



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 36

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House Met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. ANTHONY MURPHY: (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker I would like to rise on a point of Personal Privilege, and that is with reference to a heading appearing in this morning's Daily News, and I think it rather misleads the public. The headline says, "Murphy wants bigger salaries for MHA's." I think that is quite different from what I spoke on last night. And I think it is misleading, I have had several calls that were not too affectionate this morning to me. And they say it is bad enough for Ottawa to be looking for more money, but when you little guys down here want more, and I would like to bring it to the attention of the House and ask the Daily News if they would kindly check through the notes they made, if they made any at that time while I was speaking, perhaps they might set the headline in its proper setting.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD: (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend a very cordially word of welcome to some twenty-five extremely beautiful intelligent, attractive, pleasant, young ladies, twenty-five of them in Grade XI at Holy Heart of Mary Regional High School in charge of Sister Carmelia O'Brien. I do not know if we had such beautiful visitors in this Chamber, more beautiful this present session. As they are Grade XI they look to me wonderfully young for Grade XI, but Grade XI is what I am told. They are awfully well advanced, if they are Grade XI as bright and intelligent and good looking, and they are wonderfully welcome here, we are very happy to have them visit us this afternoon. And I would like to say also in behalf of the House, and in behalf especially of the Minister of Education, my colleague, warmly we welcome some twelve students of the College of Trades and Technology, I do not know where they are, oh! yes, I see them, taking the course in secretarial science. And they are in charge of one of these teachers, Mrs. Hounsell. And we are doublely lucky today to have visitors consisting in the galleries of all ladies. All good looking all beautiful, all intelligent and all very welcome here in the House.

And I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition is straining there

MR. SMALLWOOD: to get up, he is just waiting impatiently for me to sit down so he can get up and agree with me. He loves every opportunity he can get to get up in the House and express his agreements with me. He hates to find himself in disagreement, and every day I give him a chance to show how much he agrees with me, when I say how welcome these students are in our House.

I would like to say also, that we in the Government and I would hope everyone in the House expresses a word of cordially welcome to Mr. Fisher and to Mr. Dickson of the great Financial House of Ames and Company of Toronto and Montreal and other cities in Canada. Ames and Company being the managers of the Newfoundland Syndicate that handles our external financing, places our bonds, and sees that our credit is guarded and protected, and kept fresh and well respected in the money markets of the world. They have done an excellent job indeed in the last four or five years, representing the Government and I hope, and expect that they will continue to do that for many years to come.

They like the ministers in the Government always wince a little bit, when they hear rouse and rude hints that our financial position is not good. They more than anyone have to be aware of the reactions in the feelings and the impressions of the money people of the world who have to subscribe to our bonds.

I am very happy to express of a word of cordially welcome to them here today, and I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition will re-echo my words in that respect too, because we are all one Province, we are all one people, we are trying to advance, we are trying to develop, we are trying to improve, we will make mistakes in doing that. But we have not got the money ourselves to pay for it. We have to borrow it from the money people of the world and the people who handle the that, for us, they are terribly important people. And I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will join with me in expressing a word of cordially welcome to them.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker it gives me very great pleasure indeed to join with the Premier in welcoming the student from Holy Heart of Mary, and from the

Mr. Murphy: College of Trades and Technology. I particularly noted the remarks of the Premier with reference to the Holy Heart of Mary students, they were beautiful, they look so young, and so intelligent, but there is reason for that, because this beautiful school lies in perhaps the greatest district in the Province, that of St. John's Centre. I think that is self-explanatory, the Premier should have known that.

With reference to the College of Trades and Technology, I too am very happy to welcome these students here, perhaps they should get their basic training here in this House, of just what is happening in the Province and how the affairs of the Province are being run. And I trust that their stay will be enjoyable. And perhaps what is more important educational.

With regards to our two distinguished guests in the visitors gallery, Mr. Fisher and Mr. Dickson representing Ames and Company. I am very happy too, to welcome them because I feel in the very near future we might have a much closer liaison with these gentlemen. Because things change, and it may be the wish of the new government perhaps to carry on dealing with the same company or perhaps there might be a change. But I would say to these gentleman that it should become known to the present Opposition and it is not too far in the future government of the Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman ought to remember the great saying that, "the more things change, the more they are the same."

MR. MURPHY: I have not heard that one, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. MURPHY: I will think that out when I go back in Common Room.

But, Mr. Speaker, quite sincerely I really appreciate the presence of these, particularly the younger people in the House, and as far as Mr. Fisher and Dickson are concerned I am sure that their contribution to our Province is as great as the Premier said, it is shared by all of us. Because after all, if we lose our creditability, we have lost it all. And to say that we are happy to see them, I think it is very true, and we are all very happy and, particularly the younger people, and I would urge more younger people to attend the House, and particularly those young teenagers who are not

MR. MURPHY: in school, perhaps the evening session are here. And they should come along and see just what is happening in the people's House.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker,

MR. JOHN C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I, too would like to welcome the Holy Heart of Mary students and the College of Trades and Technology students. And I notice the hon. Premier's remarks these are extremely a beautiful delegation, we are not lucky enough on this side to be able to see the visitors that this delegation is sitting on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You do not deserve it that is why, you do not deserve it.

MR. CROSBIE: Well this is one of the punishments we get Mr. Speaker for disagreeing with some policies of Government. But one thing that we can agree with the Premier on, we all appreciate beauty. And as my wife often reminds me, you know that you are getting old, when you think that the policemen look very young. And in this case, I found also Mr. Speaker, that the policemen seem to be getting younger everyday. I do not know if the hon. the Premier has ever noticed that. Of course, he seems never to get any older.

But, we welcome both these groups to the House, and we hope that they will find it interesting. We also on behalf of the Independent Liberals like to welcome the representatives of Ames and Company. We are sure if they come back again while the estimates are being discussed, they will have their eyes opened and will even go out ^{with} greater diligence to borrow the sums of money that are needed to keep Government expanding and functioning in Newfoundland.

In any event we hope that they had a good visit, and that they will keep on with their good work in the bond markets of the world, Germany and France and Euro dollars. We have not loans floated in Bulgarian money yet, or Hungarian or Russian. But there is no reason why we should not even borrow over there Mr. Speaker, if we need to. There is no market we should not look too.

In any event Mr. Speaker we are glad to have to welcome all these visitors today and we hope they will enjoy the next few minutes.

HON. WILLIAM N. ROWE: (MINISTER OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement concerning the DREE Program as it effects Newfoundland. Before doing Sir I might say it is not the statement which I

MR. ROWE, W.N.) had hoped or intended to make concerning this subject at this time.

Mr. Speaker immediately upon the establishment of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, (DREE) in the early summer of last year, this Government began work to enable our Province to avail itself of the benefits of the new Federal Program. The staff of the Department of Community and Social Development has devoted full time to that work since last summer. And every senior official of this Government has worked strenuously during that period on the necessary planning. In addition, this Government had previously entered into contract with a group of consultant specialists to help us prepare a one year program for Newfoundland and Labrador pending agreement on the main five year DREE Program.

All of this work was done in close co-operation with the Minister of DREE, and his officials. As a result of these efforts it became possible for the one year development plan to be submitted by DREE to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in November of last year, for this Government's formal approval. On December 5th, 1969 I communicated to the hon. Mr. Marchand the substantial agreement of this Government to DREE's one year Newfoundland Development Program, at least as far, as that program went. Shortly, thereafter several remaining details were resolved in order that the program could be submitted to the Federal Treasury Board, and Cabinet before last Christmas, in accordance with the stated intention of DREE officials.

Unfortunately the program was not so significant at that time. We were informed by DREE officials that other provinces were somewhat behind in their planning and that DREE staff which had been assigned to Newfoundland planning had been assigned to work with other provinces to assist them in bringing their plan to a state of readiness. Thus neither the Newfoundland program nor a DREE Program for any other province was submitted to the Federal Treasury Board until relatively recently. No one program Mr. Speaker for any province has yet been approved by the Canadian Government.

Although it has been firmly intended by this Government and by DREE that the Newfoundland agreements would be signed before the beginning of April of this year, this month, the House will recall that I was forced to

MR. ROWE: W.N.: announce when that time came, the beginning of this month, that I had been advised by the Deputy Minister of DREE that it would be the middle of this month before the schedule of projects could be passed by Treasury Board and the Federal Cabinet. I was assured by DREE at that time that there would be no difficulty encountered in having the agreement ready for signature by the middle of this month.

Yesterday, Sir, April 14th. I was in touch with Mr. Thomas Kent, the Deputy Minister of DREE, and was extremely disappointed to be informed by that gentleman, that there would be a further delay of approximately a week to ten days before the schedule of projects for Newfoundland and the other provinces will be passed through Federal Treasury Board. Mr. Kent declared to me that the delay could only be attributed to the fact that since the DREE Program was a new program for the Government of Canada the staff of the Federal Treasury Board was scrutinizing and questioning, usually on technical grounds, the proposed projects for all the provinces including, of course, this Province.

Since the DREE Program is entirely new, Treasury Board staff are exceedingly anxious to make certain that each and every project proposed by DREE to them is strictly in accord with the requirements of the DREE Act, and regulations.

For my own part, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel safe in spite of Mr. Kent's assurance that the agreement will be ready for signatures within a week or ten days in making a firm commitment to the hon. members of this House as to when the agreement will be signed. I do expect, however, that it will be signed well before the end of this month. It suffices to say that as far as the Newfoundland Government is concerned, we are ready to sign the agreement as soon as it is presented to us for that purpose. And we have been ready to do just that for several months passed. We cannot but regret the fact that the program for this Province is delayed while projects of some of the other provinces are still being considered.

In the meantime, as I mentioned a week or two ago, outside this hon. House, I have already entered into a preliminary work agreement with the

MR. ROWE: W.N.: Government of Canada in order to make certain that none of the actual projects themselves is delayed. What is delayed is the formal signing of the agreement. The irritating features of not having signed as yet the actual one year agreement is that it is not possible to disclose to the members of this House, and the people of Newfoundland the full details of this year's DREE Development Program at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have copies of this statement for each hon. member and for the press.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

HON. STEPHEN A. NEARY: (MINISTER OF WELFARE): Mr. Speaker, before you get on to Presenting Petitions, I have a very important statement to make regarding the payment of short term assistance. Following the successful completion of a six month trial period on Fogo Island, the Government have decided that the payment of social assistance to those requiring short term help will be made by checks throughout the entire Province.

For years those who needed assistance from our department to tie them over between employment emergencies had been forced into a sort of economic second class citizenship. To have to stand in line with a food order in hand in stead of being able to pay for supplies in the ordinary, one has proved it a pretty harrowing experience for many temporarily forced into unemployment.

We have also had complaints from time to time from merchants about delays in of accounts owed them by our department. And also from our own people about the onerous job of checking vouchers issued against invoices.

The Fogo Island trial period has resulted in complete approval for the issuance of cheques in stead of vouchers to applicants for short term assistance. Clients, merchants and our accounting people all are unanimous in praise. Unanimous with the exception of one merchant, who complained that now that the welfare recipients are able to shop around for better value for their dollar, his business was being a bit hurt a little. The cash payment procedure will be phased in five distinct steps. Commencing May 1st. 1970 recipients of short term assistance will be paid by cheque in several Avalon Peninsula communities, Bay Bulls, Bay Roberts,

MR. CHALKER: these are welfare districts.....

MR. NEARY: They are not necessarily welfare districts, but we try to stick pretty close to district, Fermuses, Harbour Grace, Heart's Content, Long Pond, Placentia, St. Mary's, and Whitbourne. On June 1st. those on temporary assistance in Baie Verte, Bonne Bay, Englee, Flower's Cove, Hampten, LaScie, Lewisporte, Milltown, Port Saunders, St. Anthony, Springdale, and Twillingate will receive welfare aid in cash. July 1st. the method of payment will be changed for Arnold's Cove, Bay L'Argent, Bonavista, Clarendville, Gander, Glovertown, Grand Bank, Harbour Breton, Marystown, and Welseyville.

change over to the nondiscriminatory, more efficient system on August 1st., will take place for Burgeo, Cartwright, Channel, Fogo, Mary's Harbour, Stephenville, Stephenville Crossing and Wabush. The last to have the new method of payment introduced will be Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Happy Valley and St. John's. In the meantime, the field staff of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, in each of the districts concerned, will received instruction at special conferences held prior to the introduction of the change over in their areas to make certain that all have full advantage of the period of testing on Fogo Island so that there will be a minimal chance for difficulties to interrupt the smooth introduction of the improved channeling of assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I have copies for all members of the House and the press.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SMALLWOOD (W.R.): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the voters of Long Island. Mr. Speaker, this petition is supported by all the voters in Lushes Bight, Beaumont Centre, south and north.

