, will you?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the only bastion of Toryism left in Newfoundland was right here in this little area that they are now going to put in regional government. And I say thank God they are putting through Bill 50, because not one of the members who are supporting this Bill on the government side will win his seat the next time round.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: Not one!

MR. NEARY: Not one will win his seat, Sir, not one of them. And I am so delighted, I cannot believe it, that this government would commit political hari-kari.

MR. WHITE: They have done just about everything else. They might as well.

MR. NEARY: I realize they were in bad shape, Mr. Speaker. I realize they were in pretty bad shape but I did not think they were that bad, that they would pass it over to us on a silver platter, give up Tory St. John's by default to us because they have got themselves convinced that they is only like the harbour arterial road, that is all it is like. There will only be a few protests against it and then we will ram her through, we will spend the taxpayers money on it and the protest will die down and we will all be heroes. They have themselves convinced of that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! This might be an opportune time to inform hon. members of the matters for debate at five thirty, and the order in which notice was given and the order in which they will be called are as follows; first - notice was given by the hon. member for LaPoile arising from a question asked the hon. Minister of Manpower; the subject matter, the possibility of controlling or regulating Quebec workers from working in this Province. The second matter, notice was given by the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), arising from a question asked the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the subject matter. cutting permits for Canada Bay Lumber Company. And the third matter, notice was given by the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir arising from a question asked the hon. Minister of Manpower with respect to that minister's possible resignation from the Cabinet.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, if people are to have regulations and taxes and the regimentation that they will get under this Bill, if the hon. members for St. John's feel that people should be rescued from poverty and squallor and dirt and filth, that they cannot govern their own affairs, that the government members have to show them the way, show them how to run their own affairs, if they feel they should have regional government why not let the people have a chance to say yes or no, aye or nay to it? Why not? If the hon. member for Mount Scio feels strongly that he in his wisdom lives much better than the people who live in the rural part of St. John's, the outskirts of St. John's, if the hon. gentleman feels that he is living better, that they are poorer off than he is, that they cannot run their own affairs, that they know nothing about democracy, let the hon. gentleman put it to the test. Put it to the test. If the hon. gentleman feels that his ideas are better than theirs, that the ten members from St. John's are God's gift to the people who live in these areas, if

Mr. Neary: they feel their ideas are superior to anybody else's in this Province, then let them put it to the test. If they are so convinced that people want this, they want it, they have told us, they have stood in their places here and they said that people want this, they will thank us for it a year or two from now they will thank us for it. Let the hon. gentleman be prepared to put it to the test.

AN HON. MEMBER: We will.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman has not come in contact with ordinary people I would say in twenty-five years. In twenty-five years the hon. gentleman has not come in contact with ordinary people of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ram it down their throats!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The only time the hon. gentleman sees ordinary people is when they are sitting out in his office in his waiting room waiting to get in so he can get the drill into them -

AN HON. MEMBER: Two dollars -

MR. NEARY: - and then charge them \$2.00 for their little child for bringing them in to get their teeth looked over. That is the only time the hon. gentleman, the only time the hon. gentleman comes in contact with ordinary people, the dollars and cents sign, that is all the hon. gentleman could see. The hon. gentleman leaves here, goes home in the evening cannot get -

MR. CALLAN: Do you know what it costs to get one tooth out? Thirteen bucks.

MR. NEARY: Thirteen dollars to get one tooth out. Well, sure that is it I mean, the hon. gentleman is in touch with reality. And then they get in their little Summer cottages on the weekends, they insulate themselves from the ordinary people. Can the hon. gentleman tell me has the hon. gentleman exposed himself on this matter - I know the hon. gentleman has exposed himself all right - has the hon. gentleman exposed himself to the people on Bill 50?

MR. NEARY: If he did he would probably be arrested for indecent exposure. Has the hon. member for Kilbride, apart from Mr. Albert Burke who he mentioned here the other day, has the hon. gentleman exposed himself to the people and said, people, my people who elected me -

MR. WELLS: Not indecently.

MR. NEARY: - my people who elected me, here is the bill, here are the pitfalls, here are the shortcomings, here are the advantages, here are the disadvantages -

MR. WHITE: How much the taxes will be.

MR. NEARY: - now you tell me as a people, has the hon. gentleman taken it upon himself to send out a householder mailing to the people who will live in the area, in the hon. gentleman's district?

MR. WELLS: The hon. gentleman is answering questions from anyone who is interested.

MR. NEARY: Oh, answered questions to anybody who has come and asked him.

MR. WELLS: That is right, anyone at all.

MR. NEARY: Look, Mr. Speaker, the people who live in the member's district or in the St. John's area would be afraid to go into the hon. gentleman's office, afraid they might be charged a legal fee.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS: That is funny.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not funny, Sir. It is not funny, but it is true. It is true. No more than they would go into the hon. gentleman's office unless they had something wrong with their teeth, and they knew they were going to have to pay the price.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: How about if they had something wrong with their heads?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. member should be very familiar with that. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is time for the members for St. John's smartened up, woke up, Sir, and became more sensitive to

Mr. Neary: the needs of the people who elected them to this House, and withdraw, agree to withdraw Bill 50, or as my colleague said, give it the six month hoist or that it be tabled indefinitely, and members be released from toeing the party line, that they be allowed to vote according to the dictates of their conscience.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that they would get an awful rude of awakening. I believe, Sir, they are afraid to let the people have a say -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: - in the kind of government they want, and the kind of regional government they want. I would almost venture to bet, Sir, that they are afraid, they are too nervous, too scared, too timid to put the question to the people. And what are the questions? Let me repeat them again, Sir. Let me repeat the questions again. What should be put before the people? First of all, do you want an expanded City of St. John's? I think I know what the answer to that would be. But at least it is one of the alternatives that should be put to the people. Do you want an expanded City of St. John's? Do you want a regional government where one-third of the members are appointed? And do you want Bill 50 that gives the minister dictatorial powers?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: or do you want to follow the example of metro Toronto and send representatives from the councils to serve on the Metro board, or do you want to elect members of the Metro board directly yourselves? Four alternatives, Sir, to put before the people, and what is wrong with asking the people to vote on these matters? Today with the electronic media that we have, radio and television, the whole proposition can be put before the people; you say, 'Here it is.' Members can go around in their districts, hold public meetings, they can get on television. And I know hon. gentlemen are going to say, 'But this is not what governments are elected for. Governments were not elected for this.' Governments were elected for it, Sir. We saw it happen recently in California with Proposition 13. And I guarantee you, Sir, right now that hon. gentlemen may be deluding themselves into thinking that people are going to love them for putting this bill through and it may turn out in the end to be the best thing that ever happened to the people - it may turn out that way although I doubt it very much, not this particular bill - but certainly regional government may be the best thing that ever happened to the people, but you have to sell it to them. You have to use the hard sell to sell it to them. If it does not work in this area, Sir. Regional government should have come into this House like a breath of fresh air coming in through the window on a fine day in this House, because it is going to have to be implemented in other parts of the Province. And when they see the controversy and the pitfalls and the protests -

AN HON. MEMBER: And the taxes.

MR. NEARY: Well, yes, and the taxes. When they see the arrogance of an incompetent minister who has unlimited powers under this bill, when they see all this do hon. gentlemen think they are going to get regional

MR. NEARY: government in various other parts of this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the government can push this measure through autocratically. They can force this unpopular decision upon the people who live in the Greater St. John's area. I feel myself, Sir, that the government should not have to use its majority to railroad this bill, Bill No. 50, in its present form through this House. There are alternatives, Sir, as I pointed out. I personally favour the time-tested one, the one that has proven to be a success, the one in Metro Toronto, Mr. Speaker. So I say, let us learn by the experience of Metro Toronto and abandon the thought, Sir, of recklessly forcing upon the Avalon Peninsula citizens an extra, unnecessary layer of government that may well force them in their frustration to a desperate protest such as the one that we saw in California a couple of weeks ago via Proposition 13.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Young) The hon. the member for St. John's South.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I welcome an opportunity to speak again in this debate, in regard to the amendment now, of course, and I must say, I am grateful to the hon. the member for Lewisporte (Mr. F. White) for permitting this.

I think I mentioned when I first spoke that I was afraid that this debate would turn out to be a rather poor one and it really did start off that way. I did not think there was going to really be much to the debate at all, but I think we are really now getting down to the core of the matter and whether we will do it on this amendment I do not know, but we certainly should be grateful to the hon. member for allowing us to keep the discussion

DR. J. COLLINS: going, and perhaps if we do not really settle the matter to everyone's satisfaction on this amendment, one of the members will bring in another amendment - several other amendments - so that we can finally get this whole thing settled, because I think we are going that way. I think we are now performing the educational function that this House should be performing in terms of a debate of this magnitude, because I think people are beginning to realize now that no matter how long the previous hearings went on and the previous expert opinions and publications and so on, really this House has a very big part to play when a matter of this magnitude comes before the people. And I think

DR. J. COLLINS: we are now beginning to perform very well. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the issue now is those who are for regional government and those who are against regional government. This is the issue that is coming our clearly.

Bill 50 has really fallen by the wayside now as a bone of contention. The matters brought up that regarded certain items in bill 50 really seemed to be quite picayune and really the debate has moved away from that now. It is now, are you for regional government? Are you against regional government?

Now, I do not think there is any doubt where the people on this side of the House stand in this regard. I think we are very much - and I think we can say that we have some intimate knowledge to take this position because we really are from this area, or many of us are anyway, the proponents of this bill. I think that we can say that we are solidly and enthusiastically for regional government.

But I think on the other side of the House - this is by no means clear - I think that this is where the educational process is going to be good, not only for the people outside, but for the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I think you have to listen to what is being said by our hon. members opposite, not just what they think they are saying. They think they are saying, 'We are for the concept of regional government.' They make that statement but then when they speak actually other words come out. Now, I do not think that they are being hypocritical or twofaced or anything like that, I really do not think they thought through this concept the way the members on this side have, shall we say, been forced to. I do not think we are any better in any means than the members opposite, but we have been actually forced to sit down with this concept and think it

DR. J. COLLINS: all the way through, look at all the points that are likely to come up for and against and reach a conscious decision about the thing. I do not think the hon. members have been forced into that position and this is why they are doubtful about the validity of regional government.

I might mention the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans. What was his main comment in regard to regional government? His main comment was, 'It is really a rip-off, it is where the City of St. John's wants to rip off the rest of the area.' So, clearly, he cannot be for regional government if he thinks that it is merely a rip-off.

I presume the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) supports the council in his area. Certainly he has not disclaimed or disowned the council in his area and the council in his area has come out publicly in the paper and said, "We want no part of bill 50 or any part of regional government." This was in the paper. Now the hon. member for Conception Bay South did not disown that statement so he, presumably, supports it. The gist of his remarks were in the same vein so clearly he is not enamoured and rather against, I would say, regional government.

The hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White), although he has done a service to this House in allowing us to get into a really cogent debate, the whole tenor of his remarks was that regional government means taxes, taxes are bad, people do not like them, probably they are bad politically so do not go that route. So, again the clear message - if I were a Martian and I came into this House and I listened to the speech of the hon. member for Lewisporte I would say, 'There is one hon. member who certainly would not touch,' as someone said earlier, 'would not touch regional government with a barge pole.' That was the whole burden of his message.

