

VOL. 1

NO. 6

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
FRIDAY, JULY 20, 1979

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, contract discussions between the Newfoundland Fishermen, Food and Allied Workers and the Newfoundland Fish Trades Association and a contract setting out fish prices for inshore fisheries have apparently reached an impasse and the union is presently in the process of taking a strike vote.

Because of the great importance of the inshore fishery to this Province and the need to ensure that this summer's fishing season is not disrupted by a strike, some weeks ago I instructed the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dihn) and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) to meet with both sides in the dispute with a view to obtaining a clear understanding of the nature of the differences between the two parties. As a result of these talks, it has become clear that the issues at stake in the strike are more than this year's prices. Both sides appear to feel that some fairly major structural changes are necessary in the way in which fish prices are set. Obviously, any such changes must first be the subject of intense study. Consequently, I have instructed the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Labour and Manpower to place before the two parties by Wednesday of next week a proposal which will, I hope, be acceptable to both parties. This proposal will have three basic elements; 1) that Newfoundland Fishermen, Food and Allied Workers and the Fish Trades decide on the prices to be paid this year; 2) that the federal and provincial governments, together with the trade and the union agree to meet to develop quality standards and inspection procedures for all species so that a price system based on quality can be placed in effect by next year's fishing season; 3) that a special committee be formed upon which both the trade and the union will be represented to study the need to make changes in the method by which fish prices are established.

July 23, 1979

Tape 149

EC - 2

PREMIER PECKFORD:

In view of the critical need to have a stable environment wherein prices fair to both the trade and the union are established, it is my hope that both parties will agree that this proposal can provide the basis on which current contract negotiations can be concluded so that

PREMIER PECKFORD: the inshore fishery can proceed during 1979 in a normal manner.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, this possibility of this strike occurring sometime towards the end of next week I am sure is a source of deep concern and worry for all Newfoundlanders. This time of the year in particular the fishing industry is the backbone of the economy of this Province and if a strike were to occur, Mr. Speaker, it would be a great tragedy in this Province this year.

We welcome the news from the Premier that they are going to present three proposals or they are coming up with three proposals to try to decide upon a price for at least this year, and hopefully hold off a strike situation. I am glad that the two levels of government plus the union will try to do something about relating fish quality control and prices, relate them both together, because I think that that is one of the basic problems with respect to the pricing of fish in this particular Province.

I do not want to be clichéish about this, but we have known about the possibility of this strike now for some weeks if not months, and I would have hoped that the government would have seen fit to do something before this particular week. The Premier did indicate, of course, that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) had made initial proposals and I am happy to hear about that. I just sincerely hope - I am sure I am expressing the wish of my colleagues here - I sincerely hope that this move that will take place next Wednesday will not be too late and that the proposals brought before the Newfoundland Fishermen, Food and Allied Workers Union and to the fish trades, the companies involved, will be acceptable to both side and that a strike will be averted. We sincerely hope that that strike will be averted

MR. F. ROWE:

this year.

Sir, I have not seen in detail the Premier's Ministerial Statement on this so I can not comment on it in detail. The only thing I can do on behalf of my colleagues in the House here this morning is express the sincerest hope that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) and the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) will be successful and the three proposals that will be made to the union and to the companies will be acceptable, and particularly the first proposal, that of trying to decide upon a price for this year and, secondly, tying in fish quality control with the price of the

MR. F. ROWE: fish will be a successful mechanism in keeping the fishing industry continuing throughout this year and hopefully in the years to come without any threats of strikes which would be very damaging to our economy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table in the House this morning a copy of the referral to the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities which has been made by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro for revised power rates for 1979 and 1980. The referral is a presentation by Hydro requesting that the Public Utilities Board recommend to Cabinet a two stage increase in electricity rates. The first stage is a proposed 10 per cent increase at the consumer level to be effective October 15th., 1979 and the second stage is a proposed increase of 6 per cent to be effective April 1st., 1980. The referral points out that Hydro's operating cost will increase from \$68.6 million per year in 1978 to \$102.9 million per year in 1980 with fuel and interest making up 85 per cent of this increase.

And that is, Mr. Speaker, over a two year period an approximate 50 per cent increase in operating costs. And it is easy to see why this has happened when one considers that the price of petroleum products in the Middle East has increased just recently by close to 60 per cent.

At a press conference this morning the Chief Executive Officer of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro will be giving details as to why in Hydro's view these increases are necessary to recover the cost of service plus a margin of profits sufficient to achieve and maintain, first, a sound financial position and, secondly, a sound credit rating in the financial markets of the world. The timing and scheduling of the formal hearings will be decided by the Public Utilities Board.

July 20, 1979

Tape No. 151

DW - 2

MR. L. BARRY:

I believe that the requirement to have the operations of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro subjected to public scrutiny by professional accountants, lawyers, economists, consumer groups, representatives of municipalities and politicians is a major step forward in public participation in the setting of energy prices.

This administration is proud, Mr.

Speaker, of

MR. BARRY: the introduction of the Electrical Power Control Act, which I had the opportunity of recommending, as non. members might recall, as early as 1975, which the hon. the Premier piloted through this House in 1977 and which for the first time permitted wide ranging public hearings on proposed electricity rates.

We look forward to the public hearings, we encourage constructive and responsible intervention, and we are confident of the capabilities of the Hydro Corporation to respond professionally to the incisive questioning and criticism which is inherent in the open debate allowed by the public hearings. We believe that the opportunity for such debate is healthy and in the end extremely beneficial to Hydro, government and the ultimate electrical consumer. We intend to deal expeditiously and responsibly with the recommendations when they are received from the Public Utilities Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to comment in detail in the absence of a text of the statement and may I just parenthetically say that I am sure that it is not a deliberate discourtesy but I would be appreciative, and I think my colleagues would, if in cases of this nature where there are statistics and the like involved if we might perhaps be given some advance opportunity to look at a ministerial statement. I am not talking about days, a few hours or something like that because it is not, of course, possible for me to really examine it in its totality. What does concern me, of course, what is clear here, is that once again, regardless of the process that the hon. member has outlined, the hon. minister, and I do not have the confidence in it that he does, that I fear that what will be the end result of this is of course that it will go to the members of the Cabinet and the final question is whether the members

MR. JAMIESON: of Cabinet at that point are simply going to have an opportunity to say, "Well, these hearings have been held and consequently, regardless of what the strain is on the consumer, we have no alternative but to go along with the recommendations." In other words, to use a vernacular phrase, it is a bit of a cop out. Unless the members opposite in the Cabinet are prepared on occasions when these rate increase recommendations come through, unless they are prepared to realize that they are horrendous, that they are going to be in many cases shockingly, shockingly, devastatingly hard on some consumers, and to say that regardless of the rationale, regardless of the economists, regardless of the experts, that the consumer group in there is going to have a very satisfactory voice, now that will only happen, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if the

Mr. Jamieson: government is also prepared to ensure that the consumer groups are given full access to all of the facts, and that they are given the legal kind of support that they need, and that they are given the time and the money, and give them all of those things; and, incidentally, it is also I think important, the hon. minister made reference almost as an afterthought to the fact that politicians were going to take a look at this, I hope that a means will be found, if one does not already exist, so that we can debate these kinds of raises in the House itself.

Now I am perfectly well aware, as the hon. minister stated on the Throne Speech debate, that energy is a serious problem. But on the other hand I think equally serious, indeed far more serious in many respects, is going to be the enormous impact and to say, as was said in this House, that there is nothing anybody can do about it, and that we might as well recognize that this is one of the elements that is built in, surely means that all of these hearings and the like are going to be a charade unless at the end of the process everybody in the government is prepared to say that, regardless of how logical this presentation is, something must be done in order to ensure that the small consumer of energy, I am talking about - I quite agree with the Premier yesterday when he talked about getting more-or the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) out of industrial users in some instances, but that the ordinary consumer is not just going to have to simply lie back and take it simply because all of the logic in the world says that it is gone up here or it gone up there or we have reached world prices.

Let me just repeat a couple of statistics which give you some idea of what is going to be involved here. If there had not even been the OPEC increase of the last month and a half, if that had not taken place at all, if we were paying world prices before the new one dollar a barrel went on, a consumer of 1,200 gallons of fuel oil in Newfoundland, which is not a large amount, particularly if we have a hard Winter, the bill right now would be something of the

Mr. Jamieson: order of \$1,200 or \$1,300 as opposed to \$770 -
it would be \$300 or \$400 difference. Then the same thing is true of
gasoline at the pump.

Now all of these things are tied in together.
And I realize that I am taking far more time than perhaps the rules of
the House allow, but I do say that unless the government shows some
spine at the end of this process then it is just simply backing away
and simply saying we are leaving the responsibility to some group
of experts and there is nothing we can do about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Hon. Minister of Mines
and Energy.

MR. BARRY: I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of constituents in the area of Brophy Place and Kelly Street here in St. John's. They have signed a petition to try and get some kind of a playground in their area for their children to play in in order to keep the children off the streets. There are close to 160 children in the small area there. There are town houses there so there is a heavier concentration of people than normal. The only place for the children to play at the present time is in the streets and already there have been a number of children knocked down by automobiles. So the families there are very seriously concerned and it appears, in the opinion of the petitioners, that when these town houses were constructed and when buildings generally were constructed in the area, residences, no thought was given to the provision of playgrounds for the children to keep them safe and off the street. So I would ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to have this petition tabled and referred to the committee to which it relates. Presumably, the Department of Municipal Affairs can bring it to the attention of City Council as I myself intend to be doing.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of
Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have
to table two special warrants.

MR. ROBERTS: Is that all?

DR. COLLINS: Right.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a

question for the hon the Premier. It is by way of seeking clarification.

In the wake of the Budget yesterday, and the Throne Speech of a few

days earlier, there are frequent references to a five year plan. I

am asking the hon. the Premier at the moment whether this particular

five year plan is the one which is in the Budget of 1978 and

whether or not, indeed, the elements that are in the so-called blueprint

have now been abandoned

MR. JAMIESON: and the government is beginning not only from a new date, which I would like to ask a supplementary about, but also whether, in fact, the five year plan is the one reflected in the 1978 Budget?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the government is examining all the policies and programmes, examining the financial situation of the Province today and what it will be over the next five years. We are assessing and examining, we are viewing all social and cultural programmes, all economic programmes and will be preparing and releasing a five year plan on all fronts within the next few months. The blueprint for development that was contained in the Budget of last year and the information in that blueprint, some of the ideas in that blueprint are being viewed. But the five year plan will be, I believe, more all-encompassing than the blueprint for development was, but the elements in that plan are being examined and looked at, that this five year plan is not necessarily the blueprint for development, but some of the components that are in the blueprint for development or ideas and concepts for developments that are contained in it no doubt would have to be a part of any five year plan. But we are not limited to what is in the blueprint for development. It is a full reassessment by a new government on the plans and programmes - financial, social, cultural and economic-for the next five years, which is the normal life of a government.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, the question is, I would consider, an important one as to timing. And may I ask the hon. the Premier if the 40,000 jobs referred to in the Speech from the Throne are now, in fact, to come at the end of this new five year cycle to which he has referred or whether or not, as the blueprint of last year indicated, those new 40,000 jobs would, in fact, be in place by the end of 1982? I think the hon. the Premier and members will appreciate the significance of this because, of course, what we are saying in the blueprint at least

MR. JAMIESON: and which the government's charts show, is that if the jobs are not in place by 1982 then we will have a rate of unemployment in Newfoundland calculated at close to 20 per cent. So what I would like to ask the hon. the Premier is whether or not we now are looking at a five year plan for 40,000 jobs ending five years from whenever they are ready to start - presumably the end of this year - or whether the 40,000 jobs are still in place for 1982?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, you know, this government is developing a five-year plan from now. We are not committed in any way to what the blueprint for development had to say; that was a development of goals and objectives and plan that was developed by a previous administration. This administration intends to develop its own plans and programmes and its own development plan for a five year period, so we are not committed to that. We are reassessing the whole question of development in our Province. On the whole question of unemployment, of course, we are well aware of the problems inherent in looking at a developmental strategy to try to reduce the unemployment rate. The economy has done very well, as the Budget Speech pointed out yesterday, in the last year. We have to increase that.

By way of trying to fill in the gap until a plan is developed, we have taken a number of interim measures, which were announced during the election campaign and which have been confirmed in the Budget Speech, dealing with housing construction and the housing plan and other such development as an interim measure towards creating jobs. But the long term thing is what we are more interested in because we are looking at permanence in the labour force rather than one or two year development plans which can only be the kind of thing you can do in a housing programme.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think anyone can argue with the obvious desirability of having long term as opposed to short term employment. My point, however, is one which I suggest the hon. the Premier has not addressed himself to. It seemed to me that what he was indeed doing was repudiating what he describes as a former administration of which many opposite members were part of

MR. D. JAMIESON: including himself. Now it is a very simple question; I would be perfectly happy to see it presented statistically if that is desirable. The fact is that in the Budget of last year it was said there would be 40,000 new jobs created by the year 1982 and included in that were jobs, for example, in Labrador Hydro this Autumn, there are jobs in various other projects, it anticipates certain other things coming on stream. In other words, it was, as I said at the time, a very thoughtful document.

Now, what I am asking the hon. Premier is not whether there will be in-between measures, we all hope there will be, and that the unemployment rate will improve. But so far as I have been able to see now the 40,000 jobs we are speaking of, the objective that is being slated, has now been moved down the line three years. In other words, we are talking, at the very earliest, 1984 or 1985. Now, that is a quite simple question, I suggest, and it is really quite important that we know it not in any sense other than to know how legitimate and appropriate planning is going to be and so that the public of Newfoundland can

MR. D. JAMIESON: have some awareness of just exactly what their job expectations are going to be over either the next two or three years, which are left in the blueprint, or the five year period.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition sort of hints as if the government is not coming clean on what our proposal is. Now if the Leader of the Opposition wants to remain debating the blueprint for development, which was a developmental plan developed by the government of last year, so be it. I am more interested in concerning myself with our announced intention to prepare and release a development plan of this Province over the next five years starting from now. So, therefore, I think it is quite obvious what five year plan I am talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER: What five year plan are you talking about?