The prayer of the petition, Sir, is for the construction of a high school to teach Grade IX, X and XI. At present, Mr. Speaker, all students in Grade IX, X and XI have to leave Long Island to receive their education. I strongly support the prayer of this petition and ask that it be received by the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates. Carried.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker in answer to Question no. 298, asked by the hon. member for Gander. The answer to the first part of the first part is: "\$397." The second part of the first part: "Nil." The answer to the second part is first: "September 3, 1968 to September 4, 1968, Corner Brook, St. Georges, Stephenville, \$46.00." The second part: "December

10th., 15th. inclusive, 1968, Montreal and Toronto, \$351."

The answer to Question no. 327 on the Order Paper of April 9th., in the name of the hon. member for Burin. The answer is, "No."

Question no. 430, Order Paper of April 15th., in the name of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, St. John's Centre. The answer is, "The latter." Can the Minister tell the House if the proposed wharf construction at Come-by-Chance costing \$16,000⁰⁰⁰ I do not accept his description of the cost, is to be paid for by the contribution of five per cent of the profits of Newfoundland Refining Co. Ltd., or by a docking charge against shipping using the facility? My answer is that: "It is the latter."

MR. CROSBIE: Did the hon. Premier say whether it would be five percent of the profits of Provincial Refining Co. Ltd. or any of the crown corporations involved?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said it would be the latter. So the former does not arise.

HON. WILLIAM R. CALLAHAN (Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources) Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to a number of questions. I might say, Sir, in respect of Question no. 199, on the Order Paper of Monday, March 9th. standing in the name of the hon. the member for Gander and in respect of Question no. 203 on the Order Paper of the same day standing in the name of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, both questions dealing with Government aircraft. In view of the fact that since the 1st of April, Government aircraft are, as I think the House knows, in the control of my colleague the Minister of Supply and Services. It might be best if these questions were redirected.

Question no. 213 on the Order Paper of March 10th. standing in the name of the hon. member for Bonavista North which is in nine parts. The first parts asks the number of acres of Crown Land granted or leased by the Government since April 1st., 1969. The acres granted, 1,128. The

number of acres leased for the same period, 2,275 acres. The second part of the question, Mr. Speaker, asks: the number of miles of access roads constructed by the department since April 1st., 1969? I assume the hon. gentleman refers to forest access roads for woodcutting purposes. The answer is 17½ miles of new road and 12½ miles of road reconstructed, for a total of 30 miles. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that these road building projects which cost in the vicinity of about \$100,000 last year actually made possible the employment of some 3,000 men in various facets of the woods' industry, principally in small job or pulp wood operations and in small sawmilling operations. The third part of the question, the trial acreage of pasture lands developed since April 1st., 1969? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that there was no trial acreage of pasture lands developed, that the experimental bog land program to which I assume the hon. gentleman refers is no longer a trial or experimental program as of the year before last and that indeed as of last year, when the Crown Lands Act was amended, it was possible for the first time to lease, for farmers to lease bog lands for agricultural development. We consider that the trial period is over. We have learned all we can learn by trail and experimentation and, therefore, there was no trial acreage developed in 1969. On the other hand, the hon. gentleman might be interested in figures in respect of community pastures which are developed not for trial purposes but for actual use and the acreages are 1,505 acres improved of community pastures in 1969 and 16,530 acres fenced in respect of community pastures. The figures are 1505 improved and 16,530 fenced.

The fourth part of the question, where was blueberry development carried out during the fiscal year ending March 31st., 1970 and the amount expended to date? I assume that means, Mr. Speaker, during that particular fiscal year. The answer is that in Conception Bay the area burned 1650 acres, roads and trails rebuilt or repaired 63 miles. The expenditure \$11,422.87. - 1650 acres burned and 63 miles of roads and trails repaired or rebuilt and

the total expenditure \$11,422.87.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What does that come to on the average per acre?

MR. CALLAHAN: Well 1600 acres, I would think, something less than \$100 an acre.

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$11,000 for 1600 acres.

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The blueberry roads?

MR. CALLAHAN: That is correct.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Very good.

MR. CALLAHAN: Now in Trinity Bay ...

MR. SMALLWOOD: With an investment, the Government could make it almost any natural resource in this Province.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is right, Mr. Speaker. It is only one part and there are four other areas that I would like to mention.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You mean more expenditure.

MR. CALLAHAN: More expenditure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On the same area.

MR. CALLAHAN: More burning. Trinity Bay, Bonavista Bay and others.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, I see, yes.

MR. CALLAHAN: In Trinity Bay Mr. Speaker, the area burned was thirty acres, roads and trails eighteen miles and the expenditure \$3,201.72. In Bonavista Bay, burned; 350 acres, roads and trails, four miles; total expenditure \$1,718.98. And other areas burned, 300 acres. Roads and trails, two miles, expenditure, \$1,262.95. Now there are two things I should like to say about that Mr. Speaker, in rounding out the picture. In the first instance last year was a very poor due to generally poor weather and due to early frost. And the commercial harvest of blueberries last year was only a half million pounds, which is about twenty-five percent of the normal average good year. It is six pounds to a gallon, so the hon. gentleman can figure it out from there. The price, the average long-term price Mr. Speaker is about twenty-five cents a pound. It could be up in the area of forty to forty-five cents a pound in a good year depending on demand. And I would say last year in view of the small crop, the demand was probably very good and the price was probably quite higher than the long term average. One other thing I think that should be said is this, that hand-picking has practically disappeared. Most people now use rakes, and burning is absolutely essential to a good commercial crop. And last year again the Crown Lands Act was amended to allow the leasing of blueberry lands to permit in fact blueberry farming, whereby lands could in fact be fenced and enclosed, rather than being public domain as they have been for hundreds of years. The burning is necessary and in the burning season there is of course no crop, the crop occurs in the following year, so that the commercial practice requires fairly large acreage which can be burned every second year in order to produce a good crop every second year. The fifth part of that question Mr. Speaker, where was pasture land development carried out during the present fiscal year, and I presume that is '69-'70; and the amount expended to date, I assume in that year. The pasture land development was carried out in Brigus, in Comfort Cove, in Robinson's, in Port-au-Port, in Peter's River, in Port Rexton, in Colinet, in St. John's West, in Salmon Cove.

AN HON. MEMBER: In St John's West, where would that be?

2128

MR CALLAHAN: Cochrane Pond. Cochrane Pond is the reference

AN HON. MEMBER: A hotel water system?

MR CALLAHAN: Well it might be one day. The hon. gentleman would like to see that. We would not like to see it? Well now we know what he would not like to see. Salmon Cove I think I mentioned Mr. Speaker, Winterland, Cape Anguille, Cormack, Micmac Lake, Spencer's Bridge, Riverhead, St. Mary's Bay, and St. Shott's. And that I think Mr. Speaker, is a fairly representative coverage around the Island. The expenditure from April 1, 1969, we might get to the Funks Mr. Speaker. We might start community pastures on which to put defeated leadership candidates so they can romp around and enjoy their terrible existence. Retired would-be leaders. Defunct would-be leaders. The expenditure Mr. Speaker, April 1, '69

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did the hon. minister say the Funks?

MR. CALLAHAN: The blue Funks I think Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is where the great awk used to be.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is why Mr. Speaker, I suggest we return certain great awks back there. Repopulate our wildlife division would be very interesting. The expenditure Sir, if I may during the year, \$240,903 and this of course is current account expenditure, and it does not relate to capital expenditure in the building or extension of pastures. The figure again \$240,903. This very interesting question Mr. Speaker, from the hon. gentleman. I can have a copy made Mr. Speaker, I had to get this on the phone. I knew the hon. gentleman would be here today and I wanted to have the answer. The number of co-operative societies or organizations, this is part six, registered as of January 1, 1970. The answer is 160 societies at January 1, 1970. The number of co-operative societies or organizations in receipt of grants during the present fiscal year, again I take to be '69-'70 too, but I must explain that. One, is Newfoundland's Co-op Services, which is the grandfather organization of all the Co-operatives in the Province; and the grant realistically \$28,000. It is shown as twenty seven six, which reflected a two percent reduction in the last Estimates. This is a diminishing grant which was stabilized or frozen last year in order to provide the Newfoundland

Co-op Services with needed funds because they have had some problems, and they have had some expansion in terms of cleaning up their organization, and this ^{has} required new and better people in some areas in the establishment of new services such as the centralized accounting and that kind of thing. So the agreement was made to stabilize the grant and in addition to that I might say, that we have in effect seconded, I say in effect because that is not really what happened. We really loaned two of our senior officials, Mr. Cyril Janes and Mr. Bert Thoms to Newfoundland Co-op Services to assist them in various aspects of organization on which they have not been able to reach again for financial reasons. And so in a sense it might be said, that the salaries of those two men at least while they are there, are in effect a grant to Newfoundland Co-op Services. The other Co-op

MR. CALLAHAN: Co-op organization which received a grant in that year was the Newfoundland Fur Farmers Feed Co-op, and the amount was \$3,500. to assist them in obtaining better accounting services. I might say too, in relation to that Sir, that the Newfoundland Fur Farmers Feed Co-op is in extremely good condition in respect of honouring its commitments to the Government. They have completely paid back a \$60,000. loan to the Farm Loan Board, and they have on deposit the first payment on their mortgage which is not due for some time yet.

There are about twenty fur farmers in the Co-op. and they will produce I would think this year about 18,000 good quality animals. In addition to that I think it should be recognized that they were the catalysts that led to the establishment at Dildo of a very substantial operation based on the fishery which I am told offers employment to in excess of 200 people.

The eighth part of the question of which there are nine parts. The eighth part I am sorry Sir, had to do with the actual grants. The seventh part had to do with the names, and the eighth part with the grants. The ninth part asks the names of the Provincial parks, where they are located, the number of attendants in each, and the cost of improvement to each park during the present fiscal year. I will have that information Sir put on paper for tabling in the House rather quickly.

Question no. 232, on the Order Paper of April 6th. in the name of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. The question is, Why was provision not made in the 1969 - 70 estimates covering the survey of mineral resources in Bonne Bay National Park thus requiring a special warrant for \$60,000. dated July 4th. 1969. The answer Mr. Speaker, is very simply that in November of the previous year 68-69, authority was given for this work to be done, and the warrant was actually issued at that time. But due to certain difficulties which arose, particularly difficulties with weather which delayed the removal of equipment from the south coast to Bonne Bay, drilling equipment and what not, the work did not get under way prior to the end of the fiscal year. I think there was perhaps a lack of communication between officials in the department and officials in the Department of Finance in respect to the physical

situation. In other words it was assumed in the Mines Branch that the authority existed, and that the work would be done on the authority granted the previous November. For this reason the amount was not put in the departmental estimates. It was only discovered after the estimates came into the House. I think if hon. members will check Hansard there is a reference there to it. Only after the estimates came to the House was it realized that the amount had not been included and it therefore could only be provided on the basis of special warrant which came sometime later in the new fiscal year.

A similar question Mr. Speaker, is 234, on the same Order Paper in the name of the hon. member for Burin. The question is in three parts. Special warrant dated June 26th. 1969, authorized expenditure of \$2 million for forest insect control. The first part of the question, what was the sum originally requested by the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources for this project. The second part, what were the reasons for reducing this figure to a token vote of \$100., and the third part, what were the reasons for the reasons for the increased provision of \$2 million within four months of the tabling of the estimates?

Mr. Speaker, I think again if hon. members will refer to Hansard, at the time of the discussion the reduction of the estimates of the department in the House

MR. MURPHY: Find a copy of Hansard

MR. CALLAHAN: I am quite sure it is in Hansard Mr. Speaker

MR. MURPHY: Yes, well where is Hansard now?

MR. CALLAHAN: Well hon. gentlemen were provided with Hansard in last year's session. I am quite sure they were, I happen to know something about it and if they would refer there I think the explanation is there, but I will give it in any event. The explanation as I gave it then was or is, or was that there was no way Sir, of knowing what expenditure would be required. At that time we were negotiating with Price (Nfld.) Ltd. and with Bowaters (Nfld.) Ltd. and with the Government of Canada of Canada in an attempt to have them come in on the spraying program which was quite a massive operation, and quite costly

obviously.

At the time the estimates were in the House, the forecasts of required expenditure Mr. Speaker, went as high as \$4.5 million on which the forester officials were divided. Some felt that it might not have to go more than \$1 million, and some felt as I indicated that it might well go in excess of \$4 million. For that reason, and for the reason that there was no way of knowing at that point ^{at} time whether we would get agreement from Bowaters, from Price, or from the Government of Canada to participate in the program. It was felt that we could not put a realistic figure in the estimates, and the figure put in in fact was the token, the amount was not reduced as the second part of the question suggests.

MR. WELLS: Besides, the budget would not balance then

MR. CALLAHAN: That is not the point Mr. Speaker, what happened was the token was put in, because there was no way of knowing what should be put in. The negotiations continued and subsequently a warrant was asked and received for \$2 million, but I am very happy to tell the House that we did in fact subsequently achieve an agreement with the Government of Canada and a special arrangement with them and also with Price (nfld.) Ltd. and Bowaters to the extent that each of the companies and the Government of Canada agreed to put in one half million dollars into the program, which would mean a twenty-five per cent share with the Province putting in the other twenty-five per cent.