DR. J. COLLINS:

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) as he said there a little while ago, he said, 'Why do you need regional government for the dump? Why do you need it for water supplies' and so on and so forth, 'the provincial government can do all this?' In other words, he is saying, 'I am against regional government. We do not really need regional government. We have provincial government and that is it.'

Well now, this is, I think, where the crux of the matter is and where this debate is of some value. We have to really look at regional government. There are many who studied it and are convinced, but there are many - and I am not only saying this of the Opposition, I am saying many of the people I have talked to, they are still not yet in their hearts and souls convinced of the value of regional government. Although if you ask them sepcific questions on how to deal with the problems they do not have the answers, they almost hate the thought of regional government but really, when you talk to them intelligently, they know they have to accept it and this is where this debate is going to help them.

Now when the Opposition say that they really do like the concept of regional government nevertheless, although, as I say, I do not think their remarks add up to that, they make certain suggestions but really, these suggestions do not add up.

The hon. member for

DR. J. COLLINS: LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in his concept, I could not see any difference in that concept from the expanded city, and the expanded city is so far out in left field that it is not worth thinking about. It would be hopeless to try to bring in the expanded city in this area. No one would accept it. And that is what his concept is. He says there is going to be no bureaucracy, not another level of bureaucracy. Who is going to manage the region? There has to be a bureaucracy. And if there is no bureaucracy brought in, which bureaucracy is going to do it? It is the city of St. John's bureaucracy. In other words, the city of St. John's through its present forms and through its present mechanisms would take over the area. In other words, we will end up with an expanded city and it will dominate the area. And this is not acceptable to the people and as I mentioned when I talked to this debate previously, the city cannot do it, the city really is not that good. It is doing a limited function moderately well, no more than that. It is not doing an expanded function in the city and if it cannot do an expanded function in the city there is no way it could do an expanded function throughout the area.

Now I think the hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay had brought up a case that one has to look at a bit more carefully. But I think if you look at his concept of regional government where he says, 'This is a council that I support,' really, he does not have a case. What he is talking about is not regional government. Let us just look at what he said. He said, 'The thing to do would be to get together the elected representatives from the councils already in place.' Now what authority is there for that? There is nothing in the St. John's City Act, there is nothing in the Local Government Act that says they have the authority to send

DR. J. COLLINS: representatives to some body or other that is going to deal with a region. They do not have that authority. We would have to alter these Acts already in place to give them the authority even to send a representative. And if we did not do that, how would we do it otherwise? The only way it could be done would be the hon. minister would have to appoint members from these various regions. Well, the whole burden of the message opposite, if there is a message, is that we do not want appointments, and here you have to appoint the whole thing. You would either have to alter radically the Acts presently in place to give the elected municipalities the authority to send representatives or you would have to have some sort of appointive mechanism to get them together and either one is a hopeless situation. Also if you could get these people together, what jurisdiction would they have? They would have jurisdiction from their own areas only because that is all they are elected for. They could not possibly have any jurisdiction for areas outside their own municipalities. They have no legislative authority in that area whatever.

MR. NOLAN: What do the St. John's members of the council now do on the Metro Board?

DR. J. COLLINS: The St. John's council are appointed to it. They have no authority in the City of St. John's Act to act outside the city of St. John's. If they have authority out there it is because they are appointed to that board irrespective or almost despite the fact that they are city councillors.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible) any commuters coming into St. John's. You do not have any people outside (inaudible) poll tax, you know.

DR. J. COLLINS: In St. John's South?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, South. (Inaudible)

DR. J. COLLINS: Yes. The area is urban, right.

DR. J. COLLINS:

So also, if you got this group together you would still have only a very limited area of the whole Northeast Avalon area represented. Because the elected councils only cover relatively small geographic areas, you would have large areas not covered at all, and even if one went to the other areas and said, 'Do you want to come in or do you not want to come in?' if some areas of the non-incorporated areas said, 'We do want to come in,' and others do not, you would have a hodge-podge, you would have a patchwork quilt of a district. So the whole thing just does not hang together at all. The only other way you could do it would be to have the Metro Board represent all these areas. In other words, you get the representatives from the elected councils together and then you would say to the Metro Board, 'Alright, now you come in to represent all the other incorporated areas. So here you would have large numbers of people who have no say whatever. In the bill that is going forward, they are going to have at least a two-third elective say and a one-third appointive say as an initial phase,

DR. COLLINS: but in the other method the only way you could do it would be to say to all these people in the non-incorporated areas you have no elective say you must have an appointive say because we are going to have the Metro Board represent you. So I think the point is this, that this bill did not arise just out of whim, this bill arose out of great study, not study only by the PC members for the St. John's area, this bill arose out of a study reaching back to 1957 and it went through studies there. It went through the Proctor and Redfern study phase, it went through the Henley study phase, it then went through the ministry study phase, it went through the MHA study phase, This has been a subject that has almost been studied to death and out of all those studies, for better or for worse - we have not got a perfect instrument, it would be stupid to say that this bill is perfect and I am sure hon. members opposite know that we do not say that this bill is perfect; no bill is perfect or ever will be perfect. But out of all of this we have come up with a very good bill in my opinion and the points that are brought up in contradiction to it only show how good the bill is because the other alternatives just do not hold water.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just say a word or two on the appointment point because I have discussed this matter with some people; some people I think are very much in favour of Regional Government but this does stick a bit with them, When they think about it they say, "I do not want appointed people in there making big decisions for me," This really bothers them. And the only way I can rationalize it - if 'rationalize' is the right word and I do not think it is, actually - but the only way I can put it across is this; when Newfoundland progressed from being a Crown colony to something else, we went through an appointive stage and then when we got into gear then we went through a fully representative stage. and the same way in unincorporated areas.

MR. PECKFORD: That is why we have local improvement districts.

DR. COLLINS: Right. I was just going to say this. When you have a totally unincorporated area and you want to incorporate, you do not suddenly, say, grab a fellow off his farm and say you are going to be mayor and so

DR. COLLINS: on and so forth, you go through a local appointive stage and then you perhaps even go through a partial one and finally you get into the other thing. And I think this is what we are doing here.

This is an innovation in Newfoundland, a long-delayed innovation that many other countries have had for generations and we are now finally tasting the fruits and it has been long needed. But it is a very massive innovation here, I think that it would be most unwise if we did it sloppily and in an illplanned way. It is very wise to take what precautions we can see are sensible, that is use a mechanism that is now in place, that is the Metro Board, use the best out of that that is the Chairman and a few other experienced members, add to that a certain number of elected people and then down the road a bit, and I would certainly hope that it will not be too far down the road, I hope within a matter of years as opposed to five or ten years type of thing, that we will be in a position to have all these people elected and they will be then building on a base that has been solidly established.

Now, the final thing: I would like to end up on a political note because my friend the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) did finally get into a political note. As the hon. member was speaking, I could not help thinking that we are making headway because he really did not have his old fire there today, his heart is not really in opposition to that, I think he is really more than half persuaded that we are on the right track with this bill and I think we have a bit of a breakthrough even when he says, previously, you know, he would not touch appointed people with a barge pole, using that awful expression again, but now he says, "All right, we will take an appointed chairman." I would think as we go on with this, as we hope to do for another two or three weeks with this debate, the hon. member will say, Right, we will take the chairman and now we will take a few other appointed members and finally, if we do not watch out we will have all the members on the municipal council appointed.

But on a political note, I think hon. members opposite really think that they are on to a good thing politically here and I would not stack my political acumen against theirs but I would doubt it. I think that the members on this side of the House have a feeling for the political groundswell in this area. I think we know that people do not

DR. J. COLLINS: like taxes, that people do not like government and all this sort of thing. But nevertheless I think we know that the people in this area, and I am not confining in this sense to just this area, that that when it comes to the crunch they take the right decisions. And when the hon. the Minister for Recreation and Rehabilitation spoke—a very canny politician, I would suggest—he came out very strongly and he said, Look, the people in Outer Cove and Flatrock and in Pouch Cove, and so on and so forth, they are really behind this. He said even the people in Torbay are essentially behind this. And I think that is a message that, coming from that individual with his record as a politician, I would take heart in what he says, and it certainly fits in what I have learned myself in conversation with people that even though no one likes taxes, no one likes government, no one likes another thing, nevertheless this is a good move and we have to get into it sooner or later.

I remember talking to someone from Wedgewood Park a little while ago and he said, "We got a very good deal out there, we are certainly glad we are not part of the City, but, you know, we know that this cannot last forever. We are onto a good thing, and if anyone tried to shake it we will kick a bit, but we know it cannot last. We know that we have to go the route of fitting in with the rest of the district." So that is how people are thinking. And I would suggest to the members opposite that if they think that there is big political gains for them in this and political suicide for us, I am willing to bet a dollar or two that this will not turn out to be the case.

Mr. Speaker, the Late Show goes on just about this time. To give you a chance to get it organized, I could adjourn at this point, or should we carry right on to the last minute?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS: All right, I will sit down in that case.

MR. F. ROWE: I will move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde has moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker: Do hon. members wish to call it 5:30?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House. The first matter for debate: the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the subject matter, control or regulation of Quebec workers from working in the Province.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the government of this Province, Sir, must immediately take a good hard look at Quebec's new labour legislation prohibiting workers from other provinces, taking jobs in the Province of Quebec. And before this session of the House is over, Sir, before we adjourn for the Summer we must pass, in my opinion, similar legislation in this Province so we can immediately take action to retaliate if Quebec, as appears certain, goes ahead to enforce its new regulations. We might also further stipulate, Mr. Speaker, that all workers in Newfoundland and Labrador pass an English fluency test before being granted a permit to work in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, Premier Davis of Ontario has taken a tough stand, has taken a firm stand against Quebec's mad dog labour legislation barring residents of other provinces from working in the Province of Quebec after July 1. In case we feel here in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to escape the brunt of Lesvesque's nation wrecking legislation, then we should take a look at the Bartlett Report on hiring practices in Labrador. And Mr. Bartlett did not suggest the work permit, he did not go quite that far, but told us that we should take a look at our hiring practices in Western Labrador.

The people of this Province, Sir, have every reason to support Premier Davis for challenging the arrogant attitude of Mr. Lesvesque who has been looking at Labrador now for a few years with a jaundiced eye since becoming Premier of the Province of Quebec. And we should have no hesitation, Sir, in joining with our sister Province of Ontario in forcing Lesvesque to backtrack on this legislation which is due to come into effect on July 1, which is Canada Day or Unity Day -

Mr. Neary: next Monday, I believe, we are observing the holiday. On a straight retaliation basis, Mr. Speaker, Quebec would suffer far more from similar legislation in Ontario and in Newfoundland because there are many more Quebec workers in our two provinces than there are Newfoundland workers or Ontario workers in Quebec. Our own Province, Sir, has far more reasons to fear the French-Canadian nationalism.