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is a five year plan that is being developed right now. As it relates to the Leader of the Opposition's comments on interim initiatives for job opportunities and that he hopes that something is done along those lines, just let me remind the Leader of the Opposition that yesterday we did take steps to do just that. It is not a hope, as the Leader of the Opposition puts it, it is a fact; it became a fact as of yesterday. May I also remind the Leader of the Opposition that the unemployment rate in the Province has gone down by 2 per cent in the last month, and that the number of jobs created over the last few months has been rather substantial compared with other time frames in the last ten years and that we will make the people of Newfoundland aware of our plans and programmes because we intend to table and to publish this five year plan document.

MR. T. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: The Premier has indicated it seems as though from his answers that the five year period starts as of now, as

MR. T. LUSH: of this current year which means, of course, that we are going to be into the 1985's before the creation of these 40,000 jobs become a reality. My question to the Premier is that up to this point in time can the Premier indicate as to what degree of this objective was created from the blueprint for development in terms of the 40,000 jobs? In other words, everything was structured from 1978 to 1982 in terms of the number of jobs that was going to be created as a result of the blueprint. Now can the Premier indicate as to how many jobs had been created up until this time of the blueprint for development or whether that was scrapped some time back?

MR. SPEAKER(SIMMS): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If I understand the hon. member's question, I think that was answered in the Budget Speech of yesterday when the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) indicated in his speech the number of new positions and new jobs that were created and, may I add, outside the public sector in the past twelve months which were somewhere in the neighbourhood of

Premier Peckford:

9,000 the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) said yesterday. So I think that specifically answers the hon. member's question. And I would ask him to address himself to that speech because besides that very important statistic there are many others which I think bear are very salient to the kinds of questions that the member seems that he thinks he should ask at this time.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. SIMMS): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I have a couple of questions in connection with the reference in the Budget Speech yesterday in connection with the public service, but I first of all want to deal with Mr. Bob Cole's contract. What is the position now on Mr. Bob Cole, the Chairman of the Action Group, who had a very generous contract with this government involving somewhere between a half a million and three-quarters of a million dollars? What is the position of Mr. Cole? Is the government going to negotiate their way out of that contract, buy their way out of it, or will Mr. Cole be appointed a deputy minister? Just what is the position in connection with Mr. Cole's contract?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Number one, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cole's contract was not signed with this government, it was signed with the previous government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: You concurred on that.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is number one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Number two is that I have, Mr. Speaker, contacted Mr. Cole and indicated to him that the Action Group would be disbanded and that I would be talking to him over the next few days about his position and his contract. And until I speak to

Premier Peckford: Mr. Cole again in the next few days I would not care to comment on further on it. I am going to pursue the matter with Mr. Cole and decide then in due course what his role, if any, will be.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Do I understand from the hon. gentleman then that Mr. Cole's services with the government could possibly be terminated? The Premier obviously has some plan in the back of his mind, and that plan is going to probably involve a substantial outlay of money from the Public Treasury if the hon. gentleman is going to terminate Mr. Cole's contract, if that is what he has in mind, or is he going to be placed in a senior position with the new administration?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I thank, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) for his terminology. I indicated to the hon. member in my previous answer that the whole question of Mr. Cole's contract and employment with the government is being reviewed and until it has been reviewed and until I have spoken to Mr. Cole and consulted with Cabinet I would not care to further comment on it because I think it would be premature.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: One final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, did I understand correctly, and it was my interpretation

MR. NEARY: of the reference to the Public Service yesterday in the Budget Speech, although the hon. Minister of Finance did not say it specifically, that a freeze has been placed on hiring already in the Public Service? And if that is so, then what about the jobs that have been advertised on the bulletin boards and in the newspapers and the people who have applied for these jobs and have put in their notice to their present employer and are in the process of being appointed to jobs in the Public Service? What will happen to these applicants? Will they now have to go back to their employer and say, "I am sorry but I was just right on the hitch. I almost got appointed to a Public Service job but I am told now there is a freeze on?" First of all, what I am asking the hon. gentlemen to confirm is whether or not in actual fact there is a freeze on hiring in the Public Service and what will happen to all the jobs that been been bulletined on the bulletin boards, advertised in the newspapers, people have applied and been accepted for these jobs, what is the position on that right now?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is a freeze on hirings in the Public Service, number one. Number two, any person who has been accepted for a position in the Public Service and has been so notified by the Public Service Commission or by the relevant departments, that will be kept. In other words, if some department in the Public Service Commission had gone through the interview process and one of the candidates were picked out, if you will, to be the suitable candidate and that candidate was so notified that they now have that job, that will be honoured obviously. Anything less than that would be totally wrong. So that will be covered and anybody who has been confirmed that they have a job, that job will remain. But there is a freeze and anybody who has been offered a job, a candidate approved, of course they still have that job. Thirdly, there is an appeal procedure

PREMIER PECKFORD: through the departments as it relates to the freeze that any minister in any department who is responsible for that department or agency, who feels that some of the positions in that department which had been requested through Treasury Board, feel that these positions are vital for the continued administration and efficiency of that department or agency can appeal the decision to the Treasury Board in Cabinet.

MR. JAMIESON: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A supplementary. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, once again I would be quite content to have this in written form or something of that nature. It may be possible for the hon. the Premier to answer in this way: Is the freeze designed to be precisely what that word suggests, namely, a freeze, or does it anticipate that the total numbers in the Public Service as a result will reduce through attrition, retirement, death or whatever? In other words, are we talking here about simply saying there are certain numbers and they will be maintained or is the objective to reduce the total?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that question because it is a very important one and we are in the process of reviewing that. What our targets will be and what our, if you will, philosophy will be as it relates to the Public Service, it has to obviously just, by the way, off the top of my head, be more than just one based on numbers. It must be based on work and quality of work and the changes between social programmes and economic programmes and so on. So it is rather complex and just cannot be referred to by numbers because that would not be a very impersonal and objective way of trying to deal with making a Public Service work. So that is being reviewed and we have not really - I fully reviewed it to the extent that we can say what our long-term view will be as it relates to the Public Service and hirings. It is a

PREMIER PECKFORD: freeze right now. The extent of the freeze and the philosophy behind it will become clear in the next few weeks, once Cabinet has had a chance to go through it all. We have a report now from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), who is responsible for the Public Service Commission, on all the positions and so on. We are getting reviews done of all the departments so that we will be able to get a full handle on it. But you cannot, until you also know what your programmes are going to be over the next couple of years, because the programmes are dependent upon people and sometimes there will be addition jobs and so on, so it is far more complex. But I appreciate the Leader of the Opposition's question and will try and have a full scale policy as it relates to Public Service, freeze or unfreeze, over the next number of weeks.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle, then the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, thank you. A question for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). The minister will agree that the law of this Province is such that the government of the Province cannot be bound for a period of more than one year except by expressed statutory authorization of this legislature.

MR. ROBERTS: and I wonder if the minister could tell us of the authorization that the previous administration - there is only one government in this Province; there are different administrations - but the previous administration had, the legislative authorization the previous administration had for entering into the contract with the director of this special Action Group?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I think what the hon. member is asking is a legal opinion.

MR. ROBERTS: No, No, I am not. Mr. Speaker, it is -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Perhaps I did not hear correctly.

MR. ROBERTS: - unlawful of me to ask for a legal opinion of the minister. I have no right to ask that. He certainly has the ability to give one but I have no right to ask him. I am asking if he could tell the House of the legislative authorization for entering into the contract. That is a statement of fact, not a matter of opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of specific legislative authorization. There are a number of contractual employees, contractual people on a contractual basis, performing various public services and in many of the instances there is no specific statutory authorization. I think that the authority is an inherent one and certainly if each time a person were taken on a contractual basis to perform some public service for a department or for a minister or for whomever, then there would be many, many specific enactments.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the whole point of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Could the minister undertake at some point to make a statement of the administration's policy to the House on this matter because he has put his finger on it? These contracts, I would suggest to him, are not valid other than on a year to year basis unless they are specifically authorized by this Legislature.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I wish to reply to the hon. gentleman's question.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It was whether I would at some time make a statement -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - with respect to policy on contractual engagements in the Public Service. I certainly agree that that is an area in which there should be a consistent policy, and if there is not one there should be one, and obviously it would not be something that tomorrow or even next week I would be in a position to do.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, maybe ten days down the road.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I agree that it is important and it will be done as time permits.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries arising out of the ministerial statement from the Premier but in the absence of the Minister of Fisheries probably the Premier could answer the question.

The Premier made a ministerial statement this morning regarding the actions the government plans to take with respect to trying to avert the strike by the Newfoundland Fishermen Food and Allied Workers Union which would adversely affect the inshore fisheries in particular this year, and the Premier might have noticed that we spoke more or less in support of that particular action because we did not want, obviously, to jeopardize any actions the government might take in averting that particular strike. But what I would like to do is ask the hon. Minister of Fisheries now if he is listening outside, or the Premier, is what exactly has the Fishing Industry Advisory Board been doing over the last few years and what actions have they taken or what have they been involved in with respect to this particular problem? With the Fishing Industry Advisory Board I would have assumed that they

MR. F. ROWE: would have been deeply involved in this over the last few months, if not years, anticipating that this thing could happen. What is the status of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board and what have they been doing over the last few months and in particular with respect to this possible strike?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: The Advisory Board now has a new Chairman, Mr. Frank Doylanger, the former Assistant Deputy Minister of Fisheries. It is being restructured. They have been working with the industry and the union compiling data, getting thoughts together on prices and this sort of thing, pricing systems. The Advisory Board has been authorized by Cabinet to increase its staff, which they are now doing. They are advertising for certain expertise in certain fields to work with the Board.

MR. NEARY: There is a freeze on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER: The Advisory Board will be playing a major role, Mr. Speaker, in the matter of setting prices and assisting both sectors, both the industry and the union, in arriving at what we hope will be fair prices for our fishermen.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary.

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

MR. F. ROWE: The hon. Minister of Fisheries, Sir, everything is past and future tense here. They will be doing this and they will be doing that. The minister indicated that the Fishing Industry

MR. F. ROWE: Advisory Board is under new chairmanship and is being restructured, hiring on new staff in spite of the freeze, and has indicated that they are really not an advisory board at this particular point but a collection agency for information on which they hope to take action in the future. What I am still trying to ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) is, What has been the involvement of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board over the past few months as it relates to the possibility of this fishermen's strike?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: The hon. member would not expect me in the few minutes that I have at my disposal to reply to his question, to give a complete run-down of the activities of the Advisory Board.

MR. F. ROWE: No, I did not ask for that.

MR. W. CARTER: But I can say this to him that the Advisory Board has been very active. For example, a strike with respect to the crab fishery was averted by virtue of action taken by the Advisory Board; a possible dispute, for example, in the matter of herring prices; certainly I can safely give the Advisory Board credit for having avoided some very serious problems there. It is constantly, Mr. Speaker, monitoring the markets both in Europe and the U.S., supplying information to the industry, to the union to enable them to arrive at, like I say, what we hope will be fair prices to the fishermen. The Advisory Board has been very active and if the hon. member is interested in finding out what it is doing I would be very happy for him to meet with the chairman of that board and let the chairman give him a thorough briefing on what it is doing and what it hopes to do in future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. F. ROWE: I suppose, Mr. Speaker, a third time I might be lucky. The Premier has indicated the activities of the

MR. F. ROWE: Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) and the possible activity of various levels of government and a special committee. Now I repeat the question to the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker; What has been the involvement of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board in the last few months with respect to this particular strike that if it comes about will be probably one of the greatest disasters to hit this Province this year or any other year? What has been the involvement of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board with respect to trying to settle or stave off this potential fishermen's strike?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms) The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: The hon. member has not understood what I am saying, that the Advisory Board has been very active in this dispute. In fact, most of the information that has been used by the Department of Manpower, for example, was information that was compiled under the leadership of the Advisory Board. And that is the role of that board. In fact, it is unique in North America, that kind of an advisory board. And certainly my hope is that once the board is functioning, as it will be within a very short time now under the new chairmanship and the new restructuring, that it will certainly have the effect maybe of avoiding strikes, certainly providing the necessary information to enable both parties, the private sector and the union, to arrive at what we hope will be fair prices.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Stephenville followed by the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. STAGG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is somewhat unusual for a member on this side to be asking questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: I must say that the hon. members on the other side are far more experienced in asking questions than I am. I have only had experience on the government side.

My question is to the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications. I wonder if the minister would

MR. STAGG: indicate what action his department has taken with regard to the bridge on the Hansen Highway near Stephenville, which was washed out a couple of days ago in a storm there? This bridge was erected by the United States Air Force in the 1950s and threatened to be flooded away on April 6, 1973 when Labrador Limerboard was opened. Some of you gentlemen may have been there at the time. And also in doing so, I wonder if the minister would undertake to contact the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan) and request him to have a look at the upstream coursing of Blanche Brook which was apparently denuded by Labrador Limerboard's woods operations and leads to considerable runoff.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

MR. STAGG: So I wonder if the minister would indicate what action he has taken and if he would undertake to contact his colleagues. And as far as my sitting down is concerned, I consider it to be -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: - a most legitimate question and worthwhile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, that is referred to, I think, as Blanche Brook Bridge, you know, right in the town of Stephenville. It occurred last Wednesday. There was a flash flood and the pier went in the morning, I think, and we were forced to close the bridge. Eventually the whole structure collapsed.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Did he read the question exactly as it was written.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. C. BRETT: I did not see the hon. member before I came to the House for your information. I was not aware of the question being asked either.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I accept that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. C. BRETT: But, anyway we were forced to close the bridge and re-route the traffic. I tell the hon. member that we have ordered a Bailey bridge that should be in place within two weeks possibly and it will probably take two or three months before we can actually design and start constructing something new. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is right; the cause of it was some work that was done by Labrador linerboard, and I will certainly have the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan) look into it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and I wonder if he will be prepared to be specific. In the Budget yesterday it referred to Hydro's intention or the Power Distribution. Distinct intention of taking certain communities off diesel and having them tied into the Hydro grid. And \$2 million will be spent in the first phase. Would the minister be specific and indicate to the House the towns that will be involved in the first phase?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot right now off the top of my head but I will be happy to seek the information for the hon. member. It would be brought out in the Estimates in any event.