I think Mr. Speaker, the delay in making estimates, the delay all round so that we could negotiate and get this participation which saved the Province on the basis of the estimate a cool \$1.5 million was a very useful and satisfactory negotiation.

MR. EARLE: I think the hon. gentleman should check the public records for the accuracy of his answers

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, that is the accurate answer, the negotiation took place and I conducted it, both in Ottawa and in Corner Brook with the other parties, and the other parties agreed each to put in one half million dollars. As it turned out Mr. Speaker, we went under the budget, and the actual share

I think I may have it here somewhere

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman was Minister of Finance last year, and the Minister of Finance lasted until March

MR. CALLAHAN: The actual sharing Mr. Speaker, the total of the program as it turned out was \$1,446,437.29 which indicates that we went under the budget by some \$600,000. and yet covered the entire 2 million acres that was programed to be covered. I might say with up to ninety-eight per cent effectiveness. The sharing as it turned out was in behalf of the Government of the Province, in behalf of Bowaters, in behalf of Price, in behalf of the Government of Canada each \$361,609.33. So while all the parties agreed to put in each one half million dollars it came out at much less than that. That Mr. Speaker, is the

MR. CALLAHAN:
is the full explanation of that question.

MR. COLLINS: I wonder would he entertain a supplementary here, on the basis of information that I have received it would indicate that side effect of the spraying is that some smaller birds some smaller animals and possibly some fish were killed, I wonder would the minister have information to substantiate that?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, there is no hard evidence to substantiate that. There have been reports from persons driving along the highway, if for example, that they saw dead birds on the road or birds would seem to be flying peculiarly but the Canadian Wildlife Service and the Canadian Department of Fisheries and Forestry and also I might say an advisory committee representing the Government in the University, agencies of the Federal Government who monitored the programme could find to my recollection no evidence whatever of any side effect. Now in the year previous which was the first year in which we had conducted this kind of programme but at a much smaller scale as there was some effect I am aware of, on small fingerlings in stagnant waters where the stuff would come down and could not dissipate. But what we did Mr. Speaker was to find a very narrow range low toxicity insecticide an organo-phosphate which has a half life of about five days, and compared with DDT and the other flourinated hydrocarbons which have a half life of at least fifteen years which cost us incidentally approximately six times as much as DDT or the DDT family and this is what really gave us the kind of result we got. We got a very narrow range effect on the insect we were after and very very slight if any, effect, side effect on birds or fish life.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question, when he said, when the hon. minister says that the saving from that budget was approximately \$600,000 what I gathered, or understand he means surely that it was not a saving it was \$1,600,000 over the budget, but below the estimate of his department as apposed to the budget approved by this hon. House. Is that correct?

MR. CALLAHAN: That is what I said, Mr. Speaker, we budgeted,

MR. HICKMAN: Who is we?

MR. CALLAHAN: And worked out by agreement with the Government of Canada and with the paper companies, I repeat what I said, worked out a budget of \$2 Million or about a dollar per acre as the cost of the programme and we came out of the programme at somewhere in the vicinity of seventy-six cents per acre. Which

meant that on the programme budget which is what I have been referring to specifically we came under it - No the programme - the budget for the particular spraying programme it was a two million dollar programme and we came out it at about a million four, five.

MR. HICKMAN: The programme was a hundred dollar budget approved by the House.

MR. CALLAHAN: Now, Mr. Speaker the hon. gentleman is twisting it, what I said and what I repeat is that we estimated in the final analysis, it started out at \$4.5 million and we got down to \$2 million as the project'd budget for a \$2 million acre spraying programme, which we carried out for an amount somewhat less than one and a half million dollars. So we actually went close to \$600,000 under the budget for the particular programme that is what I said, Mr. Speaker.

Question No. 313,

MR. COLLINS: A supplementary Mr. Speaker, I wonder will the minister promise ^{answers as} ~~XXXXXX~~ co-operative and as long-winded on days other than opposition days in this House.

MR. CALLAHAN: Of course Mr. Speaker, any time at all.

Question No. 313,

MR. CALLAHAN: Does the hon. gentleman want this information or not, of course he did not ask this question?

MR. SREAKER: When there is a question to be asked the hon. minister will answer it and h's reply is not the subject of comment under our rules.

MR. CALLAHAN: This question was not asked by the hon. gentleman from Humber East so perhaps I should answer it, it is number 313 on the Order Paper of April 8. asked by the hon. member for St. John's West.

(1) No.

(2) No.

Mr. Speaker in that event I had better read the questions.

- (1) Has Mr. John J. Kavanagh of Portugal Cove made application in writing or orally at any time since April 1st, 1969 to acquire or purchase breeding hogs from the Central Service Breeding Station at Anderson's Pond and, if so, on what date or dates was any application so received?
- (2) If an application to purchase breeding hogs was received from Mr. John J. Kavanagh were any such breeding hogs sold to him and, if not, why were breeding hogs not sold to him in accordance with his request?

What Mr. Kavanagh did do Mr. Speaker, is to come to me in December month and tell me that he would like to buy out our abattoir and other operations at

Pleasantville and he suggest that our swine breeding establishment. And I told Mr. Kavanagh Sir, personally, in my office I doubt it very much if Mr. Kavanagh would operate the complex as we would like it operated for the benefit of all farmers and not for so-called independents but that at the same time that Mr. Kavanagh had a proposal to make would he please put it in writing, so we could look at it. And it has not been put in writing Mr. Speaker.

Question No. 314, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West.

The answer is no.

Question NO. 315, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West.

MR. CALLAHAN? 314 is right after 313, the hon. gentleman has it, 314, and the answer is no. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker I have the answer to Question No. 428 on yesterday's Order Paper asked by the hon. member for St. John's West.

(1) The hon. member did not specify the period in which he wanted his information Mr. Speaker, so I have taken the liberty of giving him the information from April 1, 1968, to September 25, 1969, during that period we purchased 63 homes for needy people, if this information is not satisfactory to the hon. gentleman perhaps he would get in touch with me and I would be glad to go back further, back to the time of Confederation if he wants me to.

(2) The answer Mr. Speaker is Newfoundland & Labrador Housing Corporation since September 25, 1969,

(3) From April 1, 1969, to September 25, 1969, \$32,149. Gross, 50 per cent of that would be net. From the Canada Assistance Plan. My hon. colleague points out that is partially shareable it would not be 50 per cent recoverable. From April 1, 1969 to September 25 1969, 21 houses. The price of these houses ranged from a low of \$400 up to \$3500.

MR. NEARY: The title of part four of that question is with respect to all such houses purchased by the Government for such purposes, Is the title to such housing or property vested in the Government or any agency of the Government, or is the title to such houses or properties in any cases vested in the occupants of such houses or properties, and if so what is the number of such houses or properties where title to the same is vested in the occupants of such houses or properties?

The title to thirty-three of these houses is vested in the Minister of Public Welfare, and are now in the process of being transferred to the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, and the ownership of the remaining thirty have been granted to the occupants. I also have the answer, the distinction is because the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation have now become the landlords and we rent the houses and in some cases, when sufficient rent

MR. WELLS: This is a new policy

MR. NEARY: It is

MR. ROBERTS: It is fully sharable with the Government of Canada

MR. NEARY: That is right

MR. WELLS: No, but is it new that the title be vested in the, in the

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation

MR. WELLS: This new policy

MR. NEARY: It started last fall, it is a new policy we started last fall

MR. ROBERTS: And the house is paid for by us

MR. NEARY: That is right

MR. WELLS: So from here on in title will not be vested in the occupants

MR. NEARY: It could be

MR. WELLS: Why

MR. ROBERTS: It depends on each case

MR. WELLS: Why should it depend on each case?

MR. NEARY: The Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation have now become the landlords, we rent the houses and outside the urban centres, when we have paid sufficient rent to pay for the house, then we would give the

title to the occupant

AN. HON. MEMBER: Inaudible

MR. NEARY: Well yes, something along those lines

MR. ROBERTS: The other way was unfair, I was the minister involved at the time, we did not rent to a number of people, in fact they were given houses of course in proof it also brings us more money from the Government of Canada.

MR. NEARY: That is right, by renting the house we cover fifty per cent of the cost of rent from the Canada Assistance Plan.

Now Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question no.442 on today's Order Paper asked by the hon. member for St. John's East Extern. The answer to part one is the Public Works Staff, that is the architects, the engineers and the experts in the Department of Public Works, who made the plans for the alteration and the architectural design, mechanical and electrical consultants were the Newfoundland Design Associates Ltd., because they were the original designer of the building. Part two of the question Mr. Speaker, ten per cent of the cost of mechanical and electrical work and the answer to part three is \$17,270.

MR. HICKMAN: Does that include supervision?

MR. NEARY: Yes, and I might say Mr. Speaker, that there are no bills outstanding to complete the answer to part three.

HON. F.W. ROWE (Minister of Education): There are I believe six questions asked of me on the Order Paper. I propose to answer only one of them right now for I think very obvious reasons. I have been out, and this is private members day. This question I want to answer because, I informed the public by way of CBC this morning, that I would be answering this this afternoon. It is question no. 443, asked by the hon. member for Burin. Here is the question; Has the school board involved been promised sufficient money from building grants to enable them in construction of an amalgamated high school on Fogo Island in 1970? There are two subsidiaries of that, if so what amount is being set aside for this purpose, and three if not when is it planned that this school will be built?

The answer to that question Mr. Speaker, is that I do not know. That is the answer to question number one. I do not know, the Department of Education does not know. I know the hon. member who asked that question being a lawyer and until recently a chairman of one of the largest, if not the largest school board in Newfoundland, one of the largest anyway for many years, and a member as I was, he knows the answer to that question. I presume he has only asked it in order to give me an opportunity to enunciate to the public what the law is. And the law is very simple. I regret to say that although it has been in existence since 1876, and applicable every minute since that time, there are still a large number of people in Newfoundland who do not know what the law is.

The law is this. The law of Newfoundland is this, it is in the Education Act, passed by this House. It was repassed, reaffirmed here last year, it is confirmed in the terms of union. Does my humble friend think I am

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible

MR. ROWE (F.W.): The question is asked by my hon. friend's colleague does he want it answered or not

MR. MURPHY: It has been answered. "I do not know"

MR. ROWE: The answer is the Government of Newfoundland does not own any schools in Newfoundland apart from the vocational schools, the university and the college of trades. Number two, the Government of Newfoundland does not build schools, and more importantly in this regard here, in respect to this question here, the Government of Newfoundland does not decide where the schools will be built. This House votes the money for capital grants, for the building of schools. That money under the law must then be divided among the respective churches on a proportionate basis. The churches then decide the denominational of those churches, the educational authorities of those churches then decide how that money will be allocated. The Government has no word in it whatsoever nor does the Department of Education.

MR. WELLS: The Government does not even know, does not even consider it before the budget is done?

MR. ROWE: The Government does not know

MR. WELLS: Before it puts the money in the budget for this?

MR. ROWE: The Government recommends to this House a grant for the buidling of schools and that grant

MR. WELLS: The Minister of Education!

MR. ROWE: I do not need to say this, that that grant has never been in the minds of most people of Newfoundland sufficiently high

MR. COLLINS: It is like a Government express, and when it stops in certain places

MR. ROWE: Does my hon. friend think that the Government can decide that a school must be built, and will be built on Fogo Island? If my hon. friend knows the views, why does he ask such foolish questions about it then? The Government of Newfoundland does not decide, I know my hon friends would like to be able to say to this side of the House, and to the Government, and to mislead the public on this perhaps, that it is the Government's decision as to where a school will be built. The Government has no more to say about it than the Government of China has. The Government recommends the vote here, this House passes the vote,

MR. WELLS: On what basis?

MR. ROWE: And after that has been done it is then allocated to the various churches on a proportionate basis who then decide how the money will be allocated.

MR. WELLS: On what basis does the Government recommend the amount? As much as we could possibly find?

MR. ROWE: The Government, my hon. friend was in the Government long enough to know that, that the Government of Newfoundland recommends to this House as much as we think we can afford in any one year. We would all like to recommend more. We recommended \$4.5 million last year. He knows as well as I know the Government would have liked to have been able to find \$15 million or \$20 million. We could not do it.

Now Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any need for a question of this type, it has been asked here many times, to be asked again. The Government

of Newfoundland does not decide where schools will be built. That may be a wrong policy I do not know, I did not make the policy, this House made it and this House has the power to change it, and the people of Newfoundland have the power to change it in a general election if they so desire.