MR. NEARY:

in Western Labrador than any other province that borders on the Quebec border or any other province in Canada. And it is high time, Sir, that we developed a little courage and took some tough action to sort out the situation which up to now has been ignored. And when we think, Sir, of the Quebec influence in Newfoundland we have a tendency too often to think about Western Labrador. But what about the group of people who are hemmed in down in the Straits of Belle Isle on the Labrador side who have to depend on medical services in Blanc Sablon in the Province of Quebec, who have to depend on the use of the airport in Blanc Sablon in the Province of Quebec. And the Province of Quebec will not even keep the road open in the Wintertime to give the people of Newfoundland access to that airstrip. It is about time, Sir, that we got over this foolish nonsense of the Quebec influence in Labrador, and that we took a tough stand in this Province and it is about time that all Canadians and all the other provinces took a tough stand. If Quebec, Sir, proceeds to enforce its regulations, pending a long, drawn-out court decision, we, and hopefully New Brunswick and hopefully Ontario, should do the same. Let us show Quebec, Sir, let us show Mr. Levesque and his mad dog legislators that Newfoundland, like Ontario, refuses to be a passive door mat. We may have problems with recalling power from the Upper Churchill, but there is nothing to stop us, Sir, from following the lead of Ontario Labour Minister, Betty Stevenson, and introduce legislation into this Province to retaliate against the legislation that they are implementing in the Province of Quebec on July 1st., that can only put Canada on a disaster course, that can only cause disunity, that can only cause dissension and hatred amongst the workers of this nation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Labour and Manpower, who is not in his seat, who has not been this afternoon, who was out doing some work on a number of the strikes in the Province, so he informed me, just before the House opened, I would like to acknowledge what the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has to say as it relates to legislation being introduced by the Government of Quebec, as it relates to workers in their province and to indicate to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that the government is aware of legislation and pending legislation in Ontario and we are looking very carefully at the situation to see just how other provinces react and to be in touch with the Labour Departments in the other provinces, to get a full reading of the situation before we embark on any hasty actions of our own.

We acknowledge and recognize the problems that exist both in Labrador West and in the Straits area as it relates to Quebec and it is quite likely that action is going to have to be taken by this government to ensure that Newfoundlanders get jobs first and all the other things that that implies. Let it also be known, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the Upper Churchill contract and the long, drawn-out process that that involves, that a major step has been taken. Today I understand that the Supreme Court of Canada has made a ruling today, a very significant ruling which denies the Hydro Quebec and Quebec Government's claim that this court case that we have put before the Supreme Court of Newfoundland should come under the auspices of the Supreme Court of Canada. In other words, now there are two defeats at the hands of the Quebec Government, one that the Quebec courts themselves have said they do not have jurisdiction and the highest court in the land, the Supreme Court of Canada has said that they do not have jurisdiction. In other words, that will have to be held in the Supreme Court of Newfoundland which speeds up the whole process by about one year, so I have been advised this afternoon by legal people. So that there is some movement,

June 29, 1978

Tape No. 4981

NM - 3

MR. PECKFORD: some quick movement now to take place as it relates to the Upper Churchill contract which has some bearing in a very general, broad way upon this whole issue and question of Quebec versus Newfoundland, our workers and so on. So that is some relatively good news but I do not want to detract from the main kernel of what the hon. member was trying to get across, and all I can say on behalf of government at this point in time is that we are aware of steps being taken in Quebec and in Ontario and we are watching it very closely and we will not be the caboose in the train which is to be set up as it relates to counteracting initiatives by the Province of Quebec which are detrimental to this Province and to this country.

June 29, 1978

Tape 4982

DW - 1

MR. SPEAKER: The second matter for debate, the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) and the subject matter, cutting permits for Canada Bay Lumber Company.

Hon. member.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, there is a town in my district facing certain economic death at this moment. It is a town that sees no future at the present time, a town of 1,200 or 1,400 people and I am talking of course about the town of Roddickton. The only employer in that community, Mr. Speaker, since the closedown of Labrador Linearboard has been the Canada Bay Lumber Company. Now that company over the past three or four months has been given a raw runaround, or so it appears, by the one department of government that could give it a breath of life and of course I am talking about the Department of Forestry and Agriculture. There are 200 or more men and their families in that community waiting for the government to make a move to help them. They are destitute, Mr. Speaker, and they face a hopeless future unless the minister takes some moves on their behalf; and there is a ray of hope but it will take positive action by the minister. Canada Bay Lumber Company has found a market for 2,000 cords of pulpwood to Bowaters Newfoundland Limited. It is not economical to ship that wood from Roddickton to Corner Brook at the price of \$50.75 a cord, which is the maximum price that Bowaters will pay, so they need help from the government; They need the government to drop the stumpage and royalties fees and even if that is done, Mr. Speaker, the company will take a loss, but they are prepared to take that loss in order to provide the employment and clean up the timber blocks in the area. The company has put in two or three stud mills so that they can saw the logs to much smaller dimensions than would be the case if that were not done. That would greatly reduce the waste, Mr. Speaker; nobody wants to leave wasted timber on their blocks. - the company does not want it, the town does not want it, the men does not want it, nobody in the area wants it. But in order for that to happen, Mr. Speaker, in order to sell

MR. T. RIDEOUT: the pulpwood and in order to get the operation going there is going to be help needed from the government.

Mr. Speaker, the regional forester in that area promised that company three months ago that they would have everything ready for Canada Bay Lumber Company by June 1st. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is June 28th. and there is still no sign that that commitment made by the regional forester has been kept. The deputy minister of the department had told the company, in response to correspondence, that he could see no problems in solving the problem so that they could issue permits to the company, yet the company has been advised during this present week that there is no approval in sight, that the government is not prepared to meet the conditions that were set out by the company.

Now, Mr. Speaker the time is running out. The town of Roddickton faces a very bleak economic future at this present time. A year or so down the road if Labrador Linearboard opens things may be better, but right now the town is dying economically and the only industry that can save that town is facing certain death and gloom. So I ask the minister to act and I ask the government to act. Let the minister show that he has some faith in the town of Roddickton, let him show that commitment and let him, without any further delay, make sure that that company is issued cutting permits, make sure that the bridge that is necessary on the forestry access road is put into place, and make sure that that company can get in the woods so that 250 men that are dependent on that company for livelihood can get on with the job and do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member gets very emotional when he speaks and quite often he gets off on the wrong tangent. The member is quite well aware of what the situation is in

MR. MAYNARD:

Roddickton and what the situation was last year when we gave the company leeway in cutting large timber or high-grading, to put it in better context, high-grading in the Roddickton area in order for them to keep their mill going. And the town council of Roddickton, which I presume represents some of the people in the Roddickton area as well as the hon. member, objected to that very strenuously because there was high-grading going on and because it would cut out the available timber was in a short period of time. We then told the company that we could no longer go along with the high-grading method and they would have to put in facilities and equipment that would take care of all the timber. If they could not find a

Mr. Maynard: market for pulpwood, pulpwood timber, four to five inch timber, then it would be necessary for them to put in stud mills in order to saw smaller size lumber. Now the company has not been given the royal runaround; the Canada Bay Lumber Company in Roddickton has been treated very well by government over the past few years. There has been very good concessions made, and one that I may point out right now, the normal rate of stumpage in this Province when we provide roads for any company is \$7 per 1,000. The Canada Bay Lumber Company at this point in time is getting it for \$3 per 1,000. And I might point out, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. member that they still owe \$10,000 from the 3 million board feet that they cut last year which they have not paid up to this point in time.

MR. RIDEOUT: Why are they getting a preferred rate?

MR. MAYNARD: They are getting a preferred rate because of the area they were in, and because government wanted to help in economically depressed area.

MR. RIDEOUT: They would do the maintenance on the roads in return, right?

MR. MAYNARD: Sure they would do the maintenance on the roads. We built the roads for them at \$3 per 1,000, Mr. Speaker. Sure they would do the maintenance on the roads. It was a very normal course of action, I would think. The company has been given the opportunity to come up with a plan in order to cut the timber that is in the Roddickton area, at least in certain specific cases, and to saw it and they have now come up, I understand, with a market for 2,000 cords of pulpwood. Now that is fine, Mr. Speaker, but they did not put that on paper and they did not make their application until the 26th. of June, which was exactly three days ago. And they have not been refused a permit. There is a letter from the Forester in Port Saunders, Mr. Brown, that has gone out to them - or Roddickton, rather - that has gone out to them in the last couple of days saying that once the \$10,000 in royalty is paid they will get their permit. Presumably then they

Mr. Maynard: will be able to go ahead with their operation.

That is hardly giving a company or the town of Roddickton any run a round and I would suggest that if we did not demand that they cut the small timber in the area, the town council would be on our backs, and I would rather have the Canada Bay Lumber Company and the member on my back than have the town council of Roddickton.

MR. RIDEOUT: I was talking to (inaudible) just now. He phoned you the day before yesterday and could not get you (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: The third matter for debate, notice given by the hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir; the subject matter pertains to the hon. Minister of Manpower and his possible resignation from the Cabinet.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked certain questions of the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations relating to his possible resignation from the Cabinet. I gave the required notice yesterday afternoon that I wished to raise the matter on the adjournment motion today. The matter is one which calls for a decision by the minister and is not an issue which can be adequately addressed by any other minister on behalf of the Minister of Manpower. I do not particularly wish to pursue the matter in the minister's absence, as he is absent at this moment, as I feel this issue ought to be debated in his presence and with his participation. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to debate the matter at this time. I shall therefore forfeit my speaking opportunity for the present and give notice that I fully intend to arrange to have the matter raised on the adjournment of the House next Thursday should it become necessary, that is, if the minister is not already submitted his resignation.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, in the minister's absence, I will ensure that he is aware of the comments of the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), and no doubt the hon.

Mr. Peckford: minister will be present for next Thursday's late show in order to fully discuss the matter with the hon. member. But I will ensure for my part that he gets the message that the hon. member has just mentioned.

MR. SPEAKER: Now before putting the question to adjourn before the House, I should just say - and I do not think there is any misunderstanding on this, but just to preclude it - for the recurrence of the debate there would not be an automatic wait over in the regular procedure.

MR. SIMMONS: I would just, Mr. Speaker, arrange to see that it is on, or arrange to give notice at least, and it then it would be Mr. Speaker's decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the Chair is that the House adjourn. Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour "Aye"?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Aye".

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Nay".

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion, the "Nayes" have it.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we can call it 6:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that we call it 6:00 o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

I leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

JUNE 29, 1978

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

8:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.

THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 1978

The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The debate on the amendment was adjourned by the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate the member for Lewisporte for moving this particular amendment which has, in effect, given this bill the six month hoist. In other words, the bill has now been deferred for six months in order to give people an opportunity for input into this bill. Further consultation, in other words, further consultation. Sir, if ever there was a need for futher consultation!

Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 33, Sir, I move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition, that further consideration of this question be postponed to a day certain, namely, the 30th. day of November 1978, which, Sir, I believe is not debatable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question! Question! Question!

MR. F.B. ROWE: Question! No point of order.

MR. FLIGHT: No point of order. It is not debatable, boy.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot hear anything until I have a copy of the -

MR. F.B. ROWE: Count the members. Count the members opposite.

MRS. MCISAAC: Nine.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is a point of order I will have to hear it.

