



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

Volume 2

2nd Session

Number 62

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

Friday, April 27, 1973

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL**

The House met at 11:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. J.C.CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): I would like to table, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the accounts of crown corporate agencies, boards, authorities and sundry funds administered by the province for the fiscal year that ended March 31, 1972. This is a companion volume to the public accounts and it contains the audited statements of the various crown corporations and agencies. There are copies to be distributed to honourable members.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. S.A.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industrial Development. I am sure, Sir, that the honourable minister is hanging right on to his seat there wondering what it is that I am going to ask him. I would like to ask the minister if he would inform the House if the government received a year ago a proposal from Canadian Javelin to construct a railway in Western Labrador to move iron ore from their holdings in the Julianne Lake Area?

HON. C.W.DOODY (MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT): Mr. Speaker, we received several proposals from Canadian Javelin about a year ago, about twelve to be exact. We just left a meeting with these gentlemen and they agreed to resubmit most of their proposals on a more rational ground. Some of the problems that we incurred on the way through in dealing with their previous applications were such things as - they had two different railway alternatives and a slurry pipeline envisaged and they applied for the rights-of-way for all three. There were a few other large areas - they wanted the complete water rights for the watershed for up there, but now they have agreed that this is not necessary and so on. We did receive

such proposals and the company is resubmitting another proposal shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador North.

MR. M. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism. Since he is not in his seat, I will direct the question to the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation. I have had representation from the sports commission of Goose Bay re the visit of the Canada Hockey Team this summer to St. John's and I have been asked if the House or the minister would permit or ask permission or try to have the team visit that area. They have agreed to put on some recreation for them - possibly a fishing trip in our great lakes, if they did go up. I would like to ask the minister if he would consider asking the team if they would like to go to Goose Bay and be entertained.

HON. J.G. ROUSSEAU (MINISTER OF RECREATION AND REHABILITATION): The honourable the Premier has already sent an invitation to the Canada Hockey Team and there is an indication that they are coming. At the present moment we do not know on what date and which people will be here. We have had a number of requests from various communities around the province. We will contact, possibly Mr. Eagleson, I would think, and attempt to determine where we can get some of these gentleman to visit while they are here. Certainly I will pass along to the Minister of Tourism, who is now handling the total picture, the honourable member's request and see what can be done to that effect. I would suggest, if I may, that the honourable member might write a letter making it a formal request to the Minister of Tourism.

MR. MARSHALL: Order (3), bill no.(11).

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Registration And Regulation Of Credit Reporting Agencies." read a third time ordered passed and its title be as on the order Paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The St. John's Housing Corporation Act." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Establishment And Operation Of Public Parks By The St. John's Municipal Council." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Establish The Newfoundland Crop Insurance Agency." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The St. John's (Metropolitan Area) Act." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Telegraph Tax Act." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Local Government (Elections) Act." read a third time ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Social Security Assessment Act, 1972, The Act No. 56 Of 1972." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Revise And Consolidate The Law With Respect To The Marketing Of Natural Products." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Gasoline Tax Act." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The City of St. John's Act." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Provincial Parks Act." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Welfare Of Neglected Adults." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Disposal Of Waste Material."

MR. HICKMAN: There is something wrong with that. Respecting the disposal - "An Act Respecting The Disposal Of Waste Material."

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Disposal Of Waste Material." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Social Assistance Act." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Revise Existing Legislation Respecting All Terrain Vehicles." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Memorial University Act." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Trustee Act." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting Historic Objects, Sites And Records." read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the order paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting A Public Service Commission For The Province."

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before we read the bill a second time there are a few preliminary remarks that I would like to make concerning this particular bill. In the first place the general principle of this bill is to establish in this province an independent public service commission along the same lines as the similar, kindred commissions that are in existence with the federal government and in many of our sister provinces. It also contains provisions to engrain into the method and mode of appointment of civil servants the merit principle. The provisions are set forth there in the type of detail, as they ought to be, of the mode and manner by which the merit principle is to be arrived at and the regulations under which the commission is going to operate.

It is also of significance, and I will go through certain parts of this bill that require and need probably more detailed elucidation, that this bill is contrary to the previous existing Civil Service Commission Act and will include virtually all civil servants except those that are listed in a certain section to which I will refer in a moment.