MR. HICKMAN: Would the hon. minister allow a supplementary question? Do I understand from his remarks that if a school board is to construct a school, a new school, or renovate or repair a school out of capital funds that have been voted by this House to the various denominations or apportioned on a per capita basis, and particularly as has been the policy in the past where the funds have been pledged

MR. ROWE: I am sorry I did not hear that, would you repeat that last, I am sorry I did not hear it.

MR. HICKMAN: The policy that has now evolved, it is public knowledge that the funds, future funds have been pledged for the construction of schools, that the school boards do not come back and ask the Department of Education and the hon. the Minister of Education for approval? Because, I can tell him of dozens, and dozens, and dozens or requests that have been made by school boards to the Department of Education for approval to build a school in a particular place, at a particular cost.

MR. WELLS: Of course

MR. HICKMAN: I have done it myself

MR. ROWE: My hon. friend must be referring, I presume he is referring to the Department of Education as it existed until this past year.

MR. HICKMAN: I am referring, well I do not know

MR. ROWE: Until Spetember past. The falacy and all that arises from the fact that until September past the denominational superintendents, namely the churches representatives had their offices in the Department of Education and all applications from school boards to build schools, or for grants to build schools, or extend schools had to come to those superintendents who then referred it to, not to the Government, not to the Department of Education, but to their churches denominational committee, and that churches denominational committee decided. I used to be a member of one of those churches, I dare say

my hon. friend was. I know my hon. friend here was, other have been).

Denominational committee then decided the priorities for that particular year and also what commitments they would make from the capital grants in respect of any other years that followed;

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker on a Point of Order, this is becoming a debate Mr. Speaker, there are education estimates we can debate this on. This is private members day and we have a resolution on the Order Paper we would like yo get to some time.

MR. ROWE: I did not ask the question

MR. NEARY: Who started the debate?

MR. CROSBIE: I am not saying who started the debate, I am just saying it is a debate now

MR. NEARY: Well do not make it appear that it was started over here

MR. SPEAKER:I must say this, the questions have been asked, supplementary questions have also been asked and the minister is attempting to answer them. If these answers are too lengthy well that is something for which I have no control.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Minister of Justice): With consent of the House Mr. Speaker ask leave to move Motion No. (2). I presume I have consent.

MR. SPEAKER: Have we the consent of the House?

MR. CROSBIE: I consent on the understanding that we have agreed upon, on the understanding that our understanding is going to be carried out.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I have to find out if the House consents too, and I cannot have a qualified consent. Does the House agree to the hon. the President of the Council moving this No.2 Motion?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I might say there was an understanding by the hon. member for St. John's West with the leader of the House, and we will agree under these conditions.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I would move the following Resolution, I regret that I have to read it because since it was drafted I have made some editorial changes. And one change in ours. So perhaps the House will bear with me if I very quickly read it. They can follow it in the meantime. I move that Standing Orders 1 to 8 be stricken out and the following substituted therefore: No. 1, there is no amendment to that, so I will not read that. No. 2, there is no amendment to that, so I will not read that. No. 3, there is no amendment, so I will not need to read that. No. 4. (a) Any member may direct the Speaker's attention to the fact that there is not a quorum present. When attention has been directed to the fact that there is not a quorum present, the Speaker shall wait if necessary for ten minutes. Put in the words after "wait for ten minutes" The rest of this section no amendment, therefore no need to read it. 4 (b) as is. (c) The only occasion when the Speaker takes the initiative in this matter is at 2:30 o'clock or at 8:00 o'clock instead of 7:30 after the intermission. If he does not see a quorum he refrains from calling the members to order for fifteen minutes, or until he sees a quorum. Add the words for fifteen minutes or until he sees a quorum. That is to make it fit in with Order No. 2. If after fifteen minutes he does not see a quorum he asks the Clerk to count the House. If

there are not fourteen members present he declares without question put that the House stands adjourned until the next sitting day. This procedure also be clearly recorded in the Journal. If after fifteen minutes he does not see a quorum he asks the clerk to count the House.

MR. CROSBIE: Just read the first two sentences of (c).

MR. WELLS: Read all of (c) as amended.

MR. CURTIS: The only occasion when the Speaker takes the initiative in this matter is at 2:30 o'clock or at 8:00 o'clock after the intermission. If he does not see a quorum he refrains from calling the members to order for fifteen minutes or until he sees a quorum. If after fifteen minutes he does not see a quorum he asks the Clerk to count the House. If there are not fourteen members present he declares without question put that the House stands adjourned until the next sitting day. In other words over night. Are you satisfied now? (d) as is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It often happens if the Government do not want a session, the Speaker comes, takes his place, three or four members come, and there is no quorum. This might go on for two months. It has often happened. A daily formal meeting which does not happen.

MR. CURTIS: No. 5; as is except on the last line. If he ascertains that fourteen members are not present he leaves the Chair the House is resumed and on his report the Speaker waits if necessary for ten minutes, at which the Clerk etc., Section 6 as is. Section 7. If at the hour of 6:00 P.M. except on Friday, the business of the House is not concluded Mr. Speaker shall leave the Chair until 8:00 P.M. Then the rest of the section remains as is. And section 8 as is. I would move Mr. Speaker the Resolution of which I have given notice and I have asked if the hon. the Premier would move the amendments I have inserted.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do so.

MR. CROSBIE: If this is the right time I would just like to say a few words Mr. Speaker. We have agreed to these changes in the rules composed by the hon. the President of the Council on the basis that if there is no quorum, that it is probably more sensible to take ten minutes to see if one can be rounded up. It is not unreasonable. And we also agree to the change in

time so that we can spend a half hour more here in the afternoons, and a half hour less in the evening. But basically Mr. Speaker, our consent is necessary because two-thirds of the members of the House have to agree to changes in the rules. And since the hon. the President of the Council took the time and trouble to consult with us about that, we are quite prepared to be reasonable. But I would like to point out Mr. Speaker, that our understanding with the hon. the President of the Council is that on Wednesday evenings, which is private members' day, we allowed to meet Wednesday evening if we have private members' business to carry on with. Because even though these rules are changed the government can move anytime, it has a majority, to move anytime that the debate be adjourned at 6 o'clock as Your Honour knows. But on the understanding with the hon. President, that is the way we will be treated, then we are quite prepared to agree with these changes in the rules which are reasonable. And if the House does happen to be without a quorum then it is more reasonable for ten minutes to be given for members to be found. So on that basis we agree to the changes in the rules.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to at this time just for a moment, sort of reiterate what the hon. member has said that this has been an agreement and it has been a gentleman's agreement more or less between us all, and we are quite prepared to go along with this because after all we feel our first duty is to complete the business of the House, and we will co-operate to what extent we can with this. But we feel that if we are asked to give certain things the Government also should be prepared to see eye to eye with the Opposition here and certain times when it may be difficult to proceed on request of the Government. So it is a gentleman's agreement and we trust that it will be carried out as it is set out here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, so that there will be no mistake. We have guaranteed nothing. We are merely changing the rules and the rules say that the House will meet at 2:30 every afternoon and close at 6 o'clock and resume again at 8 o'clock until 10:30 at night, except on Friday nights. That is all it says. It does not mean that we are guaranteed we have to come here every night of the week or any night of the week. Every night

is the same. There is no difference, there is no distinction made. The normal meeting time of the House if these changes are adopted, the normal meeting times are on Monday 2:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., and 8:00 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. Tuesday 2:30 to 6:00 p.m., 8:00 p.m. to 10:30 p.m., Wednesday 2:30 to 6:00 p.m. 8:00 p.m. to 10:30 p.m., 2:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., 8:00 p.m. Thursday, and Friday 2:30 to 6:00 p.m. that is all. No distinction is made, no distinction at all. These are the meeting, the normal meeting hours. Now as the rules are today, on Wednesday the normal meeting hours are 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., and to meet on Wednesday night it takes a special motion. This will do away with the need of a special motion and the normal meeting hours on Wednesday are the same as any other day except Friday when we do not meet at night. There is no distinction, no distinction. And the normal procedure will be to meet on Wednesday nights, and on Monday nights, and on Thursday nights, but if the House does not wish to meet on those nights it does not meet. Let it not be.....

MR. WELLS: rules do not one bit of good. It is no benefit to us at all. The House just adjourned. Now all we are asking is a bit of reasonableness, a bit of fair play. Of course we are out voted, we are out voted by a country mile. All we are asking is some semblance of democracy in this place. We do not want the Government to undertake desert, they are going to meet every single day and every single night, of course the Government can make its motion anytime. Except, Wednesday is private members day. And please recognize that. Please have some consideration for the other members of this House. The basis of democracy is recognition and fair play to minority, not a trampling of their rights and their desires by an unwieldy majority. This is all we ask Mr. Speaker and that is the basis on which we have agreed to amend these rules now, and without that Sir, I can assure the Premier right now, I will not vote for it. I do not know about the other hon. members here, but I will recommend to them that they not vote for it, and I do not think there will be enough members seated opposite to carry it, maybe there will.

MR. SPEAKER: Before any other hon. member goes on, I do not want to be charged with participating in this debate. But seeing that it is dealing with the rules of the House, I would like with the indulgence of the House to say this. This Resolution as it stands at the present time, and it may come back to me by and by, if we pass for interpretation and somebody will say, we agreed. We will not be able to take no recognition of what was agreed, it will only be able to take recognition of what changes were made in the rules themselves. The whole thing boils down simply to a matter, is there going to be an agreement between the parties, that they will not do this, or they will do something else. I will not be able to deprive any hon. member in spite of what agreement exist between the parties. If an hon. member rises, or this change goes through and an hon. member no matter which side he is sitting on, he stands up and moves that this House do now adjourn. I cannot deny him making that motion. The whole thing must rest on an agreement between the parties and in a mutual trust or otherwise. This is the way it has to be interrupted. But it will not be able to be interrupted in any other manner, if this matter goes through.

MR. T. ALEX. HICKMAN: The rule is very clear, and I do not think any hon. members under the misapprehension that this rule binds Government or future Houses or the House to meet on any night that is mentioned in the rules. But the simple thing is that the hon. Leader of the House, the hon. the Minister of Justice is the House leader. As I understand it, he enunciates the policy of Government so long as he is House Leader, and he is the one who is authorized to make public commitments on behalf of the Government of the day, insofar as the running of this House is concerned. The hon. the Minister of Justice as Leader of this House is given a firm irrevocable commitment to the opposition, that so long as he is House Leader, that the policy of this Government, the present Government is, that on no occasion, and under no circumstances on Wednesday, under no circumstances, Mr. Speaker, so long as there is a private member's motion on the Order Paper. Unless a private member so agrees and says, I do not wish have my motion debated today, I will wait until next Wednesday. Unless that commitment is given and if there is on the Order Paper a motion of private members, then Mr. Speaker, the commitment from the hon. House Leader is that the Government will not move an adjournment at 6:00 o'clock, it is as simple as that.

MR. ROWE, F.W.: I am not sure, I understand. Will you permit a question? Is he saying, and I am asking this and I am not sure, is he saying that we would commit ourselves morally, ethically, we would commit ourselves to meeting every Wednesday night, if there is any item of private members item on the Order Paper, even if we are not meeting Monday night, or Tuesday night or Thursday night?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, that was the agreement. The commitment Mr. Speaker is that-

MR WELLS: Yes.

MR SMALLWOOD: Pure nonsense.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, If I may be allowed to continue, this is a very simple reasonable commitment. We have listened in this House week after week, we hear it on the radio, Wednesday is private members day, the Government is completely and absolutely in the hands of the private members. What ever private members want to do they can do within the rules of this House.

MR. HICKMAN: Now the position that was put to the hon. House Leader and which I thought he very readily and sensibly agreed that as Wednesday is private members day, if a private member has a resolution on the Order Paper which is awaiting debate or which is in the course of debate, and that private member wishes that debate to continue into Wednesday night, that the Government will not move an adjournment at 6:00 o'clock. It could not be simpler than that, it would not be more reasonable than that, and it cannot bind future Government, it is simply a statement of Government policy by the only person who can give a statement as I understand the rules is the Hon. House Leader. And all we ask is for his confirmation of that. Let me simply repeat it Mr. Speaker, so there can be no mistake. So long as there is a private members resolution on the Order Paper, and if that private member wishes the debate to continue or if he wishes a resolution to be debated, that the present Government undertakes as a gentleman's agreement, and as Government policy that it will not an adjournment at 6:00 o'clock. And I am sure the hon. House Leader will agree that that was the commitment given to the ten members.

MR. WELLS: It certainly was.