MR. G. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A supplementary, hon. member for Windsor -
Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: The reason I raised the question to the
minister in particular was in 1978's Throne Speech the community of
Millertown in my district was designated as being a town where this
indeed would happen, that Hydro intended to take off a diesel commitment
that was made in the Throne Speech that Millertown would come off the
diesel facility it is on and be tied into the Hydro grid. Nothing
happened! That did not happen, although it was a condition of the
Throne Speech and I want to determine whether or not Millertown will
retain that particular status because it is probably one of the towns
in Newfoundland most deserving and most needy of that particular
service.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, this will be an ongoing
process, I cannot say whether or not Millertown has been included for this
year but I think it is \$2 million allocated out of a \$10 million programme,
so every site where it is feasible to tie into the provincial grid we hope
to see tied in as quickly as possible because it will mean money saved for
the Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ooo

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

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, the hon. member for
LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to raise the matter
that was brought up by the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) ..
the other day. The hon. gentleman raised a point of personal privilege
in the House and said he did not want to sit on his rights and the
hon. gentleman now has not taken advantage, Sir, of following through,
and I presume he has seen Hansard by now, has not seen fit to

MR. S. NEARY: follow through with his point of privilege. Is the hon. gentleman now letting the matter rest? Is it now a dead issue?

MR. BARRY: Are you asking a question or raising a point of order?

MR. S. NEARY: It is a point of order, Sir, because the hon. gentleman interrupted the House the other day. It was so important to raise a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER(SIMMS): Order, please!
In my opinion this is not a valid point of order, it is simply a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Order 3, Bill No. 3.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 3.
Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Adoption Of Children Act, 1972." Bill No. 3.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. HICKEY: This amendment, Mr. Speaker, would eliminate what could be a serious situation. It is not at the moment but it could turn out to be a serious situation if not corrected.

Basically -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
If I might be permitted hon. minister I am having difficulty in hearing things that are being said and I would request that the member speaking be heard in silence.

The hon. minister.

MR. T. HICKEY: Thank you Your Honour.
The present legislation requires that consent for children to be adopted be taken only

Mr. Hickey: after seven days after birth. That is the case with the amended legislation as it stands on the books right now. There happens to be, however, a number of cases where the consent for adoption was taken prior to birth, which was quite normal under the old legislation or in certain instances a few days after birth, but before the seventh day occurred. And technically and legally, of course, as the Statute stands right now, this is incorrect. I suppose, it could be classed as illegal as such. There obviously was a breakdown in communication. Indeed, in a couple of instances I believe an adoption order was made by some magistrates, a couple of magistrates. And whilst there was no problem at the time, Mr. Speaker, we want to correct the situation to make those consents legal to remove the possibility of any problem arising in the future.

This is basically it. This amendment would correct this situation as the bill would indicate. It is very specific. And basically that is it.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would think there are two points which should be made and both of them will be very, very brief. First of all, as the minister says, and my understanding of the present Adoption Act is that there is a seven day requirement. I think that is a very wise requirement to allow the mother of a child at least a seven day period in which she may decide. And this bill does not directly deal with that but it does deal with a situation which, as I understand the minister, could conceivably arise where an order that was given during a specific period between June 1978 and the 1st. of September 1979, could conceivably at some point be challenged down the road. Obviously, that is a situation which, you know, should not be tolerated, and if there was, as apparently there has been, a defect in a Statute that was originally drafted and passed by the House, then we should certainly move to correct it.

Mr. Roberts: I should add to that, Sir, that we have been consulted by hon. and learned friend, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), and for our part we are willing to allow this bill to proceed through all of its stages this morning, if that is the wish of the House, so that when His Honour attends, I understand he may be before we adjourn this morning, if the bill has been adopted His Honour could be asked whether he would assent to it. I assume if he is asked he will assent to it, if not, we will have an awfully interesting situation indeed.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to, before the hon. gentleman winds up second reading, I wonder if it would be in order, Sir, to ask the hon. gentleman what the situation is now concerning the supply and demand of children available for adoption in the Province? I understand that the only children who are available for adoption now are the older children, that the babies are taken immediately because there is quite a demand on the part of adoptive parents who want to adopt babies more than the older children. What is the situation now regarding the adoption programme?

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I obviously do not have figures at the moment, but I will be glad to get them for the hon. member. I can tell him that, and he is obviously familiar as a former minister, there was quite a few years ago a surplus, and because of the programme put in place to increase the number of adoptions, indeed to promote adoptions in the Province, that situation was corrected and the number is greatly reduced. There was a time when there was a scarcity of children, I suppose could be said, for adoption. But over the past number of years strangely enough, when one would have normally expected the numbers to continue in small numbers in terms of children available, the numbers have increased and presently there are quite a few adoptions being processed within the Province. Few are being

Mr. Hickey: processed for parents or prospective adopted parents from outside the Province, and indeed outside of the country. We have been involved in international adoptions to a certain degree.

But I will be pleased to get that information in a more detailed way, providing the numbers that are currently available and indeed the numbers of children which have been adopted within and outside of the Province for the past number of years.

I thank my colleagues on the other side for agreeing to see this bill passed, and I have much pleasure in moving second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Adoption Of Children Act, 1972." read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House now, by leave. (Bill No. 3)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The motion is that I leave the Chair.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Order J. (Bill No.3)

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Adoption Of Children Act, 1972." (Bill No. 3)

Motion that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 3 without amendment, carried.

MR. MARSHALL: I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred, have directed me to report Bill No. 3 without amendments and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reports that it has considered the matters to it referred and has directed him to report Bill No. 3 without amendment.

On motion report received and adopted Bill No. 3, ordered read a third time now by leave.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Adoption Of Children Act, 1972," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No.3)

MR. MARSHALL: Motion 4.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Motion 4. The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to move reforms, alterations in the way of reforms to the Standing Orders of this House. These are reforms that the government has put together and the government feels are very significant and will do much to enhance the dignity and esteem of this House in the eyes of the public. I do not need—before I get into the rules themselves and explain them, I do not think I need to labour too much on the need for alterations and changes and reforms in the rules themselves. The hon. the Premier when he was speaking on opening day indicated, I think, quite clearly as to the view of the government with respect to the necessity of this and in fact , I think, the Throne Speech indicated as well that there is somewhat of an equation between the economic health of an area and of a Province and the health of its political institutions. And there is no doubt about it that anyone who has ever read the Amulree Report and has observed events both before and, I might say, after the restoration of self-government in this Province, there is certainly a need of a change in the political institutions.

Now this motion, these rules and these reforms that are brought before this House, Mr. Speaker, are brought forth in a sincere, honest and earnest attempt on the part of government to make the House of Assembly relevant and to enable it to cope with the tasks which are before it. It is a fact that we talk about the British parliamentary system and we talk about our roots going back to over 400 years, but it is also a fact as well that the institution we have, the framework on

MR. W. MARSHALL: which we operate, is unable to cope with the future shock of the present days and to a large extent the machinery in the Legislature itself is as inadequate for the purpose of communication in this day and age of automobiles and airplanes and what have you, as the horse and buggy and can be compared to, really, the horse and buggy days.

Now, the purpose of these rules, as I say, is to restore the House of Assembly to its rightful place or to attempt to restore the House of Assembly to its rightful place of dignity and esteem with the public.

MR. MORGAN: Hear, hear.

MR. W. MARSHALL: The changes, they represent reforms. As I say, they do not presume to be completely all encompassing but they represent reforms that we feel are most necessary as judged by impartial observers of the legislative process in this Province.

Undoubtedly, there may be others but for the moment we confine ourselves to the most essential that are represented in this motion itself. I should say at the same time though, Mr. Speaker, that it is inherent in the policy of this present administration of the recognition of the fact that the Legislature is a growing organism, a growing body and an evolving body and this government intends to make the Standing Orders' Committee - the Committee on the Standing Orders - active during this assembly and that we will be monitoring the changes that come in with a view to looking at them in the future and seeing how they are working and seeing whether any further changes may be necessary in the future. But what is before the House now is what we honestly believe, as I say, to be beneficial changes and we honestly believe that if they are regarded by all members and approached by all members with a sincere intention to make it work, that it will be very effective and be a gaint step towards, what we view to be, the restoration of parliamentary democracy in this Province.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Now, it is government's intention to make these changes, Government announced it in the Throne Speech, they are government's proposals, but I would be remiss in introducing this motion if I did not point out that under the present legislation in this House the government itself can not effect the changes because under the House of Assembly Act it is required that two-thirds of the compliment of this House vote in order to effect any changes. The recent election left us with a few seats short of that two-thirds and we will, in order to get these through under the present legislation, need the co-operation of the Opposition.

Now, as a matter of interest and somewhat of an aside, I could indicate that there are two ways it could be brought through with co-operation. First of all, we have received the co-operation, for which we are extremely grateful, from the Opposition -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. MARSHALL: - and it is the way in which the government prefers to be able to deal. We could, as I say - as a matter of aside, it might be of interest to this House to learn that in the ten provincial jurisdictions in Canada eight of them are amended, amendments can be effected by a simple majority rule of the House itself. It is only Newfoundland and Nova Scotia which have two-thirds. The House of Commons has a majority ruling which can effect changes and recently, I understand that Westminster has also made it a majority.

But in any event, Mr. Speaker, that is aside. The fact of the matter is that we have asked for and we have received - we have consulted with the Opposition with respect to these rules that have been initiated by the government, and we have received, and I want to emphasize, the co-operation of the Opposition. I think it augurs well for this assembly in the future days and I want to - as I say, I would be very remiss if I did not bring this to the attention of the House itself because it is obviously government's intention and desire and wish that these amendments receive the approbation of all

July 20, 1979

Tape No. 165

SD - 3

MR. W. MARSHALL:

people on both sides of the House.

Before I get again, which I will in
a moment, into the rules itself, I want to say, emphasize that they
were put together in a sincere desire to

MR. W. MARSHALL: reform the parliamentary institutions. There are aspects in them which limit debate but I think shallow and superficial indeed would be an analysis on anybody's part that the purpose of these rules is to limit debate in any manner. That is not the underlying purpose. The purpose of these rules is really to extend and protect the rights of all members of this House, to give all members of this House an opportunity to participate, particularly those people who are styled, which I think is an inappropriate term, as backbenchers, I prefer to call them private members, to enable them to speak and get involved in the process, the legislative process and the governmental process in the House, and to prevent certain people, say in the ministry or what have you, or persons on the other side of the House from completely monopolizing the proceedings of the House itself and to foster and encourage the participation of everyone.

So I would indicate and I emphasize, that it is not the purpose of these rules to limit debate but really to foster and extend the rights of every member and to realize as much as we possibly can, the equality of all members in this House and their equal rights to participate in the deliberation of the affairs of the government itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are three major aspects to this motion. There are first of all, as I say, three main thrusts. Now there are other areas dealt with, other necessary areas but it reforms Private Members' Day, it strengthens the private members themselves by allowing them to participate in deliberations with respect to the estimates, and it allows much more participation in the debate itself by everybody, by making the rules of speaking such that people have to be more concise and direct in addressing themselves to any problems and questions, and also alters somewhat the position that the House, and the way in which the House would deal with petitions which are presented.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Now I shall then briefly describe the contents of this motion which is before the House.

Paragraphs one, two and three I do not think we need to spend any time on to any great degree. What this does it amends the Standing Orders of the House to provide that the sitting hours on Friday will be from ten o'clock to one o'clock, and this really regularizes the practice which has occurred over the past few years. And the reason why we have that is that it allows members, particularly those members who journey home to their districts on the weekend, a head start on the weekend itself and I think it is a sensible change and, as I say, it really formalizes existing procedures.

Paragraph four: I direct the House's attention now to paragraph four, the motion. And this emanated from a suggestion and discussions which we had with the Opposition and it changes the ordinary daily routine of business. Before when the Speaker came in he would say, "Statements By Ministers" first and then, well as it is here. Presenting Petitions, Reports of Standing Committees, Notices of Motion, and Oral Questions was at the end. Now, it was felt that the showpiece, really, or one of the showpieces of any legislature has to be the Oral Question period and it was felt that that should be moved up on the daily routine of business so we have moved that up as second, after Statements of Ministers, Oral Questions. The reason why Oral Questions would not be put first is that first of all Statements By Ministers have to have a priority in the business of the House itself, but secondly, many times Oral Questions themselves will arise out of a statement that a minister has made at that particular time. Also by making this alteration and change it will allow people to plan their times a little bit more effectively so that you will know when the Oral Question period comes on early in the day, as early as possible.

MR. ROBERTS: There is a typo by the way there.

MR. MARSHALL: Is there really?

MR. ROBERTS:

It says three, it should say

three-thirty.

MR. MARSHALL:

Now I am on the ordinary routine of -

MR. ROBERTS:

Oh, I am sorry. It is in the next

one.

MR. MARSHALL:

The next one, yes.

MR. ROBERTS:

The next but one. I am sorry.

MR. MARSHALL:

I am on number five now with

respect to debate.

MR. ROBERTS:

Yes. It is in number six.

MR. MARSHALL:

Number six. Okay. Well, we can pick

that up as we get to it then.

In paragraph five on today's Order Paper, Standing Order 49 is revoked. Now this relates to Private Members' Day and it will be - no, not to Private Members' Day, to the time of debate in the House itself and it represents a really significant change. First of all, the time limit for speaking of all members will be thirty minutes instead of forty-five. We thought this was a good measure to bring in because one of the major improvements that was made in 1970, one of the best

MR. MARSHALL: ones, I think all members will agree, was the Late Show where members get five minutes each to question a minister and a minister gets five minutes to respond. We find that when people have to have a shorter period of time they tend to plan out their address a little bit more effectively. So it goes from forty-five minutes to thirty minutes except in the cases where Government Orders are being moved. But the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, a minister moving a Government Order or a member replying thereto immediately after such minister, a member moving a motion of non-confidence and the minister replying thereto shall not speak for more than sixty minutes.