Now, turning the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, to the bill itself: What we have in effect is the strengthening of the professional aspect of the civil service itself.

Permanent employees of the civil service will be appointed by a commission and the commission will be appointed from the public service, which will have executive experience, and one of whom shall have served in the public service for at least ten years.

Now I might point out that in reviewing similar legislation in other provinces, we found in one province, I believe it was in

British Columbia, where all of the commissioners had been appointed from the established civil service, but only in that province. In the federal government they were just merely appointed by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council without any stipulation as to where the compliment of the commission was going to be drawn from. We considered this and considered this fully and we thought that while we will be giving preference with respect to all three appointments to applications from the civil service, that we should not perhaps at this stage be bound to accept all three from within the civil service itself but certainly at least one of them. As I say this does not mean that more than one will not come from the civil service.

The commissioners are given, Mr. Speaker, under this bill, under section (6) of the bill, security of tenure in the same manner and given the same status as the auditor general, the comptroller of the treasury, in other words that they are servants of this House. While their salary is set by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council, there is a protection there in section (6) to the effect that the salary may not be reduced by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council but it is set by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council. In other words it is an effective attempt to make the Civil Service Commission a truly independent body that can operate in an independent manner unfettered by any extraneous influences.

Now I draw the House's attention also to the sections appearing on pages nine to eleven of the bill concerning the appointments and promotions. This provides that there be no appointments or promotions within the public service except on the recommendation of the commission itself. Now that is extremely important, that there are to be no appointments or promotions to posts within the public service except on the recommendation of the commission. This is one of the failings of the previous act wherein there were many, many categories exempted from the ambit of the public service or the then Civil

Service Commission. There were far, far too many and the result, well I do not think it profited us this morning, with the fog disappearing from the hills, to speculate on the results that occurred. But I think everybody really knows the results. The position here is that within the public service, under section (14) of the bill it is provided that appointments within, appointments from without and promotions from within shall be on a merit system. There are provisions in this bill for the procedure of setting up adequate examinations, for the cataloguing of various positions in the civil service and the general approach to the appointment in the civil service itself on a merit basis.

There is another item that I would draw to your attention: Included within the ambit of this act at the initial stages are going to be all of those posts, all of those departments that are listed in the first schedule. In the second schedule there are those yet to be included and the reason for not including them all is that when we are starting up something that is going to be in this province, really, without casting any dispersions whatsoever on what exists, something relatively new, there has to be ample and adequate time for the commissioners when they are appointed to set up the commission on a fair and equitable basis. They are going to have to do an awful lot of study and they are going to have to do an awful lot of preparation. It was felt, after due consideration by everybody, that the departments in the first schedule are the only ones that they can handle justifiably at the present time. Now it is significant to note that at the present time many of the posts in these departments do not even come within the ambit of the present Civil Service Commission but it is the intention as soon as possible and as soon as feasible to include the items in the second schedule into the first schedule of the act and there is a provision to allow the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council to do just that.

There are also exempted from the provisions of the act



certain categories that are set forth in section (5) of the act and these are normal, usual categories such as deputy ministers and associate and assistant deputy ministers that are normally and usually exempted from the provisions of similar acts such as this. There was a certain amount of difficulty in determining when the cutoff point should be, whether it should come, as obviously I think everyone will concur that deputy ministers have traditionally and should remain the appointment of the premier of the province and in consultation with the ministers responsible. There was a certain amount of debate as to how far down the line should this go.

It comes in this bill down to assistant deputy ministers but the government has authorized a policy statement to the effect that when an assistant deputy minister is employed that the selection will be made from a panel of ministers who are not the minister concerned himself in order to make it as fair and as equitable as it possibly can be.

This is an extremely important bill, Mr. Speaker. In the preliminary remarks and perhaps I could expand quite a bit more on them but as I say the purpose of the act is really to appoint an independent public service commission. This bill has been gone into and studied by committee after committee. It has been almost strangled from time to time in red tape before it came to the position where it now is. It has received the study and we have received the views of all sectors and segments of the government and the public service. It enshrines the merit principle and as

I say, it includes all civil servants or all public servants as they are referred to and it is in conformity, Mr. Speaker, with the report of the Royal Commission on Economics Prospects.