MR. NEARY: You have to put the question first.

MR. DOODY: A point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

As I understand it there is already an amendment to a motion

MR. PECKFORD: and, therefore, I am not at all sure that Standing Order 33 is applicable in this instance. Therefore, I would ask Your Honour to look carefully at what the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F.B. Rowe) has just proposed in order to assure the hon. House that what he has just proposed is in order.

"When a question is under debate no question is received unless to amend it; to postpone it to a day certain; for the previous question." I am not sure whether that whole Standing Order 33 applies, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask for some guidance from you on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I do have to rule on that point.

Actually the question now before the House is an amendment to a particular bill, a six month hoist amendment. That is an amendment, one of those amendments, which is not in itself amendable. However, what the hon. gentleman has moved is not an amendment but a motion, a motion which I think is called a dilatory motion.

The motion is in order and it is of the nature of non-debatable motions. I therefore put the question. The motion is that further consideration -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

- of this question be postponed to the 30th. day of November 1978.

Those in favour of the motion please say 'aye'. Contrary minded please say 'nay'. I can only judge, obviously, by immediate eye, what my eye immediately tells me in making certain assumptions: In my opinion the 'ayes' have it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Those in favour of the motion that further consideration of the question be postponed to the 30th day of November, 1978, please stand.

Mr. Hodder, Mrs. MacIsaac, Mr. Strachan, Mr. Fred Rowe, Mr. Neary, Mr. Simmons, Mr. White, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Lush, Dr. Kitchen, Mr. Callan, Mr. Flight, Mr. Canning, Capt. Winsor, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Rideout, Mr. McNeil, Mr. Jack Winsor, Mr. Moores.

Those opposed to the motion, please stand.

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Mr. Lundrigan, Dr. Collins, Mr. Young, Dr. Twomey, Mr. Goudie, Mr. Neil Windsor, Mr. Cross, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Woodrow, Mr. Power.

The motion is carried, twenty in favour of, fourteen against.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Order 26.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I move that Order 26 be deferred and we discuss an urgent matter of public importance, namely, the unemployment in this Province at the present time. The motion is seconded by the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I cannot accept that now. Under Standing Order No. 23, such leave may be asked upon the calling of Orders of the Day, but I cannot accept it now.

MR. HICKMAN: Order 26.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Administration Of Certain Facilities Constructed For The Canada Summer Games."

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation, I take great pleasure in introducing for second reading, Bill No. 74, "An Act To Provide For the Administration Of Certain Facilities Constructed For The Canada Summer Games."

MR. B. PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as most hon. members know, very successful Summer Games was held here in the Province last year in the capital city of St. John's, and many facilities were constructed to allow those games to go ahead. After the Summer games were completed with money from both the Federal Government, the Provincial Government and the Municipal Government, it had to be decided on how just one would dispose of those very valuable assets. Of course, Mr. Speaker, it has always been sort of a debatable thing with rural members especially in this hon. Assembly, and no doubt by citizens around the Province in rural settlements, of the advantage of these kinds of facilities in the capital city when there are many places around the Province crying out for recreational facilities. So, therefore, it is extremely important that government who are involved in this give serious consideration as to how we are going to dispose of these facilities so that they are going to be used not only by the city of St. John's or by the citizens of the St. John's urban region but by everybody in the Province. So therefore government did establish a commission in order to examine just how these facilities should be

MR. DOODY:

I cannot hear my hon. friend. There is a Committee meeting going on here in the corner.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. gentleman has difficulty hearing.

MR. B. PECKFORD:

The hon. member for the Straits (Mr. Roberts), the former leader, would grace us with his presence more often perhaps one would be a little relaxed in how we impose the rules.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. B. PECKFORD:

Perhaps the hon. member can give more sense to the assembly if he was here more often then and therefore participated in the debate. Because the hon. member was defeated once or twice or three times does not mean necessarily that he will be defeated forever.

There is still hope for the hon. member for the Straits. I mean, let us all face that. There is still hope for the hon. member for the Straits.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

If hon. members would restrain themselves and not interrupt, and if the hon. gentleman would speak on the bill and others would not interrupt him. I realize he may have been led astray but I am endeavouring to resolve that.

MR. PECKFORD:

I think His Honour in trying to assist me to be pertinent to the debate. The explanatory note Mr. Speaker, I ask for some silence.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I must ask hon. members not to speak in such loud voices. The hon. gentleman apparently is having great difficulty in speaking and he does have the right to express himself.

Hon. minister.

MR. B. PECKFORD:

Yes, I hope, Mr. Speaker, you mean that I have the right to express myself here in this Chamber when I am on my feet and have the floor and no other hon. members do, and I take it that is what you mean because that is how I interpreted it and I would like to have silence so that I can proceed with my few remarks on this bill in second reading.

The two major facilities that were constructed last year for the Summer Games were, as everybody knows, the Aquarena and the Canada Games Summer playgrounds or park which are the track and field facilities for the Summer Games and, of course, for the Province now. These two facilities, notwithstanding the major improvements that were done to the former St. Pat's field which is now the baseball park, are the three major facilities that were constructed. There was a lot of work, of course, done also on a number of softball pitches around the Province, around the city as well. The one at the Lion's Park over here near the Curling Club and also the softball park at Bannerman Park was also constructed. There was also other work done on some of the facilities at Churchill Park to provide field hockey facilities.

But the two big money grabbers were of course the Aquarena near the Univeristy and the other

MR. PECKFORD: being near the university also, the track and field park. Up until now, Mr. Speaker, these facilities have not been used because they are waiting some action by government and as a result of Judge Steele's commission there has been put together this act, Bill 74, to put into place a proper procedure for dispensing of, and the operation of these facilities.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, after having said that, and considering that we are into just approval in principle, I am sure all hon. members in this Assembly will be only too happy to support this kind of a bill to put into place a proper vehicle for the administration of these facilities which everybody in the city and even around the Province are dying to get their hands on because, this being Summer and all, there can be an ongoing swimming programme at the Aquarena, and there is right now a number of activities ongoing in the Province and also in the Atlantic Provinces for tournaments, for all Newfoundland track and field tournaments, for Atlantic Provinces tournaments that can make use of both the Aquarena and the track and field facilities. So it is important we move quickly to get these things in place, as is mentioned here in this act, so that the young people of the city, as well as the young people of Newfoundland and Atlantic Canada, can take full advantage of these facilities that came our way by funds from Ottawa, funds from the Province and funds from the city, to allow the young people to go ahead and use them now so that we will be better off because of the Summer Games.

I think most hon. members are familiar with the recommendations that were in the report that Judge Steele made and that most of them are contained here, the Canada Games Park Commission, which will consist of three members to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, or

MR. PECKFORD: the Provincial Government because of our heavy involvement in it. And may I say, Mr. Speaker, that our heavy involvement, I think the Provincial Government put more money into the Canada Games facilities than any other individual government, number one. And number two, if I am not mistaken we are going to be asked to pick up a fairly sizeable deficit.

One talks about the deficit in Montreal, which of course is dealing with a world-wide games situation, but as I understand it, we are talking about in this Province right now a deficit of \$700,000 or \$800,000, eighty or ninety per cent of which will have to be picked up by the Provincial Government.

MR. NEARY: How much?

MR. PECKFORD: Eighty or ninety per cent.

MR. RIDEOUT: Eighty-five - fifteen.

MR. PECKFORD: No, I do not know if you can separate the operating and capital as it relates to - it just relates to the Canada Summer Games, and the Canada Summer Games Committee has built up a deficit, I should not say 'has built up; it seems like they were deliberately going out of their way to do it, but what I mean is they have incurred a deficit of somewhere in the order of \$700,000 to \$800,000, which this government has to pick up. The federal government will not pick up any more of the money for the Canada Summer Games. The city council is looking at somewhere around fifteen per cent and so here we have a situation that is not at all healthy from a financial point of view and yet the facilities now are not being used. So it is extremely important that we get it in place so why I bring that in, Mr. Speaker, is simply because in section three of the bill we are talking about three members to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, which is the Provincial Government,

MR. PECKFORD: through Cabinet, we are going to have to have a large say in the operation of those facilities. If on the one hand the provincial government is asked to contribute more money than anybody else at the start, then to pick up eighty per cent of the deficit at the end, then this House should want to discuss it fully, number one, and then to pass certain acts or bills and amendments to or whatever, that will allow the government, through this House, to have some real say in the operation of those facilities.

Now whether it is done the way section three is or what, that is why the three members are to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council or the government. One member to be appointed by the city and one member to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council upon the recommendation of the Board of Directors of the Newfoundland and Labrador Amateur Sports Federation, which is a reasonable proposition obviously. We should have somebody

MR. PECKFORD: who represents the major or the parent or umbrella body of the sports fraternity in the Province and hence, that is in there. So that is a fairly major part of the whole bill, is this commission that was recommended by Judge Steele and his report should be established to operate it. But I am sure that hon. members on both sides of the House will want to speak at some length on this whole question of the full cost of the games to the city and to the Province, and even to the Federal government, for that matter, but particularly now as it affects us and to the Province in the deficit of \$700,000 which no doubt the minister when he gets in his seat will be able to speak on so that when we pass this bill we will be recognizing that fact and giving the government the kind of power that it will need to carry on and administer these facilities. And remembering always that we must - and while I am in favour of the commission as proposed in this bill we must insure that people from all over Newfoundland get a chance to use these facilities and so why it should go to a commission rather than to the city, rather than to the University or rather than to some other organization which is orientated primarily to St. John's or to this region because I think that would do a great disservice because all the people of the Province have paid for these facilities and not only the people of St. John's.

MR. DOODY: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: So therefore a commission which reflects that kind of psychology or philosophy, whatever you want to call it, is essential in order to put in place a vehicle which is the right vehicle to administer because the Canada Games Park is Newfoundland's Games Park from here on, that the Aquarena is Newfoundland's Aquarena, not St. John's, not Memorial University's or anybody else's but everybody's and I am sure that it will be the intention of this commission to insure that all Newfoundland finals or all Newfoundland tournaments as relates to track and field, as it relates to swimming, will be able to use those facilities and they will get first crack at them rather than it being any kind of move on anybody else's part.

The rest of the bill, the objects of the

MR. PECKFORD:

commission are outlined there, Mr. Speaker, in some detail; the powers of the commission are outlined under Section 11, the staff under Section 12; financial year of the commission under Section 15; and 16 has to do with the finances of it and when it shall submit to the minister its financial statement, the Auditor General shall audit the accounts under Section 20, and Section 22, the business of course of its being enabling legislation in the sense that regulations can also be made under the act.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill which will put into place a commission to operate the Aquarena and the Canada Games Park so that they can get into use. I notice as I pass along every day, Mr. Speaker, on one of the other facilities, the Baseball Park, the old St. Pat's area, the field down there off Empire Avenue, off Carpasian Road that the grass has been growing pretty green and pretty long on that facility and as an old baseball fan I would like to - the only place in this city where you can attract any fans for baseball is not where it is now being played but it is in this new park that is down there now that is lying dormant even though the baseball season is upon us. It is important that we move on these facilities, get a commission established and get the young people of this Province involved in facilities that were put there in the first instance for the Summer Games but always keeping in mind the longterm, and that is to provide additional recreational facilities for all Newfoundland. So I am very proud to move second reading.