Now what we have here is in effect we have the exception of the right in the hands of the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier - which I will get to in a moment - we have to all intents and purposes removed the aspect of unlimited time. It was felt that the way the previous rules were where if anyone moved a non-confidence motion they would get unlimited time was unsatisfactory - Mr. Speaker, was unsatisfactory because it would certainly appear that members were moving non-confidence motions not because they wished to express necessarily at that time specifically non-confidence in the government on a particular measure, but purely and simply to get unlimited time, and we thought that really, in effect, that would derogate it from the effect of non-confidence motions themselves. Sixty minutes should be enough for any member to be able to express the reasons for his lack of confidence in the government and sixty minutes should be quite adequate for anyone to respond and reply to that. So it is thirty minutes or sixty in the case of introducing bills, responding to same or in non-confidence motions.

Now the only instance where there is unlimited time is where the Leader of the Opposition moves a motion of non-confidence and the Premier replies thereto. It was thought best to preserve this because this is a right that should not really be interfered with and if it is necessary for a long period of time to explain the

MR. MARSHALL: reason for longer than an hour - non-confidence in the government that it should repose, really, in the leader of the party who is going to present that and the right to reply should be in the leader of the party who has to respond. Also, of course, the time constraints do not apply to the Minister of Finance when he gives his Budget Speech or the person replying immediately after.

So we feel, then, that these changes in the times, the permissions or the period of time when one may speak are beneficial. I would emphasize again and say that shallow and superficial indeed is any analysis which looks to this particular rule and indicates that it is there purely and simply for the purpose of limiting time. It is not for that purpose, it is for the purpose of enhancing the examination of matters in the House of Assembly and giving and extending rights to all members of the House, itself.

The next change, and significant change, that we have, and I think a real improvement, is the one with respect to Private Members' Days. Now everyone knows that matters would be set down on the Order Paper at the opening of the session and one, and maybe two at the most, motions would be considered for the entire session. They would be debated on and on and on, sometimes by design of the Opposition, sometimes by design of the government. And this really infringed on the rights and trampled really, on the rights of members, I think. And I think that Private Members' motions should be considered as expeditiously as possible and as many as possible in a session, itself.

So consequently, what we are doing is we are providing that a Private Members' motion shall be considered for not more than two sitting days, not more than two Wednesdays. This is the effect of the amendment to Standing Order 53 (1). And at 6:00 P.M. at the close of the second day, the Speaker will then put the motion to vote and adopt or otherwise the motion. It will then be dispensed with and the next day we will move on to other -

MR. ROBERTS: We might just correct the typographical error, Mr. Speaker, that is in

MR. ROBERTS: (4) of Standing Order 53 and it says;
"On Wednesdays the question period shall commence not later than 3:00 p.m."

MR. MARSHALL: 3:30 that is supposed to be. Thank you.

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe we can just agree to correct it
and not have to worry about it anymore.

MR. MARSHALL: Now in the private motions because we
have only two days, instead of thirty minutes a member may speak only
twenty minutes. And that is not for the purpose again of limiting members
speaking, it

Mr. Marshall is to ensure that the largest number of members - that one person or two or three or four or five, however many, are not going to monopolize the proceedings and that every member is going to get an opportunity to speak.

The member introducing the motion will get an opportunity to close the debate. He will get twenty minutes to close the debate. And if at the end of the second sitting day the motion is not disposed of at 5:40 in the afternoon, the Speaker will interrupt the person who then has the floor, give the floor to the mover of the motion who can close the debate and answer any questions.

On Wednesdays, also in order to assure that a full consideration of these private motions will be considered and to prevent government from getting up and using a lot of time, consuming a lot to time in the matter of statements and what have you, it is provided that the debate must start by 4:00 each afternoon. So you are guaranteed that there will be at least four hours of consideration of a private member's motion.

The Question Period will start at 3:30. And as the Leader of the Opposition has indicated, there should be an amendment which we can - it is only a typographical, but we should assure that it is in there. On Wednesdays the Question Period shall commence not later than 3:30.

So you are assured of two things, a half hour Question Period and you are sure of at least four hours of consideration of a private member's motion.

Paragraph 7, Standing Order 82 amends the order to provide that on Divisions, now that is, of course, when votes are called, when formal votes are called, that the time is expanded to ten minutes from that which is presently, or such lesser time as may be signified to the Speaker by the government and opposition whips. In other words, they can say the members are there and they are ready to proceed, it is no longer necessary to wait for the ten minutes. And the reason why we put it ten minutes is this, that the offices are on the fifth floor, this is a practical reason and it some-

Mr. Marshall: times takes more than the five minutes and the three minutes to get upstairs. And I think anyone will agree that it is not sensible that a government should be defeated merely because persons cannot get the use of the elevators, you know, and cannot get upstairs. So it allows a reasonable period of time in relation to the present situation which we are in.

Also, that Standing Order would revise the procedure to make and permit Divisions in the Committee of the Whole. Again, this would prevent the government from, you know, if the government is to be defeated, let us face it, if it is to be faced with a question and a matter of confidence or some other action is to be taken as a result of the vote, it should not be because people are closeted in a common room or elsewhere, and there should be an adequate opportunity for the expression of members intent.

Paragraph 8 is just merely to change the quorum of the Committees from nine to seven. I shall deal with that when I get on the estimates procedures.

Paragraph 9 changes Standing Order 87 and allows, and I will get on to that in a moment as well, allows there to be alterations in the personnel of the Committees, after they are appointed by the House, by a letter signed by the Government House Leader and, of course, the Government House Leader would take advice from the Opposition with respect to the Opposition members with respect to it. I will get on to that when we get on to Committees.

Paragraph 10, Standing Order 92 is changed and this is a significant one as well, it deals with petitions. Petitions now are last on the daily ordinary routine of business. But it provides also that petitions, there may be only the introducer of the petition and two others speaking to it, one from the government side of the House and one from the opposition side of the House. We obviously wish to preserve the right of petition, but we want them also to be dealt with in a reasonable manner because I think

Mr. Marshall: . . . all members or certainly most members, the majority of members would agree that the manner in which petitions were sometimes handled in the past was really to the extent that they intefferred unduly with the operations of the House itself.

I think a major significance is the amendment with respect to the

MR. MARSHALL: estimates. While I go through that I could indicate certain of government's intentions with respect to the dealing of it this year.

Now, on estimates the Committee of Supply will remain seventy-five hours. Then there will be deducted from that seventy-five hours the amount necessarily consumed in Interim Supply. That is the way it is now. The Striking Committee, and that is a committee which we will appoint either today, if we have time, or on Monday, and that is the committee that determines the personnel of committees in the House itself, will meet and they will appoint committees.

This year the government intends to use the committee system where it has not been used before. The government intends to have three committees this year dealing with fifteen departments. The compliment of the committee will be not less than seven or more than fifteen, that is provided here. And I might say, in connection with that, it is the intention this year to have seven member committees, with four from the government side and three from the Opposition side.

It is also government's intention, in view of its desire to involve the private members of this House, to see that the government nominees on it are persons who are private members on the government side of the House itself. We feel that this will be much better because it will result in much more involvement on the part of private members themselves and get them very much more involved in the estimates and bring about a meaningful and detailed examination of the estimates themselves. It is no secret, for one reason or another, that the estimates of this Province in previous years were dealt with in a most unsatisfactory manner, both because of the rules and because of other reasons. And we have to strive,

MR. MARSHALL: because of the financial situation of this Province and many other reasons, this is the whole basis of parliament itself, to ensure that there is as much and as indepth and as detailed an analysis of the expenditures that government poses to make as there can possibly be.

Now we are doing this, when we do the committees, we are taking two steps; we are assuring that there will be this detailed examination on the one hand, and on the other, it is our determination to see that our colleagues, who are private members on this side of the House, together with the private members on the other side of the House, get an opportunity to participate in government in a real meaningful way.

The next thing, Mr. Speaker, is the time of sitting. It is proposed that the committees may set their own hours of sitting. They will sit, by the way - where they will sit; government proposes to use - there will be three committees - proposes to use the House of Assembly on the one hand. It proposes, hopefully, to use the Collective Bargaining room on the other hand. But I think even more significantly and more importantly, it is determined that it is also going to use the Colonial Building for the sittings of one of the committees.

This administration has indicated a desire as well as to go ahead, to be cognizant of the roots of our Province itself and we feel that it will be, I think, a very significant move on our part to get a portion of the legislative process back into the historical Colonial Building from where some people feel, anyway, it should never have been removed.

The rest on the order of business of the committees themselves is all set forth here and I shall not go into it in any detail except to hit a few highlights. Again, in order to assure a completeness of debate itself, the provision in the committees is that the ministers who will attend, not as members but to answer

MR. MARSHALL: questions from the private members of this House, will have fifteen minutes to introduce their estimates. In other words, they cannot go on interminably and usurp all of the period of time provided. And the person responding will have fifteen minutes to respond and thereafter each member can speak for ten minutes. Now it does not mean he can speak for ten minutes only and he is limited to debate for only ten minutes, what it means is a person must so organize his thoughts that he speaks for ten minutes and then sits down and gives another person a chance. He or she may then get up afterwards and speak for another ten minutes. So I want to emphasize that and emphasize again and again that

MR. MARSHALL: I think it is very shallow and superficial of any individual to turn around and say the purpose of these rules is to limit debate. I emphasize again and again that this is a parliamentary reform which is done in a sincere attempt by this government in order to involve all members of the House in the way in which they should be and the electors intended them to be when they sent them to the hon. House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, as we go on, the committees which will be established - this is important to know as well - the committees which will be established shall have fifteen days within which to report back to the House, itself. In other words, they can sit for as long as they want to provided they cannot sit when the House is in session except with the leave of the House, itself, but they can sit within that fifteen days as long as the committee determines it is going to sit but it must report back to the House within fifteen days of its constitution. And then at that time the chairman of the committee will report to the House of Assembly and there will be a three hour debate on that report. The chairman of the committee will get up and say the usual, that the committee has or has not - usually and hopefully it will be 'has' considered the matters to them referred and has passed certain items of expenditure and ask that the report be received. Then there will be opportunity on the Opposition side and on the government side to have a three hour debate on the report of that committee, which we will call a concurrence debate, itself. And this is put in to assure that even though we are putting things off in the committee, that anything that is necessary to be brought directly to the attention of the House, itself, will be brought directly to the attention of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have pretty well covered it all. I know other members will wish to address themselves to the motion. I should indicate that we look on the rules of this House as an evolving process. It is the intention of government to have the committee on the Standing Orders activated and active as well, that we will

MR. MARSHALL: be monitoring the changes that come in and any changes or improvements that are reasonably necessary in the future, that they will be considered.

In closing, I would like to - I will close the debate after I hear other comments but at this stage I would like to again express my appreciation to the Opposition for their co-operation in this regard. As far as we are concerned this is done, as I say, in the desire to improve the rules of the House, and we are going to give the Opposition, as well, an opportunity to assess the rules publicly. And we undertake, if the Opposition wishes a motion we can do it, but certainly, the government gives the undertaking that in the next session of the House we will be prepared to set aside one sitting day - not being a Wednesday - wherein on the signature of the proposal of twelve members of this House who wish to debate these rules, so that there can be a public assessment of them if that is necessary.

Now we cannot, I do not think, move in any more of a reasonable fashion than we have done and I move the adoption of these rules, Mr. Speaker, and I do so with a great deal of pride because they indicate a real effort on the part of this government, one month and one day after it has assumed office in accordance with its promise, to restore the dignity and esteem of this House of Assembly to the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the member for the Strait of Bella Isle.

AN HON. MEMBER: We did it! We did it!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, now that my colleagues have finished demonstrating their enthusiasm for the hon. gentleman opposite, when I finish they can demonstrate their enthusiasm for me.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying, Sir, that we support these changes in the rules as they have been proposed by the President of the Council, the hon. and learned member who is the

MR. MARSHALL:

Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall)

in addition to his onerous and time consuming duties as the President of the Executive Council. I shall speak in a moment or so of one or two qualifications on that because, while I express the view of the great preponderance of my colleagues, there are those who feel very strongly, and I want to say that while I do not agree with their position, I think it has

MR. E. ROBERTS: some merit and I think it certainly should be expressed to the House and I think it will be and then, of course, it will speak for itself.

Before I go into any detail at all on the changes, I suppose it is fair to say not take issue with the hon. gentleman when he spoke of the effect of these rule changes but let me perhaps add to it. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, and I think I express the views of my colleagues on it, but even if I do not, I speak as somebody who is not the senior member of this House in terms of service. My friend from LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) is the senior member of this House in terms of service but the hon. gentleman from St. John's East Extern (Mr. T. Hickey) and I, through the vagaries of faith, have managed to become the second senior members of this House in terms of service which may be nothing more than a commentary upon either the fickleness of the electorate, if you wish Mr. Speaker, or their ability to make improvements in their elected representatives. But the fact remains that there are only three of us who have been in this House - two have been here for five elections and the third, my friend from LaPoile who has been returned to the House six times. So when I say that I do not think the rules in themselves will bring about the improvement which we all hope for and which we all work for, I do not say that in any criticism of the rules or any criticism of the proposed changes.