MR. NOEL: I would just like to say a few words about this, I might say it is an awful way to be operating a House of Assembly. And I cannot quite understand why the hon. members opposition are getting at. Now, personally I am a member of this House, once the rules are passed, these rules are my rules, as much as they are the rules of many member of this House, including the House Leader, the President of the Council, the hon. the Premier or anybody else. Any private arrangement made between the House Leader and members of the Opposition ought not to be discussed publicly here, that is a matter between gentlemen and it should not be discussed here at all. Personally, the House Leader cannot bind me, if I want to move an adjournment any old time, if the rules say I can do it, I can do it. And I think that the Premier is perfectly correct in saying that no undertakings can be given here today, even if the hon. members present got the undertaking which they were asking for, it would not bind anybody in the House, it would not bind me, it would not bind anybody. And certainly if the outcome of the

next general election is as the hon. members opposite seem to think it is, it certainly would not bind them. We are making rules here for the governing of the House of Assembly. Now we all know that there are gentlemen's agreements back and forth during the operation of the House. But, these are no more than that, and any gentlemen's agreement that the President of the Council or the Leader of the House might give to the Leader of the Opposition, is no more than that. It cannot bind me. And these things ought not to be discussed in this House at all. These rules ought to be taken on the basis of merit. Are they good rules or bad rules? If they are good, we vote for them. If they are not good, we do not vote for them. Now hon. members may have something to say about Wednesday night, and they may or may not have some kind of a gentleman's agreement with a person who holds a particular office on the Government side of this House. I do not think the rest of us can

MR. SMALLWOOD: let it be understood. Let us ~~fligh~~ this out, not under misunderstanding, no deception, no false promises. The rules are the rules, if we change the rules we change them. If we do not do it like this forget it. Forget it.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I feel there is probably a bit of misunderstanding. And our basic concern Sir arises from what happened in this House on last Wednesday, when we were debating the motion of the hon. member for St. Barbe South of concerning the Bonne Bay Park. The Government took up an hour or so of the afternoon time, and when the motion was called the hon. member moved his motion, the hon. minister responded ~~for~~ about an hour and it was six o'clock, the Government refused to allow us to continue on as had been the practice before the adjournment. It had been the practice. Well maybe the member was not here.

Our concern Sir is not whether the Government, if the minister would keep quiet, Sir, for a few minutes he will have to hear what I have to say, and then he can express his opinion on it. Now I ask him just to refrain from this nonsense for a few minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

MR. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our concern Sir is only this that when Opposition motions are on the Order Paper, that if they have not been completely dealt with by 6:00 o'clock on Wednesday we have assurance that if we wish to, we can come back on Wednesday night and debate it. We do not care, if the Government does not want to come back Monday night, okay. Tuesday night, okay, we do not ask for any promise that they will or any such thing. We ask no such promises. All we are concerned about is this, that if there are Opposition motions on this Order Paper, on Wednesdays, and the Opposition want to come back on Wednesday that there will be no Government motion that we will adjourn at 6:00 o'clock. Now that is the basis of the agreement, and the basis on which this was given.

Today, Mr. Speaker, is private members day, and there are several motions on the Order Paper to be debated. One of which many of the members want to speak on. And it is now 4:30 o'clock Sir, if we pass these rules and the Leader of the House, the hon. the President of the Council stands up at 6:00 o'clock and says, Mr. Speaker I move the House adjourn. These

The rest of us members are interested in what the gentlemen's agreements are. This is what they are, they are gentlemen's agreements. When you say gentlemen's agreements - my position is, Mr. Speaker, that these gentlemen's agreements ought not to be here, ought not to be on the record of this House.

MR. MURPHY: Well let us put an amendment - can we put an amendment to the motion.

MR. NOEL: Well go ahead, but my feeling is that the hon. the Premier is right and certainly I could never see the leader of any government saying, we will pass the rules. Here is what they read but everybody knows that they do not really mean that.

MR. HICKMAN: That is not so.

MR. NOEL: That is what the hon. members are asking. They are asking us to pass rules today and stating publicly that although we solemnly pass this rule by the two-thirds or three-thirds whatever it is, necessary to do it, that that is not really the rule at all. I do not think you can operate a beer parlour that way.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One night of the four is different from the other three.

MR. NOEL: Rules are rules, gentlemen's agreements are gentlemen's agreements. Rules are for this House. Gentlemen's agreements are for outside this House, and ought not to be discussed, and I certainly feel that the hon. the Premier is right in not agreeing publicly to anything contrary to the rules that has been passed. Even if the hon. Premier knew that there was a gentlemen's agreement that you are talking about or that hon. members opposite are talking about. Even if that gentlemen's agreement was in the words stated by the hon. gentlemen opposite. If I were leader of the House, I would not publicly say that I had agreed to such an agreement. It is a travesty on the Premier. I mean it is ridiculous. It is an insult to the rest of us. It is an insult to the other members of the House. It is an insult to me; for me to stand here and have rules passed and then somebody stand up publicly and say, "well hon. member for St. John's North, you got holes

in your head, you know. You just voted here for a set of rules but you know we got a little gentlemen's agreement that this is all balls." What kind of a beer parlour are we running? I mean rules are rules. If they are stated, they are stated and gentlemen's agreements are gentlemen's agreements. Personally, myself, if I were the hon. the Premier, I would say exactly as he said that these are the rules.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, if I might speak for a moment before we..

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member, I think, has already spoken. We are not in committee.

MR. CROSBIE: I know, Mr. Speaker, but before I spoke this disagreement had not arisen, and I would like to speak.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman already spoke.

AN HON. MEMBER: He did raise the point, and spoke, and cannot speak again.

MR. SPEAKER: This was on another matter, and another member, away altogether. Does the hon. member intend to close the debate?

MR. CURTIS: If the House is finished?

MR. ROBERTS: Does the Leader of the Opposition want to speak?

MR. MURPHY: Of course, of course. I have spoken.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do not look so aggrieved.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, at this point I am wondering who I am speaking for. Mr. Speaker, I can agree with the hon. member for St. John's North, when he says that this is no place for .. gentlemen's agreements, as we have just found out.

MR. NOEL: The hon. gentleman is sitting in the right place to know that.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, as I understand what we are debating, it appears to me that there is an agreement made or at least an understanding that on Wednesdays, there would be no motion to adjourn the House at 6:00p.m., if any member of the Opposition had a resolution on the Order Paper and wished to continue after 6:00 p.m. Mr. Speaker, I certainly am

not going to tell the hon. the President of the Council that he did, because he did not make any commitment to me personally, but this is the understanding, Sir, that I have for my colleagues and this is the understanding on which I have agreed or I have decided or I have made up my mind to support this resolution that he has introduced.

I feel, Sir, that there should be some reasonable co-operation from the Government when a private members' bill or resolution is being debated and surely, if it is not concluded or finished at 6:00 p.m., there being only one day of the week on which it can be debated, surely it is not too much to ask that the House sit during that night. This is, I understand, the only thing for which the Opposition is asking. Surely, this is not too much to ask. I am well aware of the fact that this issue can be debated and voted upon and possibly can be passed, without a doubt, it will be passed. But while it is fine to say that there is no place for agreement or co-operation within this Chamber, we all know that there are contacts made by the House Leader whoever he might be. I am a spokesman for the Opposition or the Opposition Leader to co-operate on certain measures. This, as I understand it, has been a long standing practice. It would appear to me that it has worked very well in most cases. I do not know of a case where the Opposition have given a commitment as such or have indicated how they feel about a particular measure. I do not know of an instance where they have gone back on their word, as it were, and have fouled the Government's side on any measure. What we are debating now, Sir, appears to me to be the same thing. There has been an understanding, if not an agreement, let us call it an understanding that certain things will take place on Wednesdays provided that a certain situation exists.

We are not saying that each and every Wednesday, the House will sit regardless as to whether it has sat the previous night or whether it intends to sit the other two nights, but rather on this being private members' day, that if a subject or if an issue is not completed in terms of

debate that if the member who introduced that issue wishes the House to sit that night that he shall be allowed to have his resolution debated or whatever it is that he is interested in.

Surely, it would appear more reasonable to have a unanimous vote on this resolution, it being the rules of the House that we are debating and that being so, surely it is not too much to ask that some understanding be given to the reasonable request, as I see it, that is being made by the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other alternative and that is that we could drop the resolution that we are now debating and go on to one - number (6) on today's order paper and quickly appoint a select committee to study the entire business of the rules of this House, because to my mind

MR. HICKEY:

my mind, Sir, we have gotten into more trouble and we have wasted more time over the rules of this House than one could imagine. We are now debating changes in the rules and there is disagreement again. I think this only points out that some kind of measure has to be brought in or those rules have to be looked at in a more definite manner than we are doing at the moment. We are just making certain changes I think on the entire Standing Orders, all of them. must be looked at. However, I would, on this particular resolution, I would think that it is not too much to ask what we have ask and I think it would be most reasonable. In view of the co-operation that the Government has received in the past on various issues it would not be too much for the Government to agree to our request.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say very much about this but I would like to say this. I am the, there is no doubt about me, I am the junior member in the House in terms of number of years in this hon. House and I must say, Sir, that I came in here with great expectations of being afforded the courtesy and form to talk about the problems of my constituents, my district and, of course, about Newfoundland in general. To tell you the truth, Sir, I have been disappointed and I suspect that many people in Newfoundland are disappointed. The manner in which the business of this House has continually been degraded until we have reached the stage, I suppose this year, probably the lowest stage in the history of the House, whereby it becomes almost impossible for private members, for sure, to carry out their responsibilities which they have to their constituents and to their Province, if the two party system of Government which we talk so much about and subscribe so much to is going to be successful.

Now, Sir, I was told today by my leader that a meeting had taken place between my leader, the House leader, and the leader of the other group to the effect that we were agreeing to the amended motion as we heard just now on the basis that we had an assurance from the Government House leader that the House would remain open Wednesday evening provided there was a private members

MR. COLLINS:

motion on the Order Paper and provided we wanted to debate it, that was an assurance. I was also told, Sir, that in making this assurance on both sides, it was a mutual agreement, the member for Humber East had agreeded that he would drop his motion which is number seven on the Order Paper in the event that the Government agreeded to this and everybody agreeded and so on and so forth. Now we find, Sir, that apparently there is no agreement at all. The hon. member for St. John's North mentioned that a gentleman's agreement was not worth much in this House and I am certainly inclined to agree with him. Not being a lawyer I do not know how it would affect the procedures of the House in terms of running the House and interpreting the rules and so on and so forth. But certainly if we are not prepared, a small group of party leaders are not prepared to take one another into their trust and confidence and be able to arrive at a gentleman's agreement, a mutual agreement, and stand by it then I do not see much sense in any of us being in this House anymore.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend or claim to be an authority on the rules of the House but this particular instance seems to read quite simple in my mind. We are not in any way trying to dispute this motion to the effect it is having on the sitting of the House. We know that under the rules of the House it can sit with the permission of the House on any night excepting Friday and we are not in any way trying to influence that. What we are trying to get here this afternoon is an admission by the leader of the House from the other side that they have agreeded to a gentleman's agreement which clearly stated is that if there is a private member's motion on the Paper -

MR. CURTIS: There is no such agreement made.

MR. EARLE: This is the whole point if there is no agreement made that is it.

MR. CURTIS: There is no agreement.

MR. EARLE: I will sit down because we understood that there was.

MR. CURTIS: How can I commit the House?

MR. EARLE: We understood that there was.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. member can.

MR HICKMAN: State what the government policy is

MR ROWE (W.N.): Just before putting the Question before the hon. leader of the House wraps up the debate, you might ask yourself what is the position now under the rules of the House, under the rules now this House has no right and the members in the House have no right to meet on Wednesday nights unless there is a motion to the effect that it will meet on Wednesday nights is put before this House. The new position which the motion intends to put into effect is that there will be a right of the members of this House to meet on Wednesday nights, a definite right, unless the normal motion to adjourn which is not debateable is put to this House. So, Mr. Speaker, nobody can say, no member of this hon. House can say that the position of the private members is not improved as a matter of right under the motion which is presently before this House.

On the question of gentleman's agreements, Mr. Speaker, as to when or when not the House will meet, I might say that it is inconceiveable that the House leader or the Government can be morally responsible if some member of this House puts a normal motion to adjourn, which is carried by this House, that the House leader can then be responsible for the fact that the House does not meet on a Wednesday night. It is equally inconceiveable, Mr. Speaker, that if on a Wednesday night not enough members, as is their right, not enough members show up to form a quorum then the House leader or the Government is then morally responsible to the private members concerned because there is no meeting on a Wednesday night. It is impossible and I agree entirely with the hon. member for St. John's North that it is impossible for the House leader to make such a moral committment.

Mr. Speaker, normally to be reasonable about this matter, normally if the House is meeting during the night time then the House will meet on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday nights. Equally normally, Mr. Speaker, if the House is not meeting ordinarily in the night time the House will not meet on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday nights. That has usually been the position in the past, Mr. Speaker, and I see no reason at all why that

MR. ROWE (W.N.):

position should change. And on this whole question of moral agreements or tacit agreements or understood agreements, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman opposite might be well advised to look into their own actions in the past few days. When a private member of this House, the hon. member for Bonavista South was speaking and making a very good speech in this House the hon. members opposite moved out of this House en masse and required your hon. to count to see if there was a quorum present and required members to scurry into this House in order to allow that hon. gentleman to continue his remarks.