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of a piece of legislation that we on this side of the House do not know if we are for or against it. It is one of those situations where a project has been carried out and now it is going to be foisted on the people of this Province. The taxpayers all over Newfoundland have to now pay for facilities that can only be used in the city of St. John's and God only knows they have enough facilities here now, Sir. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, before I swing into this, for the benefit of the people that have taken the trouble tonight to come up from St. Thomas's and other areas to hear these debates

MR. NEARY: on Bill No. 50, regional government, as the House knows, the Opposition defeated the government a few moments ago. About a couple of minutes before the people arrived in the gallery the Opposition outnumbered, defeated the government, and Bill No. 50, regional government is now postponed for six months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I am happy to be able to tell the people that they can relax at least for another six months and that will give us a little breathing spell when we can really dig in if we have a Fall session. And I doubt very much if the Premier and the ministers and the government have the nerve to come back and face us again in the Fall of the year. They cannot wait now to get the House closed, Sir.

MR. DOODY: You wanted the House closed. You tried to close her down (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows that was merely a trial run. We were just lining up our troops. We were firing up the troops.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows we could have closed the House tonight, and we could still close the House. We still have the majority. We do not want the House closed. We were merely having a trial run, just testing out the other side, firing up the troops, getting their morale up, and the hon. gentleman saw the result of it tonight when we came in and defeated the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And under our parliamentary system, Sir, if they would do the honourable thing, the Premier would fly in from the West Coast or wherever he is, go down to the Governor and pass in his resignation and have a general election in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Resign! Resign!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Any minister who is defeated on a money bill should quit.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they should resign in ignominious defeat and disgrace.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: But obviously, Sir, they are going to brazen it out as they have done over the last three or four months - the most brazen government, Sir, we have ever seen in the history of the British Empire, in the history of British parliamentary government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill that the minister introduced a few moments ago - and unexpectedly, I might say, the minister never expected that he would have to introduce this bill tonight, so he was totally unprepared - he put up no defence for the bill at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: Told us nothing.

MR. NEARY: Told us nothing about it.

MR. W. ROWE: Told us what he knew -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: - which was nothing.

MR. NEARY: Just kept reading the odd paragraph from the bill. And obviously, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was ill-prepared.

AN HON. MEMBER: He was in shock.

MR. NEARY: He was in a state of shock and could not do the job that he was supposed to do in the introduction of this bill.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is Alex Hickman?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the ministers are scattered all over the countryside. They are out in the hinterlands -

AN HON. MEMBER: Salmon fishing.

MR. NEARY: - salmon fishing, jetting around in helicopters, travelling in Europe. They are doing it all except here running the affairs of this country. And we have before us now, Sir, a piece of legislation that has been foisted on the people of this Province when what we should be debating is the cost of electricity and the high unemployment that we have in this Province at the present time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if there was any parliamentary technique that we could use to push this bill aside we would do it now and go on and debate unemployment which is far more important than having a little clique

MR. NEARY: in St. John's stick their hand down in the public treasury and take out a few dollars to keep the Summer Games facilities going for the elite of this city, because, Mr. Speaker, it is the snobs and the aristocrats who will benefit more from this than anybody else in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The ordinary person, Sir, cannot afford to take advantage of these facilities. They cannot afford to buy their kids the equipment that they need and the things that they need to go over there in that Aquarena.

MR. DOODY: What about St. Pat's softball field?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is a different situation.

Sir, what we have in this city - we have facilities -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must point out that one hon. member at a time speaking would certainly be a felicitous situation and I would ask hon. members not to interrupt.

The hon. member.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman says, "What about St. Pat's?" I would say, yes, St. Pat's are doing a good job, but Mr. Speaker, you have levels of facilities in this city. You have one crowd that caters to the ordinary people - St. Pat's and the like - and you have the other crowd that caters to the elite and the snobs and the aristocrats. And that is what this bill will do, cater to that crowd.

Mr. Neary: You will not see, Mr. Speaker, very many people from Shea Heights, from Mundy Pond, from the Brow, from the Battery, from down in the heart of St. John's over in the Aquarena-or from Bell Island, for that matter, over in the Aquarena. All you will see over there, Sir, all you will see are the people who can afford it, the sons and daughters of the elite, of the rich of this city. That is the people you will find over using the facilities of the Aquarena because they are the only ones that can afford to buy the equipment and the things that the kids need to go in and and use these facilities.

Mr. Speaker, we are sorely tempted, Sir, to give this bill the six month hoist.

AN HON. MEMBER: Close it down.

MR. NEARY: We are sorely tempted, but here we are-we are stuck. We found ourselves in a situation where certain people in this city and in this Province let their hearts run away with them, and you would be unpatriotic if you criticized the Summer Games a couple of years or a year and a half or two years ago. You would be unpatriotic. I came into this House on more than one occasion and challenged the price that was paid for that land upon which that Aquarena was built-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: -\$750,000. One of the biggest ripoffs for a sale of a piece of land in the history of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: No investigation.

MR. NEARY: No investigation.

MR. DOODY: Your buddy's land?

MR. NEARY: It is not my buddy's land. My friend, that will be a rainy day when the snobs and the aristocrats of this city become my buddies. That will be a frosty Friday, I will guarantee you that, when you can point your finger at me and say that I am a part of the St. John's establishment. \$750,000 lashed out for that piece of land upon which the Aquarena is built! There should have been an inquiry into it, and it is not too late yet. But no, Sir, another case of where a scandal is swept under the rug. I have got all of the documentation down in my office, I sent it to Ottawa -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Oh yes. It is down in my office. If it was not in my office I would table it, and I will table the hon. gentleman if he wants me too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now we are told, Sir, that the deficit for the Summer Games--and the hon. gentleman did not even know, the hon. gentleman did not have the Steele report in front of him--and the hon. gentleman did not know that the deficit from the Summer Games, what is owing after the Summer Games were over, since 1977 \$160,000 approximately is owing by the Summer Games Committee. And, Mr. Speaker, the Summer Games Committee account to nobody. They have had all kinds of booze parties, they have had all kinds of mysterious goings on, carrying on the Summer Games -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame on them.

MR. NEARY: - and here they are now with a deficit of \$159,700.

MR. LUSH: I believe that is just for one month.

MR. NEARY: Listen to this, Sir, Here is what Mr. Steele says, "My information is that from September 1, 1977 to December 31, 1977 the association", just listen, September, October, November, December, "In a three month period the association has spent approximately \$159,700 on maintaining the facilities, and they continue to cost the association approximately \$12,800 per month," \$12,800 per month, and they are not even operating, When they are operating, Sir, these facilities are going to cost the taxpayers of this Province \$300,000 a year. Obviously, he says, therefore it is a safe assumption that there will be a deficit and the association in winding up its affairs will have debts and liabilities that have to be satisfied. And now the minister tells us that the government may have to pick up 80 per cent or 90 per cent of the deficit that was incurred by the Summer Games that had to answer to nobody in this Province. They were above everybody, above the Provincial Government, above the Canadian Government, they were above everybody. And now we have to

MR. NEARY: pay the price. Not only do we have to pick up the deficit but now we are stuck with the facilities. And now, Sir, the government that refused -

AN HON. MEMBER: We have heard enough.

MR. NEARY: And now, Sir, the government that refused to open up a swimming pool out in Stephenville that was run by the RC Parish out there, as my hon. friend knows, not only a swimming pool but recreation facilities that were taken over by the RC Parish, that served the whole Bay St. George area have been closed down for two years, three years is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Three years.

MR. NEARY: Three years. They have been closed down for three years simply because this government will not give them any help. But in the city of St. John's we are going to lash out \$300,000 a year to keep the Aquarena.

MR. MCNEIL: They were promised money before the election.

MR. NEARY: And they were promised, as my hon. colleague, the member for Stephenville (Mr. McNeil) says, the government, when they were going around electioneering, going around this Province looking for votes, promised the people in the Bay St. George area that these recreation facilities would be open and I believe the Minister of Health was then the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation, who has a broken promise chalked up to him.

SOME HON. MEMBER: More than one.

MR. H. COLLINS: Eleven years untaxed.

MR. RIDEOUT: What about the Fisheries Department?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we could say a lot, Sir, now, now that the emotion is all over, now that the fanfare has died down, now that there is no emotion we can look back on the whole thing. There is quite a bit that we can say about the

MR. NEARY: Summer Games, quite a bit about the construction contracts that were given out and how everybody was put in place to make sure that a certain family compact in this Province would control and manage all the work and all the contracts that were done in connection with the Summer Games facilities.

AN HON. MEMBER: But not paid for.

MR. NEARY: No, that is right. That is right. Had it passed over to him on a silver platter. No tender calls, no tender calls, just passed over.

MR. H. COLLINS: (Inaudible) hopeless.

MR. SIMMONS: Watch your blood pressure, 'Harold.'

MR. H. COLLINS: I have good doctors.

MR. NEARY: They had to answer to nobody, no accounting to anybody. The Minister of Finance, I will bet you the former Minister of Finance when he was in that portfolio would not be able to get an accounting from this crowd.

MR. DOODY: It worked out for the city and the Summer Games crowd.

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, listen to this. Listen to this, Sir. Worked out between the city and the Summer Games.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, Mr. Speaker, let me say this for the benefit, Sir, of people who may not know the difference, that this Province, the taxpayers of Newfoundland -

MR. DOODY: Contributed.

MR. NEARY: Contributed how much? How much did they contribute?

MR. DOODY: A considerable amount of money.

MR. NEARY: They contributed close on \$4 million.

MR. DOODY: You are a little bit off but you are -

MR. NEARY: \$3.5 million.

MR. F. ROWE: He was Minister of Finance, he should know.

MR. NEARY: Not a bad guess, Sir.

MR. DOODY: You are about one hundred per cent out but -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of this Province contributed anywhere between \$3.5 million and \$4 million for these facilities and the minister says, "It was between the city of St. John's and the Summer Games Committee." What a lot of baloney. What a lot of malarkey, Sir. Who is the hon. gentleman, Sir, trying to cod? Do we take millions of dollars of taxpayers money and pass it over to a group to do what they like with it?

MR. H. COLLINS: It was all approved in this hon. House.

MR. NEARY: It was not approved in this hon. House.

Mr. Speaker, I have not missed,

Sir -

MR. H. COLLINS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, has the hon. gentleman gone off his head down there? Mr. Speaker, I understand -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMONS: Is there a doctor in the House?

MR. NEARY: I understand, Mr. Speaker, that you only need one doctor now to certify people. I wish the hon. gentleman from Exploits (Dr. Twomey) would go down and look after his hon. colleague.

MR. H. COLLINS: (Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT: The minister has supped well again this evening.

AN HON. MEMBER: A little Valium could do a lot.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, here we have before us this evening, Sir, we have before us this evening -

MR. H. COLLINS: - CJON.

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

MR. NEARY: I am all right, Your Honour.

I am enjoying it. And, Mr. Speaker, I believe the people who are responsible for the Summer Games, I am not quite sure of this, brought in a Montreal company to do the designing and to manage the construction of the Summer Games.