Like every member and I know I speak for every member, the fifty-two of us, on this point all of us feel that this House needs to improve its performance, needs to improve its effectiveness, needs to serve better the interests of the people of this Province. Over the last period of years and I do not put any period of one or two or three or five but over the last period of years I think many of us, or perhaps all of us who served in the House have, from time to time, felt less than proud of what the House has done. I do not lay blame on any particular individual, I

MR. E. ROBERTS: suspect all of us who participated in the House are entitled to receive and should, in fact, receive a share of whatever blame there may have been. The important thing though is that that is behind us. I think this session to date, and I have no doubt this will continue, we have seen a new tone set. I think the hon. gentlemen opposite have done their share to bring this about and I think that we on this side, Mr. Speaker, have done our share to bring this about. Nobody wins. It is not a matter of advantage for the government side or our side, the only winners as a result of that new arrangement will be the only people who should win and that is the people of this Province. I think that is what is important, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. ROBERTS: The rule changes in themselves will not bring it about if we do not have the atmosphere of - I want to say of co-operation, this is not a tea party. I do not mind strong debate. You know, in fact, we must have strong debate, we must have strong differences of opinion because the fifty-two of us have been sent here to speak and to resolve serious issues. And we are going to have differences of opinion and strongly held differences of opinion on great issues and so we should. But I think we can still have a spirit of co-operation, a recognition of a common desire and a common intent to serve the people of this Province even if we may differ on the methods by which that service should be rendered.

And perhaps on an aside I could bring to the attention of the ministry something which I find offensive as a member of the House and that is the description contained in the Estimates of the legislative process. This House, Sir, runs the government of this Province in the sense there is no government until and unless they have the support of the members of this House.

MR. E. ROBERTS: There is no Supply, there is no money, there can not be one nickel spent other than the few dollars authorized on statutory expenditures by us earlier, there can not be one dollar spent without the approval of this House. And I find it offensive, to say the least - I do not think it was intended to be offensive but I would hope the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) would bring it to the attention of his officials and would arrange to have a correction made. The description is contained in the Estimates which he tabled yesterday saying: "The House of Assembly consists of the elected representatives of the Province," that is correct, "whose primary responsibility is to express the views, needs and wishes of their constituents in their study and debate of the law making process." That is not our primary responsibility.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Our primary responsibility is to be responsible for governing this Province. The Government, of which the hon. Minister of Finance is a distinguished and leading member, the government are the government simply because they have the support of a majority of the members of this House and the civil servants who produced that should quite correctly be asked to correct it. I do not think they did it in any spirit of malice but it is indicative of the kind of attitude that perhaps has grown up about this House over the years. This House, Sir, is the supreme parliament of this Province subject only to the British North American Act which limits the types of laws we may make but within that we are the supreme body in this Province and in that sense we are just as supreme as the Parliament at Ottawa which my friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson) served with such great distinction for twelve or thirteen years. We are supreme and the Civil Service, Sir, answer to us. They answer to the government but the government answers to us

MR. E. ROBERTS: and the government are the government because they have the support, because they have the confidence of a majority of the members of this House and that should never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, the rule changes, as I have said, will be effective only if they are carried out in an atmosphere of a willingness to recognize that this House has a role and the role is to represent the interest of the people of this Province and to ensure that the Government of this Province is responsive to wishes of the people whom it is attempting to serve. I think the rule changes will help, Sir, and I think even more important than that is the spirit in which they have been worked out. I want to say, I want to make it quite clear that these rules and I think my learned friend opposite made the point and I agree with him and I reinforce it, that these rules are not the government's rule changes, they are the House's rule changes. The government took the lead, as was their duty and as was their responsibility and they have proposed rule changes. But the government then responded and I want to put this on the record, I think very positively our caucus was given an ample opportunity, the learned gentleman opposite, the hon. gentleman, the President of the Council, agreed to hold off the Notice of Motion for two or three days so we did have an opportunity to study it. Perhaps we could have had a longer opportunity but some things cannot be done. We made some responses and I want to acknowledge now that in a number of very important matters, points which we raised were taken into account by the government and the appropriate changes were made in the rules as they now stand in the name of the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall).

We went along with it, Sir, we went along with these rules only after a great deal of thought and consideration and as I have said - I think it is fair to say at least one of my colleagues has indicated he wishes to speak and I think it is fair to say that he has honestly and sincerely held reservations. He can express them. He certainly needs no help from me to express himself and to make his point clear, but I think it is equally fair to say that the great majority,

MR. E. ROBERTS: the great preponderance feel as I do, that these changes are a step forward. They are not perfect, Sir, and they certainly do not represent everything we would want if we were drafting the rules. But, Sir, we are not responsible for drafting the rules, we are not the government. That issue was settled on the 18th. of June and the hon. gentlemen opposite have won the right, at the hands of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, to be the Government of this Province for the period provided for in the laws of this Province. But while the rules are not perfect, Sir, we think they are a considerable step forward. We also feel that as the government did take into account our wishes and have made changes to reflect the points which we brought forward, they are worthy of our support and accordingly we are prepared to support them.

Mr. Speaker, the areas of change, I think they have been well spelled out by President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). I do not propose to go through them in any detail. I think he has summed up quite clearly the affect of the various changes which would come into effect if this motion carries, as I believe it will, as I understand it will. The only point that I would make is that some of my colleagues, some of our members, the members sitting to Your Honour's right do have some reservations about the change in the right, which members hitherto have enjoyed, to gain unlimited time by moving a motion of non-confidence. Now we are prepared to accept the change, we have accepted it, we have grappled with it, we have resolved it in our own caucus but I think it is fair to put that on record. I listened to what the hon. gentleman said and I am prepared to take that as representing an honestly held position. I have no doubt that is the government's view. We went along with it essentially because this change, the restriction in the length of time does not restrict the number of times that a member may move a motion of non-confidence. That right is still preserved and it will simply mean if a member feels that he has a point so serious that he cannot make it in sixty minutes and that could quite easily be the case -

MR. E. ROBERTS: I know that my friend, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) will agree that while perhaps the unlimited time on a non-confidence measure was used sometimes for the legitimate purpose of a filibuster, there were other times when the case to be laid out in support of a non-confidence motion was such that it would require more than sixty minutes adequately to put it before the House. That can be achieved then by the process of an amendment or

MR. ROBERTS: a sub-amendment and two bites out off the apple will still see the apple eaten, to carry through that metaphor.

Mr. Speaker, we also felt and we so suggested to the government, that these changes ought to be adopted on a sessional basis. That would mean that they would be in effect only for this session but that at the end of the session the matter would come up for review, or at the beginning of the next session they would come up for review again. The government felt that the matter was such that the changes ought to be made permanent and that is the way they now stand. We thought long and hard about this and my hon. friend has indicated that the government are prepared and I think it is fair to say are prepared in response to concerns which we expressed, to take two steps. One, is to activate the Standing Orders Committee, whatever the technically correct name of it is, I believe it is Standing Order 84(b), but to activate that Committee, to appoint it at an early time, to cause it to meet and to cause it to have a look at our rules because I think our rules, Sir, need a thorough revision. I am not sure they need any substantive revision but I think they need a thorough revision in that they are in many cases archaic, badly drafted - and I do not say that in criticism of the draftsman. Some of them I suspect were never properly drafted they just emerged and evolved. In essence, these rules grew from 1949, Sir, and in 1949 they represented what those who put them together in 1949, as I understand it, recalled of what was in effect in 1934. And the pre-commission, the Responsible Government House of Assembly was a pretty chaotic place in many ways. My friend the Premier is a great historian, reads widely in history, he, perhaps, has read some of the debates which were published. The House was complete chaos and anybody who thinks that this House on occasion has deteriorated into less than acceptable conduct ought to read what went on in the 1920s and in the 1930s when political life in Newfoundland did deteriorate. On that point, by the way I will take issue with the President of the Council. I was surprised to hear him cite the Amulree Report and it was in the Throne Speech as

MR. ROBERTS: well. With any sort of favourable feeling my understanding of Newfoundland history is anybody who has read any history of Newfoundland knows that the Amulree Report was the classic hatchet job, the classic hatchet job on the then Dominion of Newfoundland. I think the historians have shown that it is biased, badly written, inaccurate, has the wrong emphasis, was the wrong diagnosis of what was wrong with Newfoundland and on, and on and on. This is not the place for an historical debate but I simply want to say that I do not think anybody should cite the Amulree Report with approval. And in my view I think it is a matter of astonishment that anybody feels that the Amulree Report is anything except a document which ought to be held up to ridicule and exposed for what it really is.

Be that as it may, Sir, we have agreed to go along with the government and make these rule changes on a permanent basis. As the President of the Council said, we could have stopped them in the short-term, we could have forced them to amend the House of Assembly Act. They could have had their way in the long run and I do not find that offensive, Sir, because as I said they are the government. In the long run they have the right to do as they believe best and they will answer to the people of the Province for what they do and that, Sir, is the real check.

The reason why we have gone along with the government, Sir, and I want to say this clearly, is that we believe the government are acting in good faith. We know that we are. We believe that they are. I think that their move in bringing in these rules, these changes is a good faith effort, a bona fide effort being made to improve the functioning, the working of this House of Assembly to allow members to participate more effectively, to allow the House to function more effectively, to allow the people of this Province better to be served by this House. On that basis we are certainly prepared to go along with it

July 20, 1979

Tape No. 173

AH-3

MR. ROBERTS:

and we will try to make
them work, we will try to work within the framework they provide and
if

MR. ROBERTS: we find at the beginning of the next session, on the basis of the experience of this session, if we find that the changes are not achieving the effect then we shall certainly move through the members we will have on the Standing Orders Committee, we shall certainly move through the procedure which the hon. gentleman has offered, And we do not need a motion on it, we accept his statement of policy on behalf of his colleagues in the government that that is enough for us, we have no question, we shall certainly move for a debate to express our concerns. We are willing to make these rules work if they can work. We believe they can but we will not know until we try. We are prepared to go forward, Sir, in good faith just as we believe the government are prepared to go forward in good faith in the interest of this House and of this Province.

So let me close on that note, Mr. Speaker, let me close by saying that we accept the rule changes. We believe they represent a step forward. Only the test of time and the test of experience will show us whether or not they do. But I want to emphasize again that the rule changes in themselves in our view, will not do what needs to be done. The real reform in this House is not just in rule changes, they are but the symptom, they are but part of the cure, the real reform in this House must come from the fifty-two of us, the fifty-two men and women who have been sent here by the people of this Province to be the thirty-eighth General Assembly of this Province and to act as members of the General Assembly for the period of life given to us by the law. For our part, Sir, we are going to try to work in a spirit of co-operation, not giving up our rights, not giving up our views. no, but in a spirit of co-operation to make this House work.

The government I want to say, and I speak in particular I think here for my friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson) who will speak a little later in this debate to speak for himself, I know I reflect his view and I reflect the view I believe of our caucus, we feel that the government

MR. ROBERTS: are coming into this session in exactly the same spirit. We hope that it continues because there are certainly a number of moves that ought to be made in our view, a number of things that ought to be done to make this House better fitted to serve the people. And if the members of the House are themselves willing to try then I think they ought to be given the opportunity and the wherewithal, the ability to carry through their intention. The rule changes, Sir, will certainly help to that end and in that vein we do support them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up very much time in this debate. The President of the Council and the Government House Leader has detailed the major changes and amendments, what I like to call reforms to the Standing Orders that have been proposed and that have been negotiated between both parties, if you will, parties in the large definition of that word, over the last week or so. I think I would have to go on record, Mr. Speaker, as expressing the kind of gratitude that the President of the Council and the Opposition House Leader has just done in the way we have gone about the changes. I think it is fair to say that the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition House Leader have been extremely co-operative in this regard, very, very co-operative and I want to thank them sincerely for the co-operation that they have shown. Of course, I must say in dealings that I have had with the Opposition House Leader over the years, especially private dealings, not necessarily all the debates in the House -

MR. ROBERTS: Not debates here in the House.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - not the debates in the House but the normal and ordinary negotiations I have had on many things dealing

PREMIER PECKFORD: with his district years ago when I was a minister in the different departments, have always been extremely fair and equitable and I think he shows again in the negotiations on these rule changes, the same kind of co-operation I did have with him in the past. So it is nothing new for me to recognize the Opposition House Leader's co-operative spirit because it has been demonstrated on many occasions between both of us.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: But, Mr. Speaker, first of all my first point is simply to thank the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition House Leader for their co-operation along the lines of amending and changing and reforming the rules of the House.

Point number two, Mr. Speaker, these, of course, are not all embracing, they are not the end of the world, they are not what one would classify as an all embracing look at the rules of the House. There are many, many others which are more technical in nature, which are more difficult to find consensus on among the caucus on this side and the caucus on the other side and we have decided to isolate, really, those rules which were most easy to change in one sense because I think not only do members of this present House but former members and the people generally who

PREMIER PECKFORD: watch through the media, through the papers the operation of this House feel are abused the most and ones which really impair the normal and natural and efficient workings of the House, and hence we have dealt with the question of the length of speaking, the question of Private Members' Day and most importantly - and I think this is the major change in them - is the question of establishing some committees in the House. And for those new members who are present on the backbenches on both sides, let me just say that I remember very distinctly the first day that I entered this hon. Chamber, I guess it was where the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) is now or where the hon. the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) is - I think that was the first seat. I was just barely in the House, just scraped in the House, not only as it relates to the physical location of myself here in this Chamber but also as it relates to the way the people of Green Bay responded at that particular time. It was not an overwhelming victory. But in any case, I was here and for the first week, two weeks, three weeks, a month or several months, it was a strange and weird and wonderful place that I had entered. Not that I was not aware of House proceedings or parliamentary proceedings before - I was - but to be physically there then was a different thing. One can read about it all one likes or see it through the media, but being here is something else. And then going through the first Budget Speech and the first Estimates that were presented, it was a strange and foreign thing to try to review and go through all the numbers and all the subheads and all the rest of it. And it took a couple of years to really get used to it. And the other thing is that I discovered perhaps in the second or third year of that first term certain government programmes that were available that I did not know were available for those two or three years. So I was not able to agitate, lobby for my constituents in the way I should have been able to do for participation in that programme because I had not known it existed. And when the ministers of the government of that day and the more learned gentlemen on the Opposition side stood in their places to debate these various programmes and more particularly to debate the principles of a given department and the kinds of general programmes they were administering, many of these smaller, yet very important programmes

PREMIER PECKFORD: were missed by the backbenches as they were by even the front bench even though the front bench knew all about them. So many members, unless you have some kind of committee system - which this does - and therefore, the backbenchers being fully involved in it, would not have the time really to grapple with and understand the various programmes and know about the various programmes in departments which affect them directly and their constituents directly. And I think besides the committees themselves being established through these amendments, Mr. Speaker, even more important is the desire on the government's part and also on the Opposition's part to place on those committees, backbenchers - no ministers to be chairmen, no ministers to be members of those committees, that it has to be done by the backbenchers on both sides, if you will, in the sense that there are, you know, the Opposition House Leader and other senior members who are not ministers obviously, but who are more familiar with it. And I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition House Leader will see that the newer members of this hon. House on the opposite side really get an opportunity to participate in these committees and therefore get to know a lot more about programmes that are in place and to question ministers about these programmes.