For years past, Mr. Speaker, at least as long as I have been in the House, the matter of a quorum has not been that rigidly or that strictly adhered to when an hon. member of this House has been speaking, no obvious attempt to embarrass the Government or this side of the House has been made until this year, this session of this House. So when the hon. members opposite talk about gentleman's agreements or tacit agreements or gentleman's understandings, Mr. Speaker, they have a lot to improve in their own conduct in this House and if there is any moral commitment attached to the motion presently before the House I do not think that I or any other member of this House can be expected to live up to it. They are guided by the rules of the House as the hon. the Deputy Speaker has already stated and no agreement can affect any hon. member who wishes to avail himself of the rules of this House in order to ask for an adjournment of this House or to exercise his right not to show up in this House at all at any particular time. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will be voting in favour of the motion as it stands which is an obvious improvement to the rights, improvement of the rights of private members of this House and I cannot contentance myself or any other member of the House being governed by some agreement which is unenforceable in any event.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, this motion is made in the interest of the private members of this House and I am very sorry that my conversations with the Leader of the Opposition and with the leader of the other party has been misunderstood. The position is this, we meet Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and

MR. CURTIS: Thursday. The hours of sitting under the new suggestion will be 2;30 o'clock to 6:00 o'clock and 8:00 o'clock to 10:30 o'clock provided that no member of the House and the majority of the House do not in the meantime move the motion to be adjourned. As leader of the House I cannot control any member on this side or on that side, all I wanted to assure the hon. members was that this was not a ruse on the part of the Government to fool them. In other words I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that on Monday night if the business of the House is not finished at 6:00 o'clock you leave the chair until 8:00 o'clock, on Tuesday -

MR. CURTIS: and on Tuesday night, if the business of the House is not concluded and there is no motion to adjourn, you leave the Chair until 8:00 O'Clock. On Wednesday is exactly a similar situation. You sit until 6:00 O'Clock, if there is no motion to adjourn, you resume at 8:00 O'Clock. The same on Thursday, and on Friday, if there is no adjournment at 6:00 o'clock, you leave the Chair until Monday. This is a motion simply to make it unnecessary every Wednesday for anybody to get up and move that the House do not rise at 6:00 O'Clock. That is the affect of the motion. There is no commitment, I cannot commit any member of the House any member, the forty-one members in this House, cannot move the House adjourned on Wednesday. The Leader of the House cannot stop them. Nobody can stop them. And everybody has a right to move the adjournment of the House on any day of the week. And I never intended for one minute

MR. CROSBIE: Admittedly the hon. minister cannot stop anybody from moving the adjournment. Does not the Leader of the House to speak for the Government and the majority of the Government has in the House?

MR. CURTIS: No. I cannot speak for the members on this side of the House.

MR. CROSBIE: You are the Leader of the House.

MR. CURTIS: I am the Leader of the House, but I mean I am not the controller. I cannot command to vote. I cannot command them to come back tonight, and I certainly have not intention of saying, that as long as there is a private member's motion, on the Order Paper, that we shall meet Wednesday. I can make no such commitment. I am in the hands of the House, that is all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We all are.

MR. CURTIS: I mean I am no more than anybody else. I just make the motion, the House can turn me down, just as I am making this motion.

MR. CROSBIE: The Government can close the House.

MR. CURTIS: Members of the House can turn me down on this motion, if so we adjourn at 6:00 O'Clock tonight period.

MR. HICKMAN: Will the hon. minister permit a Question?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, to ahead.

MR. HICKMAN: I think we have an awful lot of misunderstanding on this.

Mr. Speaker, the trouble is there cannot be any misunderstanding, will the hon. minister state as House Leader that Government policy is, that it will not move an adjournment at 6:00 O'Clock. Government policy. Not a question of committing the hon. members. Not ordinary members, but that

MR. CURTIS: Public Government measure, Mr. Speaker, this is a measure introduced by me, as Leader of the House to try to solve the situation which makes it necessary every Wednesday to have a special motion in order to meet Wednesday night. That is the object of the motion. So it would save what the hon. member for Humber East had on his mind for that. This is purely a motion for the benefit of the private members. It is not a Government measure, all I can say is this, that in all sincerity, the Government wants to meet any night to finish its business. But I am not making any commitment, and I want to be absolutely sure that no commitment on my part to come back on every Wednesday night unless the House wishes.

MR. MURPHY: We all misunderstood it, so we agreed to let the motion to be put today

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. CURTIS: Well all right let it be put.

MR. SPEAKER: Will all those in favour of the motion please say "I".

Contrary "Nay". The House will divide. Call in the members.

Will all those in favour of the motion please rise. The hon. the Premier, The hon. the President of the Council, the hon. the Minister of Highways, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Noel, Mr. Smallwood, the hon. the Minister of Labrador Affairs, Mr. Hodder, Captain Strickland, the hon. the Minister of Education, the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, the hon. the Minister of Community and Social Development, the hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the hon. the Minister of Public Welfare, Mr. Canning, Mr. Barbour, the hon. the Minister of Health, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Mahoney, Mr. Wornell

2163

MR. WELLS: A point of Order, Mr. Speaker. One hon. minister just walked in. I believe it is incorrect that he be counted during the vote.

MR. ROBERTS: Part 5 of Beauchesne, "No point of order maybe entertained during a division. It is in order after the division."

MR. SPEAKER: Carry on. Will all those against the motion please rise. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hickey, Mr. Collins, Mr. Earle, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Wells, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Myrden.

MR. WELLS: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, and before the count is recorded, It would be reported the Minister of Fisheries walked in innocently, I agree, but...

MR. SPEAKER: it is something that actually we do not have to decide on, and it is not important as of now. It is a matter for decision is important. But I think there is a citation which says; members may come back and forth even during a division, the members may come back and forth. I do not think it is in our own Standing Orders; that members may go back and forth during a division. The count again please. I declare the motion lost.

As hon. members already know, of course, in order to put the motion through we have to have two-thirds; which would be twenty-seven members voting for the matter anyway. The next orders, please.

MR. WELLS: A vote of no confidence.

MR. CROSBIE: Dissolve the House. The Government have been defeated.

MR. WELLS: It is a government measure.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, it appears as though the hon. the Premier is not going to go to the Governor as tradition would call for. The Government having lost a government measure.

AN. NON. MEMBER: It is not a government measure.,

MR. WELLS: Of course it is a government measure, introduced by the government, introduced by the President of the Council.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member ~~was~~ is speaking now to number 7 unless he wants to raise a constitutional point.

MR. WELLS: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Hon. members may or may not be aware that prior to coming into the House this afternoon this matter was discussed with the Hon. the President of the Council and I had agreed that had this motion been brought forward, the motion that was just defeated, been brought forward and carried, of course this would have been unnecessary and I would have withdrawn the motion. However, the government did not live up to the undertaking made on behalf of the government by the Hon the President of the Council to assure us that on Wednesdays if there were Opposition matters on the Order Paper ready for debate, or in the course of debate, that there would be no motion to adjourn at 6 p.m. This is now -

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Min. of Justice): The words if there are opposition motions on the Order Paper those words were never used in any discussions.

MR. WELLS: I accept the hon. members statement that those words may not have been used, but it was quite clear, I do not remember the precise words used, but it was quite clear, what the intention was, and this all arose as a result of what transpired in this House last Wednesday.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the debate on that motion is finished and the order now is order seven.

MR. WELLS: This is the purpose of it Mr. Speaker, order seven is that the motion is that on all Wednesdays during the balance of this present session of the House at 6 o'clock p.m. the Chairman, 6 o'clock p.m., the Speaker at 6 o'clock p.m. shall leave the Chair until 8 o'clock. At which time the House shall resume and continue until 11 o'clock p.m. unless sooner adjourned by motion put. Now if the Government is sincere in what it just said a few moments ago, if there is any sincerity there at all this then is what they want. They want the situation

created, whereby the House will automatically resume at 8 o'clock on Wednesdays
But that the Government will be free to put a motion at any time that is what
this would do. They did not want to be placed in the position where they
had given an undertaking not to put such a motion and so defeat the agreement.
They did not want to be placed in that position, and indicated very strongly
their feelings so that this motion that is now before the House would very
clearly provide just what the government wants. To have the House open on
Wednesdays at 8 o'clock, that at 6 o'clock Mr. Speaker, leave the Chair until
8 rather than until 3 o'clock the next day. And the House then resumes at 8
and continues until 11 p'clock, unless, and that is in there, unless it is
sooner adjourned by motion put, which of course, as has been said can be put
at any time. The clear understanding is that the members who sit on this
side of the House will be given ample opportunity to debate the matters they
want to debate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would expect that I will have the support of all
members opposite, in this motion because it is precisely what the Government
wanted. You do not mean to say that ~~xxx~~^{they} are opposed to it, I cannot believe it.
I cannot believe for one moment Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the President of
the Council should stand there and say no, and indicate that he and the members
on his side of the House are not going to vote in favour of this motion that
we meet this Wednesday evening and all Wednesday evenings after.

MR. NEARY: stupidity on the part of the hon. gentleman.

MR. WELLS: The hon. member knows all about stupidity. He has been wallowing
in it for long enough.

MR. NEARY: I have learning it from the other side of the House.

MR. WELLS: He has been wallowing in it for long enough, it is oozing out of
his ears.

MR. NEARY: I have been learning it from members on the opposite side.

MR. WELLS: Now if he will be quiet I will continue with what I have to say.
Mr. Speaker, Look, let us face a basic fact, aside from what went on here
today and aside from what went on here last Wednesday let us face something
rather important, if this House is to have any real meaning or if there is
going to ~~have~~ be any real meaning or significance to sitting on this side
of the House. We must, Mr. Speaker, have ample time to debate the matter

that the members who sit on this side of the House want to debate. Look now at the clock Mr. Speaker, it is five fifteen, there is forty-five minutes left in this day's sitting unless this motion is approved or a similar motion is approved. That is ample time to debate the Bonne Bay Park issue which the Government refused to allow to be debated last Wednesday evening, refused to come back and debate. That is ample time is it not? An hour and fifteen minutes of the time was taken up with answering questions and government statements at the outset, and then the motion of the President of the Council took about the last twenty to twenty-five minutes. That does not leave us very much time, Mr. Speaker. And it does not leave very much time Mr. Speaker, for a rather substantial proportion of the people of this Province to be represented, for their views to be presented to this House or at least for the views of the people who represent them to be presented to this House. This is the way the Government wants to treat the people then I hope the news media will tell them so. If this is what they want to do, fine, go right ahead and do it, but I sincerely hope the news media will be accurate enough to tell the people of this Province that it is government policy not to allow the representatives of about forty or forty-five per cent of the people of this Province to adequately express their views on the matters that they want brought before the House. Because that is precisely what it means. That is precisely what it means tell them everything.

MR. ROWE: Tell them what happened yesterday, that is right.

MR. WELLS: Tell them everything, quite clear what happened last Wednesday afternoon -

MR. ROWE: A hundred per cent, it was not done last night.

MR. WELLS: It was done last Wednesday afternoon, when the Bonne Bay Park resolution was on the Order Paper.

AN. HON. MEMBER: It was not very flattery to the hon. gentleman.

MR. CROSBIE: It was not very flattery to the hon. member ^{the} ~~EX~~ hon. minister either.

MR. WELLS: It was done last Wednesday afternoon, the Government were ashamed and deservedly so, quite properly so, they are quite justified in their shame of having come out, what was coming out about the Bonne Bay Park and that situation. So they did not want it debated, so they closed off debate and this

is what this resolution seeks to cure Mr. Speaker. It seeks to provide an opportunity for the members who sit on this side of the House to represent not to speak for them, because members are here to express their own views not the views of the constituents but it seeks to provide time for the representatives of 40 to 45 per cent of our population to express ~~the~~ ^{their} views before this House. And speak on matters that they feel should be spoken to. Matters that they feel are important. The Government did not want to do it it would not call the order last Thursday, instead it was the adjourned debate on the Speech from the Throne. That is what was called not the Bonne Bay Park issue that people wanted to hear. So I hope the news media get a good accurate report of the Government's position on this and I hope they put it quite clearly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No Opposition present -

MR. WELLS: They are all listening outside - they will be here when the time comes - I suppose they will be. I cannot speak for them I suppose they will be here when the time comes. Any way there are a number of the Government members not here that does not worry me too much either. It does not bother me either.

MR. CROSBIE: There was not enough for a quorum last week, or yesterday.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I know that - tempers have flared a little bit, and the hon. the President of the Council, the Minister of Justice got into a little bit of a tissy as we probably all did over the different, there was a difference or misunderstanding or whatever you call it. It was quite clear that I had the impression from speaking with the Hon. the President of the Council that the Government would not - this was his understanding, the clear understanding that he gave us - this is what we -

MR. SPEAKER (Noel): Order, Order please. We are not permitted to refer to previous debates.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did not resume his seat, to a point of order. The point of order Mr. Speaker is that when Your Honour speaks any hon. member of the House who is on his feet he immediately resumes his seat, he does not stay up while Your Honour is speaking. Is my point of order well taken Your Honour, my point of order?