But anyway, be that as it may, that is all over and done with. There was nothing we could do about it at the time. The government used their majority. They used brute force. They shouted us down.

MR. H. COLLINS: All went before the House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY: They shouted us

MR. S. NEARY: down in this House. They shouted us down, Sir, They would not grant us an investigation, an inquiry into the purchase of that land. They would not tell us anything about the contracts. They would not tell us anything about public tenders. We just could not find out anything about the Summer Games commitment except that somebody was going to put their hand down in the public treasury, grab a handful of taxpayers' money in this Province, and go off and spend it how they liked. And we could get no explanation, no information from the minister of that day who is after being in four or five departments now.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Which one is that?

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. Minister of Health who has been in four or five departments, starting at Fisheries which he made a mess of and then going on to Rehabilitation and Recreation, and he made a mess of that. Now the hon. gentleman is down making a mess of the Department of Health.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not yet.

MR. S. NEARY: Eighty or ninety per cent of the deficit. Eighty or ninety per cent of the deficit which is roughly \$160,000 will have to be picked up by the taxpayers of this Province. Mr. Speaker, let the word go out from this House tonight that it is the taxpayers of Newfoundland who have to pick up the deficit for the Summer Games facility and it is the taxpayers of this Province, Sir, Newfoundland as a whole - Western Labrador, the Straits of Belle Isle, Lewisporte, the Great Northern Peninsula, Bell Island, LaPoile, Francois, Grand Bruit - it is the fishermen, Mr. Speaker, it is the fishermen out in the rural areas, the backbone of this Province who are paying their taxes, and the miners in Labrador that will have to pay for these facilities here in the City of St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: And the poor people in the city.

MR. S. NEARY: And the poor people. I would not mind so bad, Sir. I might be able to condone that, I might be able to condone it if the poor people could use these facilities. But, Sir, I will

MR. S. NEARY: guarantee you right now, Sir, and I have four kids of my own who go around swimming, playing soccer and baseball and what have you around to the various parks in this city and outside the city, and I guarantee you right now, Sir, that the elite, the aristocrats and the snobs of this city will not have their children rubbing shoulders with the children of the ordinary people of this city.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: I will guarantee you that. That will be an exclusive club over there. You will see, Sir, the children of the wealthy will be over using these facilities. It will be like Bally Haly, that is what it will be like. I mean you cannot get at the Premier he does not come to the House if you will go down to Bally Haly you can find him.

MR. DOODY: Why do you not go down there?

MR. S. NEARY: Because I do not associate with snobbery.

Mr. Speaker, I do not, Sir, patronize the nineteenth hole -

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible) nineteenth hole.

MR. S. NEARY: And the nineteenth hole - the hon. gentleman is familiar with it, the nineteenth hole.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the day may come when they will be very glad to have me in. They may be very glad, when the revolution takes place in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: When the ordinary people of this Province rise up, Sir, the crowd down at Bally Haly may be glad to have me in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. A. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: Oh, listen to the member from Sarasota.

The member from Sarasota will not be around to pay any taxes to keep the Summer Games facilities going. The hon. gentleman will be paying his taxes down in the state of Florida.

MR. A. MURPHY: They got smart. They got a new Whip already. Look!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we had a similiar situation happen in Canada in Montreal. Mayor Drapeau did the same thing. - went on the rampage, went on a big spending spree, and then saddled the taxpayers of Quebec and of Canada with a huge deficit and a huge expense to keep the Olympic facilities in Montreal going. And now we are saddled with the same thing. I hope, Mr. Speaker, we can learn a lesson from this and we will never again let our hearts take control of our brains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Sir, I am as much interested in sport and recreation as anybody on the face of this earth, but I do not like to see it turned into a racket. And I am afraid that that is what happened in this case, it was turned into a big racket. Here we are now, tonight - what is the date today?

MR. SIMMONS: The 29th. of June.

MR. NEARY: - the 29th, of June, in here debating a bill to decide whether or not a commission should be established to run the Summer Games facilities. The minister made no reference at all to how much it is going to cost to run the Summer Games facilities. How much? I would estimate the cost of running these facilities, Sir, to be in the vicinity of \$300,000 and 75 per cent of that \$300,000 will have to be paid by taxpayers in other parts of this Province, outside of St. John's. The other 25 per cent will have to be paid by the City of St. John's.

MR. DOODY: Metro Board will pay it.

MR. NEARY: Oh, the Metro Board, yes!

MR. DOODY: That is right.

MR. NEARY: It is a good thing that we managed to give that bill the six month hoist.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The people who are sitting in the galleries, Sir, who came in to hear the debate tonight on regional government, should thank their lucky stars because next year they would have been paying anywhere from \$200 to \$300 in taxes if that bill had gone through that we fought so hard against in the last couple of weeks. And the members for St. John's, including, by the way, the member who represents St. Thomas' - no, part of it. St. Phillips, part of St. Phillips - the member gets up - the government member I am talking about - and says, oh, they will love us for this. They will love us for it. A year or two from now

MR. NEARY: they will love us for it.
You could hardly believe your ears when you heard that kind of a statement coming from ministers on the government side of the House. They will love us for it. They will be strung up for it! The whole trouble is, Mr. Speaker, when we are getting this kind of legislation, we are getting it from a crowd, Sir, who have no intention of ever offering themselves again in public life. Most of them are going to retire or they will be too frightened to run again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Therefore, they could not care less what kind of legislation they ram through this House, how much damage they do to the people of this Province, how much they sock it to them in taxes.

MR. PECKFORD: You got enough stamps.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman will run again. He may not win but he will run again.

MR. DOODY: You are darn right, I will.

MR. NEARY: But I would say the majority of ministers, Sir - the Minister of Justice has no intention of ever running again, he is going to retire. The Minister of Consumer Affairs is retiring, not going to run anymore. The Minister of Education will be too frightened to run again. Who else do we have over there?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: What about the Premier?

MR. SIMMONS: Placentia. Placentia.

MR. NEARY: The member for Placentia will probably not run any more, he has had enough of politics. The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), the savoury farmer, should get the Royal Order of the Boot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: And will.

MR. NEARY: And will. The hon. member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) will not run again. He will go back

MR. NEARY: to practicing medicine. He probably regrets that he ever got into politics in the first place. So, Mr. Speaker, we have one example after the other. You are dealing with a crowd who are now living recklessly, Sir. They do not care what they do to the people of this Province, they do not care what kind of legislation they bring before this House because they have no intention of running again for the simple reason that they can retire and live off their pension or they will be too frightened to run.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right.

MR. NEARY: And there you have it, Sir.

MR. F.B. ROWE: The Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation was not even here to introduce his own bill.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, a very interesting observation, Sir, was made on this particular bill we are discussing now, the commission, "An Act To Provide For The Administration Of Certain Facilities Constructed For The Canada Summer Games," the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation was not even in the House to introduce his own bill. The member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey), too busy out trying to prop up his buddies, too busy, Sir, out trying to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Trying to get them out on bail.

MR. NEARY: - trying to bail them out.

MR. SIMMONS: Bail is the the word too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: I do not know if there are visiting hours down on Forest Road.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, all this bill will do now, Sir, is establish a commission, then it will be one of the responsibilities of the commission to

Mr. Neary: present a budget to the City of St. John's or to the government, to the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation. Now, Mr. Speaker, we would like to have some idea, if I can get the hon. gentleman's attention for a moment, we would like to have some idea of how much it is going to cost to operate these facilities a year.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Why did not the hon. gentleman answer it when he introduced the Bill?

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NEARY: Because the hon. gentleman did not know the answer. The hon. gentleman had not read the Steele report, and the hon. gentleman did not have the information and, as I said when I started, was ill-prepared and just filling in for the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are all the young people and all the taxpayers in other parts of this Province going to say about this piece of legislation? What are the taxpayers in Labrador and on the Southwest Cost and on the Great Northern Peninsula and in Central and in Western Newfoundland, what are they going to say about us in this House putting through a bill that is favouring St. John's, that is loaded in favour of St. John's -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - that is giving additional facilities in St. John's, where you already have too many facilities? And these people out there struggling to keep their swimming pools going, to keep their stadiums opened, and in some cases have not got the dollars to finish their swimming pools, to finish their outdoor rinks, and that sort of thing, and their parks and their recreations, and some of them have not even got water and swerage, as my hon. friend said. Well, we are in now the realm of recreation. What are these people going to think of us in this House lashing out \$300,000 a year of their money to keep facilities going in St. John's for the elite and the snobs, when they themselves are struggling or do not have any recreation or sports facilities for their children?

MR. NEARY: Why, Mr. Speaker, down in my own district, down in the city of Port aux Basques the Kinsmen are five years, five years, Sir, struggling with a swimming pool, trying to build a swimming pool and get it open for the children around the Southwest corner of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Five years. Now the government have given them little bits and pieces of help, little bits and pieces. They will not give them enough to finish it. They will give them \$15,000 now and next year they have got to come back on their hands and knees and beg for another \$15,000. And as a result that swimming pool is there 90 per cent complete and they have not got the funds to finish it, and here we are putting a bill before the House -

MR. FLIGHT: No way.

MR. NEARY: - to supply more recreational facilities to the city of St. John's where they already have an abundance of swimming pools.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: No so.

MR. NEARY: Well maybe it is not true. I will tell you one thing, this is one time when I believe my hon. colleagues on this side of the House at least should be freed up and they should vote according to the dictates of their conscience and not be forced to toe the party line on a St. John's Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: St. John's against the outports.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, it is not, it is not St. John's against the outports; it is the St. John's aristocrats.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: It is the snobs against the outports, that is what it is.

MR. F. ROWE: Gentlemen farmers.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if these facilities were within reach of large numbers of the population of this Province, if

Mr. Neary: they were in Central Newfoundland somewhere where people could have their meet every week or once a month, if it was centrally located where the whole population could have access to it then there might be some justification.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Smallwood would not want these facilities called after him.

AN HON. MEMBER: - could store the savory in.

MR. NEARY: The only thing they tried to do with Mr. Smallwood was put him in jail.

MR. F. ROWE: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Two weeks before Christmas, 1972 they sent the RCMP over to his house and seized his documents and little letters from his grandchildren, letters to Santa Claus and took them. The RCMP had the place under seige for eight hours. And now where is the scandal? Why, Joey's crowd looked liked Charlie's Angels compared to that crowd over there though.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what else I could say about this bill. I guess we will just have to let nature take its course. It is a very difficult decision for members to have to make because here

MR. NEARY: you have these facilities, they are there, they were put there by the taxpayers of Canada, they were put there by the taxpayers of this Province and you will be damned if you do and double damned if you do not. What do you do in a case like this, Mr. Speaker, when you know that out in the rural areas, out in the countryside across this Province and in Labrador young people are crying out every day for recreation facilities, for sports facilities and they cannot get them and the government will not give them to them? If the government want to put this through what they should have done, Sir, they should have sweetened it, they should have sweetened it by saying, We are going to do this for St. John's but we are going to do this for all the other communities in Newfoundland. That is what they should have done if they were thinking.