And again, Mr. Speaker, on that point of committees, a third point is simply that as most Newfoundlanders know and most members of this House know, what can very easily happen if you do not have these committees is that the wide-ranging debate on the Estimates becomes the Budget debate. And they are separate, Mr. Speaker, one is general and the principles involved - it is like doing legislation, there is second reading and then there is the Committee of the Whole in which there is a clause by clause. Well, in the same way we must separate the Budget debate as it relates to the overall thrust or lack of it that the government is giving to the Province from the clause by clause, subhead by subhead approach. And by doing that then all of us benefit because all hon. members will get an opportunity to participate in the Budget debate as it relates to what government is or is not doing, and therefore, the Opposition should throw volleys at us on those issues.

PREMIER PECKFORD: But additionally and just as important for all hon. members is to get down to a clause by clause, dollar by dollar examination of the particular subheads in every department so that therefore we are really streamlining and making possible far better use of our time on those two fronts, because now you have both of them, in the last number of years hon. members really only had one and that was that the Budget debate was the Estimates debate. And although the Opposition could

Premier Peckford: criticize the government for not calling the Budget debate, in actual fact the government had a very good point in its retort by saying we have had the Budget debate because that is all that the estimates have been concerned with, the estimate considerations have been concerned with was the debate on the Budget Speech rather than a particular examination of the estimates themselves. And this will ensure that we actually have both and so, therefore, the vulnerability of the House to falling into that trap of just having a Budget debate is far lessened in this particular instance. I think that is very important.

A final point, Mr. Speaker. Simply that we are prepared, as the House Leader has pointed out, to give the Opposition the opportunity in the next session to have a full-scale debate on these rules and on the rules in total to see how they work as we get into it in this session, and we are prepared on any reasonable changes that might come up at that time. And we will establish a committee, a striking committee, I think it is three and two -

MR. MARSHALL: Four and three.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Four and three, four members from this side -

MR. MARSHALL: The striking committee, three and two.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Three and two, yes, right. Three and two, three from this side and two from the Opposition side to examine the other rules that might need some changes and reforms, and, also, at the same time to observe the workings of the committees and the new rules that we will now hopefully pass before this day is out.

So we want to be flexible and reasonable. I think we have demonstrated that to the Leader of the Opposition and to the caucus on the opposite side. And I think this can go down, Mr. Speaker, as a red letter day in the operations of this House. And I agree, of course, with the Opposition House Leader that you can have all of the rule changes you like but if there is not that spirit of

Premier Peckford: co-operation then the rules mean nothing. So that, therefore, we can go so far on changing rules, the rest of it is up to every hon. member to be responsible in their approach to this, to criticize and to support or whatever government on different programmes, but to do it in a spirit of responsibility, and a spirit of construction, in most cases. Sometimes there has to be some destruction as well in order to - you have to get rid of something before you can put something in its place. But if there is that kind of spirit of co-operation yet, attack and opposition, then I think we are on the road to having members in this House in years to come look back on this as a major reform and a major attempt by hon. members to really elevate not only this House but how politics has operated in Newfoundland. And so I am very proud to be associated with these amendments today and trust that hon. members opposite will take them in the spirit that they are meant and we are willing always to participate in other changes and to be fair, and to compromise, and to give and take, to see that all of us together can do a better job on serving the people of this Province.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who just took his seat, Sir, said that the future members of this House will look upon these rule changes as a red-letter day in Newfoundland's history. I would submit, Sir, that they will look upon it and our children's children will look upon it as black Friday, as a sad day for Newfoundland, as the day that the Mussolini type politics came into this Province, where we have arbitrary dictatorial decisions being made by a government that told us only a few weeks ago, a few months ago when the former Premier retired at a big banquet that they had for the hon. gentleman that he had brought democracy to Newfoundland, had brought democracy to Newfoundland, and I will deal with that in a few short minutes, Sir.

Mr. Neary: What I am getting at, Mr. Speaker, is that in every other jurisdiction in the world, every other jurisdiction in the world, in Canada, in Great Britain, in every other part of the British Empire when there are substantive changes made to rules in the Legislature they are made by a Committee of the House and not rammed down the throats of the members by a dictatorial attitude of the Government House Leader.

And how do I know that, Sir? How do I know that? Well, I am not a student of history, I do not know as much about history as my hon. friend, the Opposition House Leader, but I picked up my phone yesterday as any member on any side of this House could have done and I picked three provinces at random. I said I will check to see how our new rule changes coincide with the rules in other provinces of Canada, and the former Speaker will probably realize what I am going to say, the significance of it, and I picked

MR. S. NEARY:

Nova Scotia, Ontario and Saskatchewan.

I said I will call these three provinces, the Clerk of the House or the Speaker of the House or the Deputy Speaker and I will ask certain questions. And the questions that I wanted to put to these people had to do with the revised rule changes in this House. So I called up Nova Scotia and the first question I put to the Clerk in the Province of Nova Scotia: "Do you have a limit," I said, "on the time of debate for the estimates not the Budget Speech now, I am talking about the item by item analysis of the estimates? And the answer from Nova Scotia was: "No, no limit on the time you can discuss or debate the estimates item by item." Ontario - three hundred and twenty-five hours; Saskatchewan - no time limit. I asked the people that I talked to in Nova Scotia if they sent their estimates to committees and the answer was an emphatic no. I asked Ontario. They said they send half the estimates to committees and the other half are done in the Legislature. And in Saskatchewan the answer was no. And what I learned from Saskatchewan was that they had, on a number of occasions, appointed a Select Committee of the House or a Rules Committee to bring in recommendations for the changes of rules in the Legislature of Saskatchewan. And the Rules Committee religiously brought in a recommendation that the estimates be sent to committees and the House has overruled, consistently overruled the Rules Committee and said, "No, this is the healthy way to do it, this is the most democratic way to do it and we are going to continue to do it in the spirit of the British Parliamentary system."

I also asked these three provinces if there was any limit on the time that members were permitted to speak in the Legislature. Nova Scotia - one hour at a time; Ontario - no limit, sky is the limit; Saskatchewan - no time limit. I also raised the matter of unlimited time in these jurisdictions. Nova Scotia did not quite comprehend what I was getting at. The Clerk thought

MR. S. NEARY: there was unlimited time but was not quite sure. In Ontario on second reading of bills and on government motions the sky is the limit, unlimited time, no time limit, no restrictions on members, no regimentation, no trying to suppress debate. And in Saskatchewan all members, I am told, can speak as long as they wish. And as far as private members' resolutions are concerned, in Nova Scotia, private members' resolutions, as my hon. friend knows, run their natural course. And in Ontario, because of the unique situation that you have in Ontario, where you have a minority government, the parties have agreed to put through two private members' resolutions every Thursday. The person who introduces the resolution gets twenty minutes and the person who wants to speak on it gets ten minutes and that is unique to Ontario and unique to Canada.

In Saskatchewan - no limit on the speeches in private members' resolutions and no limits on the amount of time you can take on a resolution.

And, Mr. Speaker, how do they go about making these rule changes when they do have rule changes? Well, in Nova Scotia, they use the Select Committee; in Ontario, they use the Procedural Affairs Committee; and in Saskatchewan, they use the Rules Committee. And so it was suggested to me, Sir, well maybe I should check with some other Provinces of Canada. Well, before the House met today I could not call the Western provinces because of the three and one-half hour time difference and I could not get New Brunswick but I did get Prince Edward Island. In Prince Edward Island no estimates go to committees outside of the House. There is no limit on speeches, no restriction on speeches, all time is unlimited and when they do change the rules they appoint a committee of the House. So that is my first criticism, Sir, of the rule changes and believe me, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, that I hope nobody but

MR. NEARY: nobody, inside or outside of this House will read anything into what I am saying other than I have a genuine concern about these rule changes, about removing the power of the Legislature, about limiting the power of the Legislature by moving it out in the board rooms and out in the dungeons in Confederation Building. That is what I have concern about, Sir. And I hope nobody will read anything into it, that there is a split in the party, that I disagree with the leader, that it is this or it is that, or I am trying to get a headline because that is not so, Sir. Mr. Speaker, if I want to get a headline I know how to get a headline without talking about the changes of the rules of the House. I am the senior member in this House at the present time. I have six general elections under my belt, I have seventeen years in this House, twenty sessions of the House, and I have seen a lot of people come and go and I have seen a lot of changes made, some for the good, some not so good, but this is the worst I have ever seen, Mr. Speaker, and I am all for change, all for it. I am all for changing the rules and I am all for doing things that are in the best interest of the ordinary people of this Province, but this dastardly act, Sir, that we are about to vote on here today is not in the interest of the ordinary people of this Province, contrary to what the Government House Leader said, and not in keeping with the spirit of the British Parliamentary system.

So I hope nobody will read anything into my taking the position that I am taking. I am genuinely concerned about it, Sir. I do not have - as I say, there are people in this House who know more about the British Parliamentary system than I do, I am not a student of history. I like history but hon. gentlemen know that it took the British Parliamentary system hundreds of years to evolve, and the only reason for this Legislature or any other legislature being in existence, the Government House Leader touched on it when he waived the estimates around to members of the House, the only reason is to pass estimates, I do not know if hon. gentlemen are aware of that or not, all the other stuff is incidental. The power of the purse is the

MR. NEARY: main reason for the Legislature being in existence. One time it was the king who collected the revenue and decided how the money was going to be spent. The king decided it.

AN HON. MEMBER: King Brian.

MR. NEARY: King Brian I am reminded by my hon. friend.

MR. ROBERTS: King Charles lost his head.

MR. NEARY: I am coming to that. My hon. friend is a great historian and my hon. friend knows the difference and that is why I was hoping this morning he would give us a great lecture. I would say the only man in the House who knows his history, maybe my hon. friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) might know a little about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not as much as he thinks.

MR. NEARY: Not as much as he thinks. But, Mr. Speaker, the king had the power of the purse. The king controlled the purse strings and eventually the barrons decided that they wanted to get in on the act and the landowners and the next thing parliament sprung up and then they challenged the king. And then King Charles I, I believe it was, was beheaded because he objected to parliament -

MR. ROBERTS: King and martyr.

MR. NEARY: - controlling the purse strings. And so, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen think it is funny. Wars have been fought to protect the British Parliamentary system and many a battle has been fought and over the years we have seen people chipping away at the system, trying to remove the power of the Legislature, take the power out of the hands of the elected representatives and put it in the board rooms, and put it in committees. We have seen that happen over the years, Sir, and we have a classic example now before us. We have the champion of all champions trying to remove the power of this Legislature and put it into the board rooms and into the tunnels, and into the dungeons of Confederation Building and hide it away, bury it, so that information

MR. NEARY: will not get out to the people, so that members of the House cannot do their jobs. The hon. gentleman says, "Oh now they will be able to do their jobs because before - the hon. gentlemen's justification for changing the rules was before only one or two members dominated the House." Mr. Speaker, I submit to Your Honour that that is the grossest insult to members that I have ever heard in my life. The rules do not apply to one or two members of this House, the rules apply equally to everybody. I would submit to, Your Honour, that it is a gross insult to the former Speaker of this House who was one of the finest Speakers that I have seen in the House and probably the best in Canada and what the hon. gentleman is saying was that the Speaker of that day was unable to maintain order in the House which is a lot of nonsense and garbage. It is not true, Sir. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the government of the day stonewalled, refused to give the members information. When estimates were being debated, Mr. Speaker, in this hon. House - and I will give hon. gentlemen who were here a couple of reminders just in case they have forgotten. I remember once my hon. friend who is going out the door and myself decided to filibuster on the Public Works scandal and we did it successfully. We managed to get the government to set up a Royal Commission of Enquiry into the operations of the Public Works Department but, Mr. Speaker, we were not quite so successful on getting a list of all the secret loans that were made from the Rural Development Authority or from the Newfoundland Development Corporation so, therefore, when we came to that subhead we had no choice, Sir, but to dig in. Dig in! We took hours and hours of the seventy-five hours because we had dug in, because the government was stonewalling, because the government was trying to cover up, because the government would not give us the information that we wanted. That subhead could have been dealt with in five minutes. The same way with the helicopter contract, with the renting of office space in the Atlantic Building, with the secret agreement that was made with Mr. Dobbin to put up

MR. NEARY: an office building. And I could go on and on and on, Mr. Speaker, and give the House examples of how the government dug in its heels and were not levelling with the people of this Province and the Opposition in trying to do their job to get the information, which we still do not have by the way, to get the information were accused of being obstructionist and negative. Well, is that the truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker? Does Your Honour know to this day about the scandals out in Labrador Linerboard? Is any member of this House concerned about \$30 or \$40 or \$50 million of taxpayers' money put in offshore accounts in Bermuda and in the Bahamas that should have been paid to Labrador Linerboard? Is anybody concerned about that? We could not get any information on the Labrador Linerboard, Sir. We could not get it and we do not have an accounting to this day. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, that is why. It is not the reason given by the Government House Leader, that members were obstructing, the decorum of the House was gone. The members were doing their job, the system was working but we were not getting the information from the government. And now the hon. gentleman says the observers of the parliamentary process in this Province say that we should have rule changes. Well, who are these mysterious observers of the parliamentary process? Who are they? Tell us who they are. And we need the restoration of parliamentary democracy in this Province. Who is it that restored democracy? Is it the present Premier or is it the one they had the banquet for who told us that he restored democracy to Newfoundland? He headed up the most corrupt government in Newfoundland's history.