MR. WELLS: I would like to speak to a point of order, Your Honour, the correct position Your Honour is that when the Speaker stands then the hon. gentleman

yields and sits down , not when the Speaker makes a comment, he would be popping up and down like a bobber, the Speaker just called me to order I am quite prepared to get back to the issue at hand and I do not have to sit down and pop up again. He will learn if he is here long enough.

MR. CALLAHAN: A point of order Mr. Speaker, may I draw to your attention and the House Sir, and the hon. gentleman who just sat down. I think on the day before yesterday Mr. Speaker, explained quite thoroughly why he does not stand and went to great pains to remind hon. members that when the Chair is addressing the House they should sit.

thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, to put it in a nutshell in just a few moments. I will not take longer than that. We on this side of the House, Sir, are asking only this: for a fair and reasonable amount of time to debate the resolutions that we feel should be debated. Now that is not too much to ask for and I think all members opposite should readily agree that that is hardly too much to ask for and in every single Wednesday that I have been sitting in this House, it is not very long. It is only the Fourth Session. It is not very long but every single Wednesday, you do not get to opposition to the private members' business until after 4:00 p.m., sometimes after 5:00 p.m. and that is quite possible to . It is well after five today. Even on Government Orders Day....

MR. ROBERTS: Private members ask questions ...

MR. WELLS : Wednesday, your Honour, is private members' day and it is fair and reasonable to accord two private members a reasonable opportunity. That is all we ask for. Without the technicalities of having to squeeze in between two speakers to get up and make a motion and make sure that it does not adjourn and then possibly have your motion defeated anyway. This is all we are asking for, fairness and reasonableness.

Now, if there was a misunderstanding between the President of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for St. John's West and myself, if there was a misunderstanding may be it was unintentional, I do not attribute to any ill-will to that hon. gentleman. I have a lot of respect for him. I have a lot of respect for him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, vote again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. member....

MR. WELLS: Nonsense. If he cannot contribute to anything better, I suggest he keep quite. Go back to Port au Port only they will not have him.

That is his problem.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman better keep out of there.

MR. WELLS: Better keep out of there, yes.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, that is all we ask for. Now I realize that what has happened has caused a little bit of ill-will. Tempers have raised a little bit, and I think, perhaps, we should forget that and agree that private members should have reasonable opportunity on Wednesday evenings. We realize that there is every freedom to put a motion and this motion recognizes that because the last phrase in it is: "unless sooner adjourned by motion put." There is ample opportunity for them to put the motion at any time. This just states clearly that the basic opportunity shall be there .

Now, if the Government wants to say, "no, we do not want to give the representatives, of forty-five per cent of the people, the basic opportunity to debate the things that they feel should be debated." Fine, then tell it to the people of this Province and live with it and face it in the next election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I was almost inclined to suggest to your Honour that this motion is out of order. I did not and I do not intend to do so. I say, I was almost tempted to do so, because there is a very striking similarity between this motion and the one the House just defeated.

MR. WELLS: That matter has already been discussed...

MR. SMALLWOOD: A very striking similarity. This motion is identical with the motion that was just debated and defeated except in one or two details, and the details were, of course, as your Honour knows that in the previous motion, which debate was conducted and completed and the motion defeated, in that motion the question of what time of the afternoon the House should meet in the first place and what time it should adjourn at night was dealt with? The essential part of the motion that was debated and defeated was: that Wednesday nights should be treated the same under the rules as Monday,

Tuesday and Thursday nights. If this motion were to carry, the one now before your Honour, it would mean only that Wednesday night would be exactly the same under the rules as Monday night. The same as Tuesday night and the same as Thursday night. In that respect, it is identical with the motion that has just been defeated. This does not give any special status to Wednesday night - this motion now before the Chair, now before the House. This does not give Wednesday night any different status from Monday, Tuesday or Thursday nights. This merely says that the House will meet on Wednesday nights, the same as any other night. That is all it says. It does not give any special status for Wednesday night. It does not give any special right for Wednesday night. It merely puts Wednesday, in the same class exactly as Monday, Tuesday and Thursday nights. There is no difference, and in that respect it is identical with the motion that we have just defeated. Both motions would have made Wednesday night the same exactly, as Monday, Tuesday and Thursday nights. There is no difference, not special, no more, no less right, exactly the same.

If we were to adopt this motion now, here today, it would merely mean that we were changing the rules of the House to say that the House will meet normally and except otherwise changed on any given day, will meet normally Monday nights, Tuesday nights, Wednesday nights and Thursday nights. That is all it does. That is all it sets out to do to make Wednesday night like any other night, but we have just decided, Mr. Speaker, we will not have that. In a motion a few minutes ago, in a vote taken, this House decided that it would not have that.

MR. WELLS: There were other things....

MR. SMALLWOOD: There were two other details as well. This is why I have not risen to a point of order and suggested to, Mr. Speaker, that the present motion is out of order, because the present motion differs from the previous one in two details; namely, that the House should meet at 2:30 p.m. instead of 3:00 p.m. and close at 10:30 p.m. instead of 11:00 p.m.

That is the only difference, but the essential thing in the other motion, Mr. Speaker, I submit to your Honour, the essential thing was that private members' day, which is Wednesday, should be made the same as Monday, Tuesday and Thursday, exactly the same, sofar as meeting at night is concerned. That there be no difference between Wednesday on the one hand and Monday, Tuesday and Thursday on the other. That they both be the same sofar as meeting at night is concerned. How can the House, unless Mr. Speaker the House voted the other motion out, because they did not want to meet at 2:30 p.m., if that was their reason, they did not want to meet at 2:30 p.m. They thought that was wrong. They did not want to close at 10:30 p.m. because they thought that was wrong. If that was the reason for defeating the motion here earlier then, of course, it would be another quintal of fish, a different quintal of fish altogether. I believe, in my heart, that was not the reason. The reason was that Wednesday was to be treated like any other night, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday nights were to be treated exactly alike, which is what this motion does.

This motion is identical with the one defeated with this sole exception that it does not deal with the hour of opening in the day or the hour or closing in the night, and it does not deal with the matter of a quorum. The essential, I will admit that these are important details; I think myself, I would prefer that the House met at 2:30 p.m. and close at 10:30 p.m. in the night. I have a selfish reason for that. I have an hour's drive to get home, when the House closes. I am willing to sit here until 12:00 and when we met until 4:00 a.m., I was here, and I will be here every waking hour the House is in session. For twenty-one years, I have been in my place in this House at 3:00 p.m. until 6:00 p.m., and when the House met at 8:00 p.m. until 11:00 p.m., I was here from 8:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. and every minute in between. I do not leave the Chamber. I am like a camel, seven days. I can go any length of time. So, I am willing to be

here whatever the hour is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had some peevishness in this session that we never had before. There is something different about this session from twenty other sessions before, twenty-one, twenty-two, indeed. We have had twenty-two sessions of this House before the present one, and those twenty-two sessions were quite different from this one or to put it another way, this session is quite different from the twenty-two. There is a peevishness here, Sir, there is a peevishness in this House in the present session. There is an unmistakable peevishness..

MR. CROSBIE: We will see it in action.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And, Sir, this is something that we are not used to. There are people, apparently who are not only willing, but determined to prevent the smooth functioning of the House. There are people..

MR. CROSBIE: Lay a charge.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are people who are quite willing and quite determined to impede, to obstruct the smooth operation of the House, and there are people who will seize upon any chance they can find, any device they can think of, within the rules, and sometimes they are not bothered by the rules, to obstruct the business of this House and this has never been the case before. The Opposition today number five, well they have numbered five before. They have numbered even as many as seven before, and, Sir, with scarcely ever an exception in those twenty-two sessions, the Opposition, the Tory Opposition, the P.C.'s or whatever - I am not trying to insult them, the name Tory is not something to be ashamed of. You can disagree with it. You may not be a Tory. You may disagree with Torism, but it is a great and historic party. It is one of the great parties of the state, the Canadian State, the British State, The Australian State, within the British Commonwealth, the Tory party is a great and historic party and the Tory Opposition in this House, since Confederation came to this moment, has, with scarcely ever any deviation been

gentlemenly.

MR. CROSBIE: And successful.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Been courteous, gentlemenly and courteous and polite and have never set out with any viciousness, never set out with any viciousness whatsoever, never set out with any semi-sain or semi-insain jealousy..

MR. CROSBIE: Not like the Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Never set out with any vindictive hatred. The Tory Opposition have in twenty-two sessions, before the present one, conducted and themselves as gentleman as statesmen.

MR. SMALLWOOD: they have worked with the House not against it. They have tried to make the rules of the House work, not fail. They have tried to have an atmosphere of decency in this Chamber. And they have often done it under provocations. They have often done it under with a sense of frustration, and they often done it when some of their supporters around the Province were hounding them, and vilifying them, and telling them, they should be in this House lamb basing the Government.

But, Sir, in this Session there is a change. There is a very unmistakable change, no one can miss it. You would not be here day after day and miss it. You could not mistake it. It is passible. It is obvious. It is quite apparent, and it is unmistakable. And very ineffective. Effective in obstruction. It is effective obstruction, but it is not effectively helping Newfoundland. It is not effectively helping the functions of Government. It is not helping to get Laws passed for Newfoundland. It is not enlightening the people more than they were enlightened.

MR. WELLS: Thats what it is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, it is a spirit of viciousness that has never existed in the Opposition in twenty-two years before the present year. Now why? It would be interesting to know why. It would be most interesting to know why? What is the difference between the House in the present session, and in all previous sessions since Confederation? What is the essential difference, Mr. Speaker? The essential difference, Mr. Speaker, is that there has now come into this House the one great essential fact of a civil war.

MR. WELLS: A point of Order, Mr. Speaker. A point of Order, Sir, that none of this is relevant to the debate. It is just wasting further time of private members day, and is most certainly not relevant. The civil wars of any particular people are what the Tory Opposition did twenty years ago is not relevant to this debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I want to dignify that interruption by pretending to treat it, as a point of order.

MR. WELLS: Of course, it is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a point of stupidity. It is a point of obstruction.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. CROSBIE: It is a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): A point of order was raised, and I do feel it is getting a little far from the particular subject.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Speaker, when a country, or even a family quarrel, and a family quarrel can be the most bitter thing imaginable. When a nation breaks out into a civil war, you get savagery beyond words. Unimaginably, and unbelievable savagery, and that is the difference between this session and twenty-two sessions before. That is the difference, that is the essential difference. We come here last Wednesday, and in previous Wednesdays, before that without fail, the Leader of the House moved a motion at the proper time, that the House at its rising at 6:00 O'Clock do not adjourn, but resume at 8:00 O'Clock. Now every Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, since the House opened, except last Wednesday and this one, the Leader of the House, the President of the Council, at the proper moment and in the proper way, moved that the House do not adjourn at 6:00 O'Clock. Every Wednesday since the House opened, except last Wednesday, why did the Leader of the House do that? Because someone had to do it, if the House was to meet on Wednesday night. If he failed, if everybody failed to move that motion, then automatically Your Honour would leave the Chair at 6:00 O'Clock, the question not put. And there would be no session Wednesday night.

Now last Wednesday, the Leader of the House, did not move such a motion, no one else moved it properly. No one else moved it legally. No one else moved it according to the rules. No one.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman would not tell us that. He would not inform us, and tell us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now Mr. Speaker, why is it that the Leader of the House last Wednesday did not move the motion that he had moved on previous Wednesdays? The reason he did not do it, that he declined to do it, that he refused to do it, is no failure, it was a very deliberate and conscious decision on his part not to move the House resume at 8:00 O'Clock last Wednesday night, a week ago today.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was a deliberate decision on his party, and the decision was made by him with the complete approval of every hon. member on this side of the House. Never did we approve anything more than we approved the decision of the Leader of the House last Wednesday, not to move that the House should not rise at 6:00 O'clock.

MR. WELLS: Tell them why, now. Tell them why.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And the reason Mr. Speaker, is this, the reason the Leader of the House refused, decided point blank not to do so, and the members on this side approved so heartedly the decision he made, the reason is that at last we had come to the point where being met on every hand, day in and day out, night in and night out, met with discourtesy, met with a blank and flat refusal to co-operate with the Government and with this side of the House, the minister said, all right, okay, if they want to meet tonight let them move it, it is not my duty. It is private members day, and if they want to go on tonight, let them move it. And on other occasions, Mr. Speaker, on previous Wednesdays...