But, Sir, this government has a tendency to commit political hari-kari. They tried to do it on bill 50 and regional government and now they are doing it again. I know, Sir, I can hear it now, I can hear the sports crowd now. In the world of sport I suppose it is almost like a religion, is it? I can hear them now saying, Oh, they are against opening up the Aquarena, or they are against opening up the baseball field, the Canada Games park and so forth, they are against it. But we are not against it, Sir, it has been foisted on us, we have not choice, it is there.

DR. KITCHEN: It should not have cost us anything.

MR. NEARY: It should not have cost us one penny and it should not cost the people of this Province one penny to operate. It is there; they should have thought about it, they should have looked before they leaped. Now we are stuck with it and now we do not have much choice. We do not have much choice now but to bail it out. But before we do, Sir, I think we should have an

MR. NEARY: accounting in this House of the money that has been spent so far on the Summer Games. How much? Does anybody know how much? Six or seven million dollars?

AN HON. MEMBER: Five and-a-half.

MR. NEARY: Five and-a-half? No, it is more than that. I would say it is up closer now to six, between six and seven million dollars of taxpayers' money lashed out for a couple of weeks. I know, I can hear the argument now, But look at all the good it did Newfoundland. How many jobs did it create in Newfoundland, Sir? What did it do for the cost of living? Did it lower the cost of electricity? Did it put any more sewerage in people's homes? Did it stop the rest of the Canadians from condemning us for our seal hunt? What good did it do? It was the flash in the pan, that is all it was. Did it cure our unemployment problem? Did it do anything for the fishery?

I remember them leading up, Oh, the PR job, what a beautiful thing this is going to be for Newfoundland. All the people are going to flock into Newfoundland. The planes and the trains and the buses and the boats will not be able to carry them, and practically every hotel room in St. John's was vacant when the Summer Games were on.

I know, I was over for the opening and I got a big thrill out of the opening. I thought it was a great thing, but was it worth six and-a-half million dollars? There are people who will argue that it was and maybe it was, I do not know. I have not seen six and-a-half million dollars worth of results. The people outside the overpass could not care less: they have their own problems. They are fighting for their own facilities and getting very little help and very little co-operation from this government. What the minister should do, the

MR. NEARY: minister should take this bill, hold it off for two or three days and bring in -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege. I must hear the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: (Inaudible) brought in a motion approximately one hour ago, fifty-five minutes ago quite properly (inaudible) members in the legislature. The Opposition quite properly moved a motion and it carried (Inaudible) impeding members from getting to their proper places in this Assembly. (Microphone not on).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: Sit down boy.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, the rules of the Chamber allow there to be three minutes following the calling of a vote in order for members to reach their places, an unusually

MR. LUNDRIGAN: short period of time, but it is designed to allow members to get from their various places in the building to the Chamber. Your Honour will recall that three members in particular walked in this Chamber approximately -

MR. NEARY: They came up in the private elevator.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I am aware of that. Approximately less than a minute or maybe a few seconds after the bar went across. Mr. Speaker, there were several other hon. members in the Chamber at the time or in the building at the time that the vote was called. Mr. Speaker, regardless if there was a member in the Chamber or no member in St. John's, the point at question is just as relevant whether we had ten members in the building or no member in the building; no member of this Legislature should go out of his way to obstruct a member from getting to his proper place of vote.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, there were members, I am advised, of this Chamber who obstructed members from getting to their proper place by calling the elevators, pressing all of the buttons on the various floors of the elevators, therefore, Mr. Speaker, preventing members from getting to their proper place. I consider it a fairly serious charge, Your Honour, and I would just ask quite properly if Your Honour could take it under advisement to ask the people who were in the precincts of the building, of the Chamber or in the precincts of this area to look into this particular very serious matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: To lose a vote, Mr. Speaker, is serious and the government deserved to lose the vote. Mr. Speaker, if there were no members in St. John's let alone in the building the question of privilege is just as relevant. For a member of this Chamber to go and impede the proper access of other hon. members to this Chamber is a pretty serious situation and I will ask Your Honour to take it under advisement and to investigate the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. First of all I refer, Mr. Speaker, to Standing Order 81. It says very clearly that no member of this House, no member is entitled - I am sorry, not number 81. Number 80, I am sorry, "Every member is bound to attend the service of the House unless leave of absence has been given to him." Everybody knew that the House met at eight and it was their decision to be here at eight or not to be here at eight in accordance with Standing Order No. 80. Now, Mr. Speaker, to this specific point of privilege, if the member for Grand Falls has any specific allegations to make against particular members of this House, or others members of the public for that matter, who may have impeded the progress of members in getting to this House, he should name names, Mr. Speaker. I will tell you for my part, Mr. Speaker, where I was during the three minute interval, or part of it. I was here part of the time and then I went to the elevator because I saw my colleague, the member for Carbonear, who apparently, Mr. Speaker, I saw him push the down button and he was apparently going to the fifth floor and I was one of the people designated over here, one of the people designated on this side to make certain, Mr. Speaker, that our people stayed here on this floor and I ran for him just the same minute as our Whip, the member for Eagle River, came out from another direction and persuaded him not to get on the elevator but to come back here in the House.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is my involvement in the matter, that is the involvement of the member for Carbonear, and I mention that in particular, Mr. Speaker, because the member for Gander, who is in need of some more Valium, Mr. Speaker, was sitting there cooking up some little plot as usual and his suspicious mind began to work, Mr. Speaker, when he saw us actually standing by an elevator. Imagine that, Mr. Speaker. My colleague was about to get on and he had pushed the down button and I assumed he was going to the fifth floor, our offices, and I persuaded him

MR. SIMMONS: not to get on the elevator. I was fortunate in doing that because just as we got in the bar was put across and, as Mr. Speaker will realize, had he gone to the fifth floor he would not have been back in time for the crucial vote which we won and which is what is at the real base of this point of privilege now. The member for Grand Falls has been over there cohorting with his group and they are sore about this, Mr. Speaker. They are just sore. There is no point of privilege. They are just sore; poor, poor losers. Too poor losers, that is all.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! To my right and to my left. Order, please! It is not my intention to endeavour to outshout any hon. members. I have heard the point submitted by the hon. gentleman to my left I have heard one reply thereto by the hon. gentleman to my right, and I think I am in a position to make a decision on the matter. The allegation by the hon. gentleman to my left

MR. SPEAKER: was that some hon. members were, in his opinion, impeded from getting to the House of Assembly because some people had in some way stopped the elevators from functioning properly or by having them stop on different floors or that type of thing. Obviously I have no way of knowing. Order please! I will adjourn for five minutes and then come back and give my ruling.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I will now make the ruling I was in the process of making before the adjournment. It was alleged by hon. gentlemen to my left that there had been some impediment of the elevators and that some hon. members were prevented or delayed, delayed is the more appropriate term, from getting to the House of Assembly because of some interference with the elevators. I have been informed by the House Leader of the Opposition that to his knowledge there was no such impediment by any members of the Opposition caucus. Whether others in neither caucus, whether people not members of the House did inadvertently or in any other way cause any malfunctioning of the elevators I have no way of knowing. There are a fairly large number of people here in the galleries and obviously they came using the elevators and that in itself would account for elevators being occupied. There are only three and there are a fairly large number of people in the galleries tonight and that is as logical an explanation as any other so it is not a matter which I can proceed with any further. I certainly will state that if there were any impeding of members by interference with the elevators to get here, that would be obviously wrong but I have no evidence that that is the case and there is no further I can go on that matter.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Now that Your Honour has indicated that there is no evidence, I would have hoped, Your Honour, that you have seen fit to take the matter under advisement and ask some of the officials which have dealings with this particular precincts of the House to come forward. I would like, Your Honour, to - I do not believe it is proper for me to

MR. LUNDRIGAN: stand here and make comments without being able to indicate particular names and I am quite prepared to do that, Your Honour, that is, namely, the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and the member I think for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) has indicated already to some people in this particular chamber that he was prepared to pull out all the stops, you have to pull out all the stops in order to win the vote. Because of that, Your Honour, I request that the matter be investigated, I have named the individuals in question and I am prepared to suggest to the people who have been witnesses to the event, I consider it a very serious event, a very serious event, Your Honour, so that I think it should be properly investigated by Your Honour to determine whether in fact what I have said is in order. And I am prepared to move a motion, Your Honour, that it be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections to have these people on tomorrow come before the Committee of this House in order to have the matter investigated. And I think because of that, Your Honour, it is serious enough to be looked into.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I have to assume the hon. gentleman's remarks as an additional, separate point of privilege in which he has stated his opinion that two hon. members whom he identified did in fact cause such an impediment. I think that the obvious course of action would be for me to have a private conversation with both hon. members and I think that can be done expeditiously and leave the matter at that until I have had such conversation.

Hon. gentleman from the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, with respect, Sir, I think Your Honour has been put in a very invidious position, unwittingly, I believe, I am sure the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) did not intend to do it, Sir. Your Honour is not an investigative body; Your Honour is our Speaker and is responsible for protecting our rights and for enforcing our rules, Sir. But

MR. ROBERTS: the mere fact that the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) has stated something does not make it so. He has led no evidence at all. Your Honour heard a point of privilege, ruled there was no point of privilege. The gentleman from Grand Falls then apparently, as I understood him, attempted to make the same point of privilege by bringing in what he said or what he alleged was evidence by naming three hon. gentlemen. My friend for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) when he spoke earlier accounted perfectly satisfactorily for a course of conduct which may have given rise to the allegations led by the gentleman for Grand Falls; they do not justify it, but they may have given rise to it. And I, with respect, Sir, I do not think it is Your Honour's role as our Speaker to have to investigate. I think an unfair burden, Sir, is being cast upon Your Honour, because then Your Honour is in the position of having to make a recommendation, to make a finding, Obviously, Sir, that finding will be challenged by one side or the other because this is a matter of some partisan import. And with all respect, Sir, I do not think it is appropriate for Your Honour to take it upon yourself to investigate or to have questions.

The hon. gentleman for Grand Falls, in my submission, Mr. Speaker, has not made a point of privilege. He has not raised it. He has not made a substantive motion, that is given. He has not made a prima facie case which must be made before a point of privilege—before a motion respecting a point of privilege can be laid before the House. I think, Sir, that the hon. gentleman for Grand Falls should be so told and the House should be allowed to carry on with the bill, the Canada Games Bill, and the gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I believe, was speaking when the gentleman for Grand Falls originally raised the same point of privilege on which Your Honour has already ruled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have already said that I did not intend for Your Honour to be an investigative body, I am quite aware of Your Honour's role. I suggested that if Your Honour considered that

Mr. Lundrigan: there was a question of privilege, in view of the fact that I laid before Your Honour the names of a number of individuals who have been allegedly involved in impeding the access of members to the Legislature, that there be a motion so moved which would in effect refer the matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections that could on tomorrow call before it anybody that would be in a position to give evidence to that particular Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I will hear one additional hon. gentleman.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I suggest that the hon. gentleman for Grand Falls' conduct is just not within the bounds on this, Sir. The hon. gentleman for Grand Falls clearly said in making his second submission, after Your Honour had ruled his original point out of order, that Your Honour should investigate. Now he has backed away from that and, Sir, that takes care of that particular point.