MR. S. NEARY:

And the hon. gentleman also told us, 'If you do not take this, if you do not accept this package we will amend the House of Assembly Act and we will shove it through anyway.' That is the spirit of co-operation the hon. gentleman is talking about.

So, Mr. Speaker, my first point is that I object to the procedure that was used in bringing about the changes in these rules and I am all for a change, I strongly object to it and I resent it that the Government House Leader in a dictatorial fashion, in a Hitler-like way -and they can talk all they want about the atmosphere of co-operation. I was sitting here in my seat and I saw the hon. gentleman the other day ready to get on his feet, give notice without the approval of the Opposition and the hon. gentleman will remember what I said to him.

Mr. Speaker, that is the first thing I object to and the second thing I object and I am not against committees, by the way, I am not against the committee system but I do object to moving the Estimates out of the House of Assembly into some subterranean part of Confederation Building. That is what they are doing, Mr. Speaker, and make no bones about it! I cannot question motives but I will tell you, Sir, the way we are going about it now it is going to restrict the activities of members of this Legislature. it is going to muzzle, stifle debate. And as far as I am concerned, reducing the forty-five minutes to thirty minutes is innocuous. I could not care less if it is ten or fifteen minutes but I am concerned about the Estimates. The whole purpose of parliament being in existence is now going to be hidden away, put under wraps so that the information cannot get out to the people, and that is what I am objecting to, Sir.

The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall):
when he introduced these new rules, played up the minor rules, he played them up and deliberately downgraded any reference to the major and substantive changes in these rules that are being made. I submit, Sir,

MR. S. NEARY: that they are not in keeping with the British Parliamentary system, that it is going to stifle debate, it is going to restrict members in their activities, it is going to remove another part of this House, it is going to cut down on the power of the purse which is the biggest whip that the elected representatives of the people have and it is going to be farmed out now to committees.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me show the House the effect of that. The gentleman who said he brought democracy to Newfoundland restricted debate on the Estimates in this House to seventy-five hours, gave us a maximum of seventy-five hours. Now we are going to have that seventy-five hours in the House further reduced by sending fifteen sub-heads to committees which is forty-five hours, three hours for each sub-head. So you deduct that forty-five hours from the seventy-five and then nine hours to debate the reports of the committees when they are brought back to the House. That is another nine hours, that is fifty-four hours plus you take away interim supply debate from the seventy-five and what do you have left, Mr. Speaker, for the House? You have fifteen or twenty hours. And if the government so wishes under these new rules they can send all of the Estimates to committee and shut the House down if they want to. And these committees, I understand, Sir, three committees will meet simultaneously. How is the press going to manage to cover the work of the committees? How is the information going to get out to the people? How will members will be able to attend three meetings that are going on at the same time when they may have an interest in one committee and they are a member of another committee? The whole thing is designed, Mr. Speaker, to limit the information that the people of this Province will get

MR. NEARY: in the future. That is the whole idea behind it. And I want to emphasize again, Sir, for those foolish people who have fallen into the trap of thinking that the decorum of this House, that there was something wrong with it - and we had one gentleman, Sir, who managed to con the Newfoundland people from 1972 up to the last election. And now we see the con job again - and people falling into that trap, that is what sets the devil in me - of saying of the decorum of the House, there is something wrong with it and that is the justification for changing the rules. There was nothing wrong with the decorum of this House except that the government were on the defensive. You had the best Opposition you ever had in the whole history of Newfoundland and I have seen them all, since Confederation. I saw Cashin, Hollett, I worked in this House with the hon. Billy Brown and I worked in this House with Jim Greene and the hon. gentleman, Minister of Finance when he was leading the Opposition, Dr. Murphy - I have seen them all, Sir. And we used to hear in this Province from those ignoramuses who did not know any better, that we had a dictator at that time. Well, did that dictator try to remove the power of the Legislature and put it in the board rooms of Confederation Building? If my hon. friend were sitting in his seat he could tell the members, especially the new members, that that gentleman let nature take its course in this House. The only thing that was wrong with the decorum of the last House, Sir, was that the government dug in and would not give the Opposition the information that they were asking for. And that is what used to cause the delays. And the poor old press up over my head, Sir, who feel they are overworked and underpaid, they used to say - I used to hear it all the time - 'What time are you going to close her down? We are getting fad up with it. What time are you going to get out of here?' and everybody up tight, sensitive to every little word that was put in the newspaper or on radio or on the television about the decorum of the House. 'Somebody made a long-winded speech today.' But they never looked beneath the surface to see why somebody made a long-winded speech. And there are some members who cannot express themselves

MR. NEARY: in thirty minutes. There are some members who need forty-five minutes, who have a lot to say. And there are some members who need several hours to do it. But you should feel free in this House, Sir, you should not be the victim or subjected to regimentation or feel that you are bound down by guillotine rules, that if you speak for a certain length of time the axe is going to fall on your skull. That is not the whole spirit of the British parliamentary system. You have to feel free in this House. Anybody who has ever had the opportunity to visit Westminster, if they are worried about the decorum of this House they should go over to the Mother of Parliament, the one that we pattern ourselves after, that I have no doubt the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) has been in. Well, I was in it several times. I was there when Mr. Wilson was Prime Minister. And hon. gentlemen who are worried, concerned about the decorum of this House, go into the Mother of Parliament and see who are on their feet asking the questions of the ministers and see if you have to get your name down to ask a question, if you have to line up. Go over and take a look at it and see. Most of the questions come from the government side of the House, from private members who are supporting the government. They are all on their feet at the same time and you get that great feeling of freedom and democracy. And then you know why the British parliamentary system works. You know that there is no devious scheme to take the power out of the Legislature and put it down on the Eighth Floor and in the board rooms of this building or even over in the old Colonial Building, as much as I would like to see that used. And if all the members of Westminster, Sir, came into the House of Commons on the same day there would not be room enough for them. I have seen them lying down - they read the newspaper and then they lie down on a bench, put the newspaper over their faces and go to sleep. If you ever did that in this House you would never live it down. You would have 'Sticky-Wicky' and the hot lines going crazy. But that is the truth of the matter, Sir. You have to feel free and you have to have complete freedom. And you can only rely on the newsmen, the news reporters up over my head to give a fair and accurate description and accounting of what goes on in the House. And if they are not getting the message

MR. NEARY: across to the people, that is not our fault down on this floor, we should still do our job. Whether they have their dislikes or whether they have their likes, or whether they are for you or against you, whether they are Tory or Liberal or NDP does not make any difference, we just have to plough on and do our job. God only knows that I am bearing the scars of some of the media in this Province, but I must be doing something right, Mr. Speaker, I have got six elections. And I will be here a long time after a lot of the people who are here now are gone. I will still be here.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I have my -

And so, Sir, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that nobody, as I say, will read the wrong motive into my standing here today and making the kind of a speech that I am making because I have very strong views on these matters. And if I were new members of this House, I would not treat this matter very lightly. I can tell the new members right now that in my opinion this is a move to restrict the activities, their activities in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. gentleman say, "Well, the old rules only gave one or two or gave ministers the opportunity to dominate the House." Well whose fault is that, Sir? When rules are made in the NHL and Bobby Orr happens to come to the surface, or my friend, the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simons) happens to be a shining light in this House, whose fault is that? Is it his fault or is it the fault of the other members of this House who are not doing their homework? When Bobby Orr started to become a star in the NHL did they change the rules to try to restruct him? That is what my hon. friend is saying. When Gordie Howe was in the NHL, did they change the rule because he was dominating the scoring every year? That is what my hon. friend is saying.

Mr. Speaker, if I were the new members of this House I would take a second look at this, take a second look at it. I would not mind it so bad, Sir, but they are permanent.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman would not even do us the courtesy of saying, "Well let them come in and we will try them out for one session." They are permanent and all we can do next year, twelve of us can stand up in this House and say, "Let us have a debate." More wind and vinegar that the hon. gentleman apparently turns up his nose at. Have a debate, that is all we can do, have a debate.

I have a great deal of confidence in the integrity of the new Premier. I kind of like his style. Before the elections the hon. gentleman saw the programme I was on on TV, I wondered to myself on that programme how the hon. gentleman ever became leader of that party, just being an ordinary Newfoundland, because of the stranglehold that the clique had on his party. The hon. gentleman managed to get in there and I complimented him for it publicly on that programme before the election was called, and I have a great deal of respect for the hon. gentleman's integrity. I think he would like to change the style of politics in Newfoundland, would like to do a good job and I have seen evidence of it and I commend the hon. gentleman. I will tell the hon. gentleman where I think he is right, when I feel like it in this House, and I will tell him where I think he is wrong. But I think I should have the time to do it, and not be restricted.

How can you do a job for the people of this Province under these rules in the Legislature? And you were elected to serve in this Legislature and not down in the cafeteria of Confederation Building. This is where the work is done and it should be done with complete exposure to the press whether or not, as I say, they report you accurately or whether they report it at all, or whether you have to get out and stand on your head in the middle of the floor to get reported, That is not our fault. We have to do our job in this House immaterial of what they think or what they say. They are not running the affairs of this Province, we are.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I had more time but my time even in this debate is rather restricted. Here we are

July 20, 1979

Tape No. 182

NM - 3

MR. NEARY: bringing in substantive rule changes in
this hon. House and we do it in one day, a couple of hours.

Mr. Nearv: We should be taking a week to debate these substantive rule changes. We are ramming them through as fast as we can hoping that the people of Newfoundland will not notice what is going on.

Well, Sir, I hope the few words that I have said this morning, that the message will get through. And I want to say this again before I sit down, I am not against reform or changes, Sir. And I hope the hon. gentleman now does not get up and say, Oh, there he is, he dominated the House, now he is against restricting the time to thirty minutes and twenty minutes. Well, it is no such thing, Sir. That is not true! And if the hon. gentleman says it, he is just being hypocritical. Because I am all for changes, I am all for reform that will help the ordinary people of this Province. But I am very concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the way the estimates are being treated. The whole purpose of Parliament being set up in the first place, the whole spirit of our British Parliamentary system is now being sloughed off to the Board Rooms and to the offices of Confederation Building, and I think this is wrong, Sir. And I agree with Saskatchewan that every time rule changes of this nature are brought into the House it is incumbent upon every elected member to get up and say, No, no, no we are not going to cut down the authority or the power of the Legislature. Let us have everything out in this House. Let the committees go on and meet, let them scrutinize the estimates, but let us have all the time we want in this House so that we can feel free and comfortable in debating these matters and getting information out to the people of this Province.

As I say, Sir, I wish I had more time. I know there are other people who want to speak. But I would ask members to take a second look at these rule changes because as I said in the beginning, this is a black Friday for the people of this Province.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I just heard and been tremendously impressed by what I think was a most sincere expression of views by what has been called the, by him and by others, veteran of this House, and I think that we as members, and I hope the public, will take to heart some of the things that he said. In many respects he reflected in his usual frank and open way very deep genuine concerns that we on this side of the House feel about changes in the rules. I say that in particular because he is quite right in saying that, in fact, a procedure that we would have much preferred and to which I made reference on opening day, was that we acknowledge the necessity for reform and that this be made the subject of some review by committee.

The government chose not to do that. There is a certain procedure, I suppose, that we in the Opposition could have adopted, and I suppose we could have, as the old expression goes, hung her down, because as the Government House Leader has said, this government, at least, has no power on its own to change these rules. The question therefore arises, why would I, in particular, as the Leader of this party and my colleague the House Leader, why would we accept and agree? And why did we co-operate in the manner to which the Premier and the House Leader have referred? And which, of course, is indeed a matter of record.

I can put it in two words, Sir, and I want them inscribed on the minds of every member opposite and those two words are "Good faith". I decided and the majority of my colleagues, many of whom, by the way, had to leave this morning in order to catch airplanes because of this being Friday, but I can speak for the majority of them, concluded that we ought to begin from the assumption that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) despite his long experience, and despite his deep concerns, is perhaps not giving to hon. members opposite, and particularly I say to the Premier

July 20, 1979

Tape 183

PK - 3

Mr. Jamieson: and to the House Leader, enough credit for being genuine in this effort.

So I make two points and I do not propose

MR. JAMIESON: to have this debate, at least insofar as I am concerned, go on very long. On the specifics the House Leader and the Government House Leader, also, made the detailed points but I say this to you, that if one year from now, or whenever the next session occurs, it is apparent and I and others will make sure that it is apparent, should this turn out to be the case, that some of the worst fears of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) are realized, that I can assure you that as long as I am leader of this party, the people of this Province will be made very, very well aware of it and they will be made aware of it on a consistent basis. But I am not beginning from that proposition, I am beginning from the genuine negotiating position which we have undertaken and which assumes that the government is genuine in its stated objective of wanting to get out more information. Now this business of the committees, Mr. Speaker, is, of course, a very serious one. There is no question in my mind that over the next session, the remainder of this session, I do not care who the draftsmen were of these rule changes, I do not care how much negotiation there was between various members on each side, each party, the government and the Opposition, is going to find that you cannot at this moment in time, or at any given moment in time, put down on tablets of stone a set of rules and regulations that are going to be totally effective in every circumstance.