MR. CROSBIE: I was going to ask the hon. gentleman, if he would permit a question. If it is a fact that last Wednesday all members on the other side decided that we were not to meet on Wednesday night, why did not the hon. minister of Health know it when I met him in the Speaker's Office about four fifteen looking at the minutes?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, there was no decision on the part of the members on this side of the House last Wednesday, there was no decision, on the part of the members over here, not to have a session on Wednesday night.

MR. ROBERTS: Is the Premier aware, that when I met the hon. member of St. John's West in the Speaker's Office at 4:00 O'Clock last Wednesday afternoon, I was checking to see what the journal showed the House had to sit, is the Premier aware of that?

MR. CROSBIE: Is the Premier aware of the hon. gentleman told me that he did not know whether or not the Government would agree to meet Wednesday night?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Sir, the reason why the Leader of the House declined, refused, point blank, No, I will not, to move the usual customary motion to

allow the House to meet Wednesday night, the reason he refused to do that and the reason why all the hon. members of this side of the House so heartedly approved his refusal, is this, not only the continued point blank refusal to collaborate, to co-operate with the Government in the conduct of the business of the House, but Sir, this fact, that on two previous Wednesdays, when the Leader of the House moved, the hon. gentleman across the floor opposed. So, he said all right, if that is the way you want it, that is the way you will get it. And he declined to move it, and he did not move it. Now that did not prevent somebody else from moving it. Any hon. member of the House could have moved it, any hon. member on this side, any hon. member on that side had the perfect freedom to get up and say, Mr. Spaker, I move that the House do not rise at 6:00 O'Clock. He could have moved that motion, if he had done it legally. And there is a right way and a wrong way, there is a way to do it in conformity with the rules. There is a way to do it, in violation of the rules. Nobody even as much as attempted to do it on the other side of the House in conformity with the rules. They did not even make the try. They did not even attempt. They did not even stand up. There was not even a hit from them. But, what there was is this, a bulleying attempt made at 5: 45 O'Clock, a completely bulley-boy attempt to get up and bulley his way and stop a minister from speaking.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order, I would like to know how the hon. Premier is referring to?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am referring to the hon. member now on his feet.

MR. CROSBIE: Well then I say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member when he says that lies. lies.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, no attempt was made

MR. CROSBIE: Deliberate misrepresentation.

MR. SPEAKER:(NOEL): Order please. I feel that the statement just made by the hon. member for St. John's West, if I heard him correctly, is hardly parliament, and is hardly the type of remark which is ordinary condoned in the House.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, that allegations that anybody was a bully-boy, or bully the Speaker, or refused to obey the Speaker, is equally unparliamentary. And when that kind of a remark

MR. CROSBIE:

and when that kind of remark is retracted the hon. member for St. John's West will be perfectly willing to retract his remarks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have said -

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): I will have to call upon the hon. member for St. John's West to withdraw the remark.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I have said that the statement by the Premier that there were bully-boy tactics used here last Wednesday is a lie. I have something I cannot retract that my belief is that it is a lie, I am convinced it is a lie, I cannot retract what I believe to be the truth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if I may say one word only. I apprehend that a lie is a statement made or not made, withheld with the intention to deceive. I have not attempted to deceive, I have made the flat and categorical statement that he got up like a bully-boy to try to bully the House and bully Mr. Speaker and bully the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources and bully and bulldoze his way against the rules of the House to make a motion that it was out of order for him to make. That is the statement that I have made. Now he calls that a lie. I had no intention to deceive. I merely state the simple truth as to what happened. Now, Sir, on Wednesday -

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): I cannot allow the point to pass. The hon. member for St. John's West must explain or modify the remark that the hon. the Premier lied.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, for the last week I have been lied about publicly and repeatedly inside this House and out and I do not retract the hon. Premier's statement that I made any attempt to bully the speaker, to bully the House, to bully anyone in this House is a lie and I will never and do not retract it.

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): I regret very much that I am obliged to name the hon. member and to ask him to withdraw.

MR BURGESS: Inaudible.

MR WELLS: That is what we should do to. It is quite clear what the truth is. We have seen very little of it here in the last few minutes.

MR ROBERTS: A deliberate provocation by the hon. member.

MR WELLS: I do not blame him. I see it the same way. We were all here. We sat here in the House last Wednesday. We know there is no truth in what was just said.

MR ROBERTS: I listened to the tape recording.

MR SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if I may resume. The reason why the President of the Council, you see, your honour, the motion we are debating is a motion affecting the House's meeting on Wednesday nights and I am dealing with the history of that, the reason why the President of the Council last Wednesday a week ago todate, did not and refused to move the customary motion is that he had grown to be completely disgusted with the attitude and conduct of hon. members, some hon. members across, not the members of the official Opposition. And on two occasions when he had previously moved on Wednesdays that customary motion, it had been and he had been opposed by hon. members across, some hon. members on the other side of the House. Now, so he refused and no one else did except that one hon. member, as I have already said, stood up in a most bullying fashion and while Mr. Speaker was on his feet and said to him, the hon. member will please resume his seat. He said, "I will not resume my seat, I will not. Now throw me out if you like." Those were his words and Mr. Speaker if your honour wants the official tape that was taken down, brought in and played, it is available I would imagine. I have heard it and so did the Sergeant-at Arms pleaded with him and said, "Silence Sir" and he said that to the hon. member who had just been kicked out.

MR. HICKMAN: Would the hon. Premier yield so that I may make a motion?

MR. SMALLWOOD: To make a motion, certainly not. Of course I will not. Yield so that, give - now this is what the other hon. gentleman tried to bully his way into doing now the hon. gentleman wants to coax his way into doing.

The answer is no, of course not

MR. WELLS: I ask the Premier to be seated on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): The speaker cannot listen to two hon. members at the same time.

MR. HICKMAN: May I rise on a point of order? A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I resent the suggestion or the insinuating that I am attempting to bully the Government into anything. I have listened with -

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said coax. I did not say bully.

MR. HICKMAN: or coax. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the Hon. the Premier who made it quite clear that all any hon. member of this House had to do on Wednesday past was to stand up and follow the proper rule which is to ask to yield to make a motion that this House not adjourn. The point of order is the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that I am now again attempting to break a rule. I am not attempting to break a rule, Mr. Speaker, I am attempting to follow the rule that has been outlined by the Hon. the Premier namely that I stand and ask the Hon. the Premier if he would yield so I can do the very reasonable thing that he suggested should have been done last Wednesday namely move that this House do not adjourn until 6:00 o'clock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I said that on last Wednesday the President of the Council having refused point blank to make that motion no one else made it.

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): Is it the wish of the House to deal with the matter namely the hon. gentleman for St. John's West at this time? I think the rule is that the hon. the member is entitled to be present in the Chamber until the matter is disposed of and he is only required to withdraw while the problem is under consideration and the hon. gentleman for St. John's West is entitled to return to the House at this time unless the House wishes to deal with the question at this time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I know of no hon. member of the House who has the least interest in the hon. gentleman's coming and going. I have not. I know that the hon. gentleman has been manoeuvring all he possibly could to get fired out of the House, to become a martyr. I am surprised he did not have a flag to drape over him as he walked out. No, I have no motion to make, Mr. Speaker. I will go on with my speech if Your Honour permits me.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is this kind of abuse permitted when the hon. gentleman is addressing the speaker on a point of order or a point raised by Your Hon. the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): I think the position is that the Speaker has to name the hon. member and ask the hon. member to withdraw. That gives the members of the House an opportunity to make a motion if they wish relating to the conduct of the hon. member. If no member of the House wishes to make such a motion then the hon. member for St. John's West is entitled to return and the matter is closed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, no martyrdom today. Now as I said, Sir, when the President of the Council refused to move that motion last Wednesday nobody else did properly, legally and in accordance with the rules. There was a proper time to do it, there were several occasions during the day from 3:00 o'clock on when an hon. member, any hon. member of the House on that side or this side could have moved it. Customarily the President of the Council had moved it but he did not this time but this did not stop any other hon. member from moving it. Nobody did until getting up close to 6:00 o'clock in the day the hon. member for St. John's West got up and tried to bully his way into, bulldoze and bully his way in defiance of the rules and in defiance of Parliamentary propriety, he tried to bulldoze his way into getting that motion done then.

~~Do not come back tonight, do not come back tonight.~~

HON. J.R. SMALLWOOD (Premier): Do not come back to night, do not come back tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have concluded my remarks, I do not know if there is time to complete the debate and put the motion, but anyway I have completed my remarks.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on this motion, I think that I am beginning to share the views of a great many people of Newfoundland when I say a plague on both their houses

AN HON. MEMBER: Bags of mail, yeah

MR. HICKMAN: Never mind bags of mail Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here listening to all this nonsensical talk about obstruction. You would almost think that the Opposition was running the House. Did anyone Mr. Speaker, ever take time to think that the Government and no one else dictates the order of business. If except on Wednesdays which is private members day, if the Leader of this, if the hon. the leader of this House on any day of this week says there are laws that must be passed, all he has to do Mr. Speaker is say " I call motion so and so and that is debated. The Opposition have no choice in it, they have no vote on it, they simply have to debate and decide if they so desire as the Opposition has done during this session when good legislation has come before this House, and Mr. Speaker, other than that dreadful Interim Supply Bill, I cannot recall any other law that has come before the House during this session that any member of this Opposition has voted against. I cannot remember of one, I am waiting for the hon. the committee member from St. Georges to stand and tell us of one Bill that we have voted against. I cannot remember on one occasion any indication from any member on this side of the House that there would be an objection to the Leader of the House calling any Bill for debate, or passing any law. It is completely, and absolutely, and unqualifiably Mr. Speaker within the hands and the discretion the absolute discretion of the Hon. House Leader to call the business of the day and to decide what laws are going to be debated.

The Opposition has no right in this Mr. Speaker, nor has the

Opposition ever objected, but simply we have waited Mr. Speaker, day after day to hear the business of the House called, to hear the people's business put before the House and Government has not done it. We have to sit and listen to this half-witted nonsense Mr. Speaker, and that is all it is. Waves of hatred, name calling that has been going on in this House, not as bad a situation since Confederation when a couple of hon. members got into a kicking in this House Mr. Speaker.

Let us make no mistake, it has not been ruled by angels for the last twenty years. I think that the public will remember a rather unusual wrestling match that went on in this hon. House as was reported in the press about fifteen years ago on the Javelin Railway debate. I think they will remember that, but Mr. Speaker, do not, do not

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): That is imagination

MR. HICKMAN: Well whether it is imagination or not Mr. Speaker, do not let us ever walk out of this House thinking that things have been sweetness and light, and do not let us walk out of this House with anyone, leaving anyone in the press gallery or anywhere else with the idea that anyone but the Government has the right to call the business of this House. Of course it has, we could have had every twenty-five or forty Bills debated and passed if they are worthy of passage and most of them would appear to be, long ago signed by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, long ago if we had so wished.

HON. E.M. ROBERTS (Minister of Health): Hon. members opposite have disputed that right.

MR. HICKMAN: Not if we had so wished Mr. Speaker, but if the Government had so wished, and the only day Mr. Speaker of the week

MR. ROBERTS: Look at last Thursday's Hansard and see if the hon. gentlemen opposite moved motion

MR. HICKMAN: Of course they did, they were in order but they disputed the Government's right to call

MR. HICKMAN: But it is still the Government, the Government Mr. Speaker has not called them

MR. ROBERTS: Of course we have

MR. HICKMAN: They have yet to call them. What about the other forty Bills that are on this Order Paper that have never been called Mr. Speaker, and I am getting sick and tired of this half-witted nonsense that we have been listening to in this House.

MR. ROBERTS: No more sick and tired than we are

MR. HICKMAN: And Mr. Speaker, if answering questions, if trying to get information for the people of Newfoundland is obstruction, than I am an obstructionist. But Mr. Speaker, in sitting in this House and debating, or waiting to debate the proposed laws of this land, if I was guilty of obstructing that then I would be a real obstructionist.

But Mr. Speaker, this is not the kind of obstruction, if there has been it has been coming from this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, we could have been here, we could have the address and reply over weeks, and weeks, and weeks ago Mr. Speaker but four hon. gentlemen had to go away. It was as simple as that.

MR. EARLE: We did not need a twelve hour speech

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman spoke, he only had the first opportunity to speak Monday past. A week Monday in the Address and Reply. We waited for three weeks, three weeks, the laws that now we hear should have been passed. Half of them were on the Order Paper then Mr. Speaker and they could have been passed even before the long adjournment that took place at that time.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I say that the people of this Province are getting a little bit fed up. They find it hard to believe, very hard to believe Mr. Speaker, that the Government has lost control of this hon. House to such an extent that it can no longer bring on and do the business of the country if it wanted it done. But Mr. Speaker, that is only part of this motion. It is not that relevant really because, I was not the one that raised the irrelevancies, I was not the one that talked about the bullies and all this sort of nonsense that has been going on in this House day after day, after day.

The motion that is before this House Mr. Speaker, I gather it is now 6:00 p.m.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow
at 3:00 p.m.