The second point the hon. gentleman just made is he would name some names. Sir, naming names is not evidence of anything and to establish the right to bring a point of privilege before this House one must make a prima facie case, and simply standing and making unsupported, and, I would venture to say, unsubstantiated allegations, and I could be stronger, but since no evidence has been led I do not need to deal with it, Sir, that does not give rise to a prima facie matter of privilege. Your Honour has already heard the original submission made by the gentleman for Grand Falls and has ruled that no evidence was led, that no prima facie case have been made and therefore no matter of privilege could arise.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. gentleman to my left. And I think I am in a position to finalize this matter.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Okay, Mr. Speaker. Just to substantiate what the hon. member for Grand Falls said, obviously we do not have videotapes or anything to substantiate charges that he made, but for my own part I can say that sitting here in my place I did see the gentlemen he named

MR. N. WINDSOR: at the elevators. I cannot say, of course, what they were doing, but I can say -

AN HON. MEMBER: Bullshit!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Of course you can.

MR. N. WINDSOR: But I can say -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. N. WINDSOR: I can say, Your Honour, that, you know, I got the clear impression from here that they were certainly attempting to hold the elevators. Now I cannot obviously prove that they were, but that was clearly the impression that I had from here.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I am in a position to dispose of the matter, The point made by the hon. gentleman for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) is a very relevant one. It is not my responsibility or authority or appropriate for me to undertake investigations. When an hon. member makes a submission on a prima facie case, then what the Chair's responsibility really is not to make a judgment whether there has been a substantive breach of privilege or not. The Chair can make no decision on that; only members make a decision on that. What the Chair may do is find that there is a prima facie case, meaning that priority will then be given to an appropriate motion and that that motion will take precedence over everything. When the Chair finds that there is no prima facie case, no priority is given to a motion. It does not mean that a motion at the appropriate time may not be made, may not be called, may not be debated, and whatever effect it has operative.

However, I am not in a

MR. SPEAKER: position to state that a motion which would automatically have priority of debate in this House would be in order now, which means that I do not find a prima facie case.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, did Your Honour say - I heard Your Honour but I am not sure I heard correctly. Did Your Honour say it was relevant or irrelevant, as a matter of interest? Your Honour began the ruling by saying some points I have made were and I did not catch the word -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Relevant.

MR. SPEAKER: Relevant.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honour.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I want to rise on a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A matter of privilege, a separate matter of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it is a matter affecting both my privileges as a member of the House and the privileges of the House itself. During the interlude or the brief recess during which Mr. Speaker was deliberating on the matter of which he has just disposed, the previous matter of privilege, I was standing within the precincts of the Chamber, indeed in the doorway here to my immediate left. Earlier, I should say just as the House had recessed, I had been the brunt of certain remarks made by the Minister of Health as he stood in the doorway just over here and I here near my bench. I do not believe I responded to him. He did say a number of things including that he would come over and take my head off or something to that effect but there were a number of witnesses to that statement. I had intended to rise on that particular matter but since then, Mr. Speaker, and it is my duty to inform you, I think, Sir, that since then a more serious matter has taken place in that subsequent to the remarks made by the Minister of Health I did move out in the corridor and then subsequently back into the doorway and the minister came across the floor and in a fairly -

MR. COLLINS: (Inaudible).

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

MR. SIMMONS: In a fairly ungentle fashion, Mr. Speaker, he grabbed me by the left arm and I had both hands in my pocket as I am standing now, grabbed me by the left arm and very rudely and forcefully shoved me through the doorway.

MR. COLLINS: I have been noted for that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, what I have to say is a very serious matter, I believe, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps it might be adviseable for all concerned, Mr. Speaker, if we could leave this matter till tomorrow. I would be prepared to vote for the adjournment of the House if the Government House Leader would agree to do so. It is obviously not the time to raise it and perhaps by tomorrow the Minister of Health might be in a more receptive mood to the things that have to be said at this time. I am not wanting to aggravate him further. I am not wanting to futher degenerate the mood of the House but I think it is my responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to raise the issue. If he does not want to hear it in silence now I can just as well do it tomorrow.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman gone cracked?

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very serious matter I am dealing with and I would ask that the Chair enforce some silence so that I can be heard in silence. It is not a trivial matter; for me it is a very important matter. I want to know if as a member of this House I can come here in safety. I want to know if I can come here without being physically assaulted by a minister of the Crown as I have been tonight, physically assaulted by a minister of the Crown, and I am grateful for the intervention of the member of the Newfoundland Constabulary who came by and escorted the Minister of Health out the corridor and presumably to his own side of the House. I do not know where he went with him but I was grateful to him that he came and intervened at that particular time. He did so in the presence of a number of witnesses including members of the House and at least one member of the press. If Mr. Speaker would like to have names I am prepared to give them to him

MR. SIMMONS: either here or in the privacy of Mr. Speaker's office.

The point I wish to raise now, Mr. Speaker, is that obviously my privileges have been breached very seriously by a physical assault by another member of this House and in this case also a minister of the Crown and not only my privileges but the privileges of the House itself. Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps Mr. Speaker might want to deliberate on it for some time and he might want some names from me as to whom he can consult on the subject. I am prepared to do all that but I submit that having done that I will then have established a prima facie case and I would be prepared to move the appropriate motion that the member of the House, in this case a minister of the Crown, be disciplined for his untoward action.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. minister since he is the -

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege. I was going to raise a point of privilege myself but knowing the hon. member for Bay d'Espoir I can understand why he would get up and try and beat me to the punch. He reminds me of the wrestler in the ring, you know, who kicks the opposition everywhere it hurts and when the referee catches him he says, no, I did not do it. There is the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member must bring his remarks with reference to the submission of the hon. gentleman to my right.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege. As I said, I was going to rise on a point of privilege myself. We can look at all the pictures around since I have been in this hon. House and certainly I am not one who is known to be rise on points of order or points of privilege. God knows there have been occasions when I should have done it but you have to accept the cut and the thrust, you have to be ready for that before you come in here. And consequently I have been one of those who have been very reserved, very restrained and hopefully showing some common sense to the whole approach. My point of privilege, Mr. Speaker - before I get to it I think I should be permitted to respond to my friend on the other side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, and it is on that point of privilege obviously the hon. gentleman -

MR. COLLINS: Fine, Mr. Speaker, so I will rise on another one afterwards so that all I have missed in the past years I am going to have tonight.

The hon. member refers to my walking across the House and assaulting him. Now I stuck my two hands in my pockets because I was hurt, my feelings were hurt because of things which the hon. member said prior to Your Honour leaving the Chair. I strolled in that door and out that one and out that one and in that one and otherwise and the hon. member deliberately, Mr. Speaker, stood in my way when I walked through that door over there. I did not open my mouth, I did not take my hands out of my pocket, his imprint is not in the facing of the door and that is a lot of nonsense, Mr. Speaker, and I would say to the House and to the Speaker that this is not a point of privilege, I am going to rise on a point of privilege when Your Honour has ruled on this one. But what the hon. member is saying is merely to try and cloud the issue and defend himself on what he knows was a very unworthy, undignified attack.

MR. COLLINS: on an hon. member of this House, namely me.

MR. SPEAKER: On point of privilege number one, since I have had a sort of notice that there will be another, I will give a decision at an appropriate time and when I have had an opportunity to think the matter through thoroughly.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Before we get to that -

MR. COLLINS: On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: I am on the point of privilege, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is in a very difficult position now because I did recognize the hon. gentleman to my left on a separate point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: May I just, before you leave the preceding point -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. SPEAKER: If hon. members will - I am in a position here where I have to say that hon. members will yield to the hon. gentleman obviously -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it is obviously alright to grab a person as long as it is somebody on this side of the House. So if that is the way the gang want it they can have it that way.

MR. COLLINS: You have had your way too long, 'Roger!

Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is this, and I am not sure what the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir said and because I am not sure, Your Honour, I would request that Your Honour look at the tapes to ensure and tell the House exactly what was said. But as I recall it, during the cut and thrust across the House the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir said that he saw me at an elevator spying on him, and there was adequate for me to have been in the House for the vote which took place just prior to my arrival here. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have said before I am not one of those to rise on too many specious, frivolous points of order or points of privilege. And I do not think there is any hon. member in this House, and I am talking now about members who were here before the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) was ever elected - I

MR. COLLINS: always occupied my seat. Now some hon. members could say you might not have taken advantage of all the debates and so on and so forth but I believe I have been doing my job before he came around here. And for that hon. member to insinuate that I was at an elevator and deliberately stayed at the elevator until the vote was over, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot accept. I cannot prove the exact words he said but, Your Honour, I

MR. H. COLLINS: would request that we get the tapes to see exactly what that hon. member said so that we can deal with it properly.

MR. SIMMONS: To that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: I can dispense with that very quickly by agreeing with the minister that what Mr. Speaker ought to do is get the tapes and he will find almost word for word that I said the minister from his place was watching the elevators. These are almost the exact words and that will dispose of that specious point of privilege very quickly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Right. On this matter as well I will consult the record when it is available and will give a decision when I have had an opportunity to give the matter consideration.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, now that that matter has been disposed of could I just briefly speak to the matter that Mr. Speaker -

MR. H. COLLINS: Where are your bruises, Roger'?

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I impressed upon the House, and we could have had other members who had witnessed the event, I am not sure I impressed upon the House the seriousness of the matter and it would appear now to be the minister's account against my account. Now in addition to what I said, that he did physically assault me, and he is saying that he did not, in addition to these two comments there are a number of people, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: I say to Mr. Speaker there are a number of persons, both members of the House, Mr. Speaker, and a member of the Constabulary. I just mentioned the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe), the

MR. SIMMONS: member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) was too, I remember, in the immediate environs and saw the act take place. These two anyway and one of the members of the Constabulary, I believe the gentleman standing in the doorway, were near enough to see what went on as was one of the members of the press who may not wish to be named publicly but I am sure he would be willing privately to speak to Mr. Speaker on the subject. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is a serious enough issue that I would hope the ruling would be made fairly soon because I do not feel like I want to operate in a House like this where you are under a constant physical threat and where the person who committed the assault is being jeered on by a number of members of his partisan supporters. That I find all the more frightful, Mr. Speaker, and all the more reason why we ought to get a decision fairly expeditiously.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I can only repeat what I have said before and what I have said on every occasion when I feel it is necessary to reserve decision and that is I will give it when I feel that I have had an opportunity -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

- to give the matter the consideration necessary and to consult what authorities I feel necessary. This is not a procedure, obviously, that I invented. It is done in practically all legislatures and frequently takes much longer for a decision than here. I would expect to be in a position to give it tomorrow but I would be more than unfair in the discharge of my responsibilities if I did not, when I felt it necessary, reserve a decision and immediately come out with what might appear to be the immediate situation. I will certainly give the decision as soon as I can, but I feel that I must reserve it.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PECKFORD: I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that this House adjourn until tomorrow Friday at 10:00 a.m. Those in favour 'aye', contrary 'nay'. In my opinion the 'ayes' have it.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until Friday, June 30, 1978, at 10:00 a.m.