I do not think we can let the opportunity really pass to show exactly what this bill is intended to replace. Now, first of all, may I say at the outset, before I make these remarks, we have heard an awful lot of remarks made that I specifically myself and I know many people on this side of the House object to violently, with respect to this person and that person being a political flunky or this person or that person being a political party hack. This bill will exclude certain - I should add this - excludes in the act certain contractual employees. It is obvious that when a government takes power there have to be certain political appointments. Now this is not in the Crassus way that the opposition have put it from time to time. This is not for the purpose of political patronage as such but in the way our system operates, our government operates or any democratic government operates, you, as a political party, have to have certain employees with respect to the carrying on of certain policies. These are, Mr. Speaker, in this bill, dealt with. They will be dealt with. They are not as many as are pointed out by the opposition. They are on a contractual basis. So, the succeeding government will not find or us when the time comes and the contract expires, we will be able not to renew the contract or the succeeding government, when it comes in, if it wants to renew a contract to somebody, it may. The individual who is subject to the contract knows he has it for a specific term. His employment is for a specific term and it may not be terminated.

Unfortunately, and I say this, when we came to power there had been - I do not think anyone will deny this after twenty-three years - there had been more political appointments to the public service than there ought to be. We should never really get to this stage. A person in the public service is in a professional position. It is a pretty frustrating thing for a man when he gets up to forty

and forty-five and he is looking forward to the next step upward and his superior, whoever it is, happens to retire and he finds somebody taken in from the outside and put above him. Now this could still happen but it would happen on an independent basis by the Public Service Commission purely and solely after considering the merits and abilities of the person to discharge his duties, and on no other basis. So this will end this procedure then forever and a day.

Now at the come-back, I do not want to delve into personalities and individuals such as the opposition has with respect to people from time to time. I think we do have to note that with the present Civil Service Commission we have as the chairman of the commission a former member of the government, a man I might say who when I was on the opposition side I found to be a thorough gentleman and a fine man and a great fellow. However, the fact of the matter is when you are talking about an independent Public Service Commission, I do not think that this type of appointment should really have been made because, the old saying, not only must justice be done but it must appear to be done, and it does not invoke confidence in the Civil Service Commission. I say that with absolutely and completely no derogatory attitude at all towards the gentleman concerned, the chairman of the Civil Service Commission who was himself, before he entered politics, a civil servant and is undoubtedly a fine gentleman. The same way with the other appointments that were made. One of them had been - it is necessary to say this and I would not know these other two gentlemen if I tripped over them - one of them had been a former candidate in the Gander by-election that occurred in 1967-1968 and another one had been actively engaged, I believe, politically in Grand Falls. Nothing against them for this. More power to them, but it is necessary in this province to appoint a Public Service Commission that is completely and absolutely independent and has the confidence of the public.

Not that these gentlemen would not have the confidence of people per se but as I say, the confidence of the general public with respect to it. We have to, as I say, strengthen the base of the public service.

We come and I make one reference and I would like to make a reference because I think it is significant, with respect to the present operations of the commission, just to point out the necessity from an independent viewpoint of a change. These were references in "The Economic State and Prospects of Newfoundland" the commission that is often reported from time to time, which was independent in nature. On page 482, with respect to the general government and administration, it said that over the years the Civil Service Commission, with a staff of at the most four or five, was almost completely relegated to the minor role of recruitment into the junior ranks, and then they made comparisons with other provinces. It went on to say that by default the departments have assumed considerable recruitment responsibilities of their own. There areas of free choice have been widened considerably by taking advantage of section 6 of the Civil Service Commission Act, quoted above, which allowed the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council to exempt certain categories or posts from the ambit of the act.

It is significant to note in this act that that provision is not here. The Lieutenant Governor-in-Council, the Cabinet, has no right to exempt from the ambit of the provisions of the act any categories that come within the area. This is an independent as I say, truly a sincere attempt to appoint an independent commission. The consequences have been, the report considers that over seventy categories, and that was up to the date of the report which was the end of 1967, over seventy categories or posts had been specifically exempt from the ambit of the Civil Service Commission. So that in actual fact what the Civil Service Commission was doing was considering appointments to relatively junior and minor posts, and in certain cases they had been exempted from the provisions there.