Now the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the hon. member who is the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Roberts) both have said the same thing, that they are men of experience in this House. I too can lay claim along with the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and these others to being a parliamentarian and having had a long experience let me say this to you, and the member for LaPoile knows it very well, anyone who is an authority will tell you in the government that you cannot write a set of rules that the Opposition cannot stymie if it chooses to do so. We do not intend to take that position. The other point that is basic is consultation, simply because a rule says something is no

MR. JAMIESON: reason why by leave we cannot change it. And I would hope that we will not see situations in this House where if a member is genuinely expressing something of very great significance to him that we will not find some person refusing him the common courtesy of every decent parliament in the world to let him carry on beyond his allotted time. There is no good reason.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: And I repeat to you that if that turns out to be the case, not only will I be solidly with the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in drawing this to the attention of the public but I am sure that every member of this caucus will be equally the same way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: Now on the question of estimates. The rule says, as my friend has pointed out, and again I share his concern, that technically speaking, strictly speaking, all three committees can meet at the same time. On the other hand, again common accepted Parliamentary procedure is by negotiation. It is decency. If there is a man who has a particular interest in two subjects, then surely goodness, if this system is going to work, house leaders or chairmen of committees or whoever, Mr. Speaker, will be able, in the interest of getting the exposure which the hon. members say they wish of the facts, to adjust matters. Once again if that does not happen, if we see the worst, which is what my hon. friend from LaPoile sees, then I can assure you that it is still open to any Opposition, including this one, to make the government's life very, very miserable. But I want to end on one point which I think is more important than any other and that is this, that it is the public of Newfoundland that we ought to be concerned about and, therefore, when ministers come to these committees let them come prepared to give answers, let them come prepared to be specific, let them come prepared to answer critics who I will hope, and I will indeed try to assure on this side, are as knowledgeable as they are on the subject. That is the whole idea, surely, behind this kind of an arrangement.

July 20, 1979

Tape No. 184

NM - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON:

And if again we find that we wind up
in a situation where it is a pure simple waste of time, like my friend
I do not particularly care about time limits and the like,

MR. JAMIESON: because usually, if you do your homework, you can handle the matter in a shorter period of time than a longer one. All I repeat here is that the job, believe me, of this Opposition is to see that the public gets dealt with properly and gets the information. Now there is a worry which I will not expand upon at this point as to whether or not the government has prepared itself in all respects in terms of adequate, official reporting of these proceedings, adequate staffing and sundry things of this sort. We are moving into something quite new. Our caucus, including the member for Lapolla, have said we have no quarrel with the idea of referring estimates but we must surely have right now consultation on how this is going to be structured and put together. There must be co-operation. If we, in the committee, say that we want the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) on Wednesday morning at 10:00 o'clock and it is inconvenient for him to be there, what does he want us to do, to go public and say he would not show up before the committee. Or is the sensible, decent, gentlemanly thing to do to say, "Well, look I have this kind of a commitment. It is difficult for me to get out of. Can we readjust?" That is the way in which I view this process. Now, I also review it in one other way, and that is -

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Administrator has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. JAMIESON: (Inaudible) in two minutes I can conclude.

MR. SPEAKER: Then we will allow the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to clue up his remarks and then we will admit the Administrator. By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave, yes.

MR. JAMIESON: I only wish to say one final thing and that is that I understand that the House Leader is prepared to establish and make effective, I am not sure what the official name of the committee is, the -

MR. ROBERTS: Standing Orders Committee.

MR. JAMIESON: Standing Orders Committee,

AN HON. MEMBER: The Striking Committee.

MR. JAMIESON: The Striking Committee plus the Standing Committee to review,

MR. JAMIESON: and then I hope that that committee will meet in a co-operative attitude and, as this process moves along, if there are serious difficulties I will be among the first to bring them to the attention of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Admit His Honour the Administrator.

May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of the Province has at its present session passed certain bills to which in the name and on behalf of the General Assembly I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Unified Family Court Act." (Bill No. 2)

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Adoption Of Children Act, 1972." (Bill No. 3)

HON. R.S.FURLONG(Administrator): In Her Majesty's name, I assent to these bills.

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

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I just have a couple of brief comments to make on the rules. Now, the first point is that regardless of what goes into the rules, it is the spirit within which hon. members of both sides of the House observe them that will be important, and on this point I would like right from the beginning just to show at least my good faith - express an apology to the hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) for a comment which, on looking back at Hansard, he might have taken in a personal vein. In the course of a speech I was making on an earlier occasion, the hon. member with certain comments began to interrupt and something slipped out that was not intended, would have not happened, will not hopefully happen again. However, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that my standing today on this basis is not because of certain subsequent remarks made by the hon. member in unfortunately what I understand to be a concerted plan by hon. members opposite to attempt, and I say this in a genuine request that the hon. member for White Bay -

MR. ROBERTS: The Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. BARRY: - sorry, the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts). I am several years out of date here - reconsider if this is a strategy which he has decided that might be effective in terms of developing then a concentrated or concerted effort if there is a slip on this side of the House to reply in kind. I am not saying that there is, but I have gotten the impression that because of a comment I made the previous day and because of certain subsequent remarks this morning.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) privilege.

MR. BARRY: No, I am just giving this as an example and the hon. member was out of the House when I made the statement that, "whatever the rules, it is the spirit within which they will be observed". I made an apology to the hon. member opposite because, on looking at Hansard, I saw -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) - members

MR. BARRY: No, I am just giving that as an example, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member could let me continue, an example of how,

MR. BARRY: whatever the rule, if the spirit of the rules is not followed, there can be problems. All I am asking the hon. member opposite if that might be a strategy.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, it is.

MR. BARRY: Well, it would not work, Mr. Speaker, because we have nothing to hide on this side of the House, clean as a hound's tooth, I believe is the ordinary expression. We will not be intimidated or browbeaten, but I believe we will honestly seek to follow the spirit of the new rules which have been reached by agreement.

Just one subsequent point. As far as the rules -

MR. NEARY: I would like to thank the hon. gentleman. Maybe I should turn the other cheek.

MR. BARRY: The hon. member says, "Quits welcome". The second point is that as far as time is concerned, myself and the hon. member of St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) have had the opportunity to observe the American Houses of Congress in session several months ago on a private meeting, nothing to do with the house -

MR. ROBERTS: Not courtesy of the government?

MR. BARRY: Not courtesy of the government, but we saw there an amazing thing where, I am not sure if this is in all parts of the house or in all sessions, a five-minute speaking rule, and I am telling you the debate was impressive. An hon. member would get up and he would speak for five minutes. Obviously, he would have to be concise. As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, it can be done if you put attention to your remarks. But if he did not happen to finish in his five minutes he would say, "Another minute by leave", and by leave he would go on and within a very brief period of time finish off his remarks. But the debate flowed. There was a lot of information in a very short time and there was good, incisive, hard-hitting debate, so I think that this is what is being striven for in these rules, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition and another member opposite on the Budget Speech,

July 20, 1979

Tape No. 186

GH-3

MR. BARRY:

I understand, would have unlimited
time in the event that there was a matter of serious importance

MR. BARRY:

that the public attention or consciousness has to be grasped by taking a long time. But a problem we have seen in the House in recent years, I believe, is that wolf has been cried too often and that there have been lengthy speeches on both sides of the House that after a while lose their impact because every speech is a lengthy speech and the public loses -

AN HON. MEMBER: Halifax (inaudible).

MR. BARRY: Whatever. Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, I will close this off just by, as I say, expressing my commitment to abide not just by the letter but the spirit of the rules as I am sure all hon. members on both sides will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Hon. President of the Council. If the hon. President speaks he now closes the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the time of the House to any great extent because I think just about everything that could be said has been said but I would like to highlight, note or comment on a few observations that were made. The hon. the Opposition House Leader indicated that - and I think it is very true - that these rules, it is not the rules themselves but it is the spirit and intent of these rules which count. From the government's point of view we can certainly say that our intent has been right from the first a sincere intent on the part of the government to make this House of Assembly more meaningful for members, more meaningful particularly for private members of the House to get them more involved in the legislative process as they were elected to do. And it is really, as I say, a sincere intent on the part of a government to improve matters and to improve the method of carrying on the public business.

As for the spirit, I think that these rules have gotten off on a real good footing. The spirit of the House, I think, is indicative of it and again I want to express the appreciation of the government to the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition for what I consider

MR. MARSHALL:

to be a very positive move in these early days in the leadership of our colleagues on the other side of the House. It has really been appreciated and I think that these two combinations together show, initially, the spirit and intent. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, You cannot write rules on tablets and there is no intention of it. You cannot write them down and, you know, this is the Holy Writ forever and a day. There will have to be a certain amount of give and take. But I can assure all members of this House that the purpose of these rules is purely and simply, as I say, to make the House more effective and government will do everything it possibly can to see that the committees co-operate in the best manner possible to bring about the positive changes which we have brought here.

As for the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I say to the member for LaPoile, Mr. Speaker, that there are one of two observations I am going to deal with that he did make. But, as I say, I fully appreciate that the views that the member for LaPoile had are obviously honestly held and firmly entrenched in him. I am not going to draw issue with him or get into a debate one way or the other. Reasonable men presumably can differ in their approaches to various measures. But I would like to draw attention to just a couple of things he said. I do not wish to prolong the debate but I think that they should not remain unanswered. His impression is that the government is trying to hide information. Not so. It is the government's real determination to disseminate information of the government to the public in the widest manner possible. We have observed the way in which the estimates have been dealt with - as I say, I will not go into the reasons for it - in the past few years. It has been certainly unsatisfactory.

We have a situation in this Province right now where nobody with any reasonable knowledge of the situation could say that we are not in anything other than a financial situation that requires a great deal of scrutiny and public awareness in order for us to be able to get ourselves out of this particular situation. What we are doing in these committees as well as involving all the members of the House

MR. MARSHALL:

is to assure that there is a more rational and reasonable investigation into the estimates and thus a greater dissemination of public information.

On the committees, all I can say with respect to committees is that the committees are the yardsticks in recent years of the democratic process. They are used in every legislative assembly. They were not used in this assembly. They have not been to any great degree and we are determined to bring them about.

MR. ROBERTS: What committees?

MR. MARSHALL: Legislative committees.

MR. JAMIESON: As well as estimates?

MR. MARSHALL: As well as estimates. We are determined, as we will see as we go on, to bring the Committee system in in a much more meaningful and rational basis in the House itself.

As to the time for speaking

MR. MARSHALL: speaking now, I have to say this, and I cannot let this go unanswered because I do not know whom the hon. gentleman was speaking to in Ontario, for example, but you see the fact of the matter is we all cherish British institutions but British institutions grew up some 400 years ago and just as there are changes in our society now, all over there have to be changes in our legislative society. If we are going to adhere to what they did four centuries ago, we are going to be in a very stultified situation that we cannot afford to be. All legislative arms of government have moved in recent years to try to make their proceedings more effective. He referred to the legislature in Ontario. As I say, I have no doubt that he got that answer, but I do not know to whom he was speaking at the time because I quote from Standing Order 64(3) of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario Standing Orders in which it says, "Time for debate shall be allotted to parties in rotation with the mover having up to twenty minutes and other speakers up to ten minutes, except as required to give effect to clause (j) which relates, I believe, to non-confidence motions and what have you. So all legislatures, and I could give a dialogue of all of the legislatures here, they all show time constraints of one degree and another. And, as I say, it is not the purpose in this House of this government in bringing in these rules and let not anybody be so shallow and superficial to comment on it that, as far as the government is doing, it is limiting debate. What government is trying to do is enhance the House of Assembly and raise it in public esteem to the place where it really ought to be.

In closing, as I move the adoption with a great deal of pride, not these alterations but what we genuinely feel to be significant reforms to the legislative process of this Province in accordance with the commitment given to the people of this Province, I would like to thank very much again the Opposition for their co-operation. I think this is a harbinger of things to come and I look forward, as we all do, to working with the Opposition in this Assembly to the betterment of the people of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms)

Order, please! There are two points here that I should make. One is that, as hon. members are aware, changes to the Standing Orders require a two-third majority vote so we will, therefore, have a division. The second point is that will obviously take us some time so, therefore, is it agreed that the clock be stopped?

MR. ROBERTS:

Well, technically we can stop the clock. I will not quarrel with Your Honour that we need a division. I am not sure we do. In any event, it is not two-thirds, it is 35. It is not two-thirds of those present voting. You will need 35 to vote in favour, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes. So is it agreed that we stop the clock then and have the division? Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a Point of Order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

I must confess that this is perhaps my own oversight and I was not aware in these rules about the necessity for this. What I am concerned about and I am sure hon. members can appreciate is that, as I mentioned in my remarks, a number of our members who are from out of town had to catch an airplane I believe it was at a quarter to twelve and I hope it will be on the record that it is not their absence that indicates any lack of enthusiasm.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, we appreciate that and understand it and I think we all have a number of members in the same category and I am sure that they would like me to express on their behalf as well the same kind of sentiments the Leader of the Opposition just expressed on behalf of his members.

MR. SPEAKER:

On the Point of Order I think it has resolved itself. We will, therefore, have division. Call in the members.

MR. ROBERTS:

We do not need to wait, do we?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

DIVISION

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) The Motion is as it appears on the order paper, Motion No. 4. Those in favour of the Motion, please rise: The hon. the Premier (Mr. Peckford), the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter), the hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mrs. Newhook), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Windsor), the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins), the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. House), Mr. Doyle, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Butt, Mr. Collins, Mr. Barrett, Mr. John Carter, Dr. Twomey, Mr. Dawe, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Aylward, Mr. Woodrow, Dr. McNicholas, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Baird, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson), Mr. Fred Rowe, Mr. Lush, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Rideout, Mr. Hollett, Mr. Stirling, Mr. Hiscock, Mr. Bennett.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) Thirty-eight members for, none against. I declare the motion carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, just before moving the motion of adjournment, I presume I have the consent of the hon. members opposite to move the Striking Committee. Pursuant to Standing Order 84(a), Mr. Speaker, there has to be a committee appointed to report to the House on the standing committees of the House and I

MR. MARSHALL:

move that the following constitute the members of the Committee: the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), the hon. the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush).

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): It has been moved and seconded that the Committee be struck. Those in favour say "Aye". Those contrary, "Nay". Carried.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at three o'clock and that this House do now adjourn. Before putting the motion, Mr. Speaker, I may indicate that on Monday we expect to go again with the Address in Reply but next week we intend to get into the Committees as soon as the striking committee and we can agree with the Opposition as to the personnel. We intend to get into the Committees on the estimates as soon as we possibly can, as soon as the facilities can be set up for it.

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