It goes on to say that it is impossible to know how many persons had been thus exempted. The range of posts is very wide indeed including, as it does, professional, technical employees as well as positions of clerical or administrative nature.

At the policy level of government it is clear that those persons working in the administration who are closest to the government must be in general accord with the government philosophy. That is an allusion, of course, to the necessity of having a certain amount of political appointments, to use the word of the other side, but they are not political appointments as such. They are appointments made for the purpose of carrying out the policy area of the government which has been elected. This fact is acknowledged and provided for in other civil service acts without wording similar to section (6) quoted above. We have provided for it here with respect to the areas of contractual employees that do not come into the permanent civil service, that are easily able to be changed when their tenor expires.

Similarly, in a province such as Newfoundland it may be to the province's advantage to hire technically qualified people on a short term, contractual basis, recognizing that professionals are highly mobile individuals uninterested in a classified civil service job with a comfortable pension on retirement. One is less confident however about exemptions for positions of a clerical or administrative nature. The door seems open for political patronage. That, Mr. Speaker, is in essence really what happened. The fabric of the civil service has to be strengthened and this is certainly one manner of doing it.

I will reiterate again that we had an awful lot of talk on the other side, from the nervous Fellies whom we got in, about the fact that there was going to be great witch hunting and what the heck have you. There was, Mr. Speaker, no witch

hunting as such. We saw when we came in that there were people who had been appointed on a basis, let us put it that way, than merit, who had been put into the permanent civil service as such. As such there was and there really is no means whereby they can be nor would we want to interfere with the civil service as such. The fact of the matter is that this type of procedure has to stop if we are going to progress in the manner in the province as we must. We must have a strong, independent civil service in which the public has confidence and which has confidence in turn in the public's representatives, their elective representatives.

I do not think there was anything that probably the other administration had done which - or the other crowd over there as the honourable member refers to from time to time - which is more degrading and probably more damaging to the morale and to the general economic, social, political well-being of this province than the procedure which had grown up of exempting from the ambit of the working Civil Service Commission, such as it was, so many positions and the consequential appointment on basis other than merit itself.

Now, in concluding, I might say there is also a section in this bill to the effect that this act has yet to be proclaimed. It will be proclaimed as soon as possible but there is still a reasonable amount of work that has to be done. It took quite a long period of time in order to come up with the draft which is now before this House. I might say there will be certain amendments in committee stage that have been suggested by the various bodies, that the government has accepted, which do not affect the principle of the bill but probably make its working more effective. It has to be proclaimed. As I say, there are regulations that have to be drawn up. The appointments to this body will be from people who are recognized as such, as being thoroughly and completely independent, untarnished, if tarnish is the word (it is not the word to use) with no political involvement whatsoever, but who are appointed on the basis of

their own merit and their capacity to invoke really and foster and strengthen the merit principle of appointment and promotion within the civil service, and no other basis. These regulations have to be drafted. The independent commissioners have to be appointed. When we are ready to take that next step, then obviously the legislation will be proclaimed.

Finally, also I might say, it is by way of a personal note, that this bill in essence contains the same germ of a bill that was introduced by myself when I was in opposition, that the present opposition then defeated. It will be very interesting to see now whether they are really going to support the position set forth in this bill, in other words, whether they have had a change of heart or whether they are going to support it.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding I will say that I feel that this bill is a bill that goes a long way and perhaps it can go a long way further and certainly the door will not be closed to examining, to see how it operates and to see whether it needs to be strengthened. If it does need to be strengthened, it will be so. In the meantime, I am happy to present it to this House for second reading.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if you would call it a change of heart or not but we do not disagree with the principle of this bill. The bill itself, Mr. Speaker, is not all that the minister paints it to be. There are too many outs in this, Sir. There are too many exemptions. For instance, contractual employees are exempted from this bill, temporary employees, seasonal employees and part-time employees. There are still, Sir, all kinds of ways that the hiring of people, political appointments can be manipulated, despite what the minister says. The bill is good as far as it goes, Sir, but I think the government should have gone a step further.

Now, the minister talks about political appointments to the Civil Service Commissions. Well, Sir, this bill is no different than the old Civil Service Commission Act in as much as the

Lieutenant Governor-in-Council will appoint the members of this commission. That could be construed, Sir, as being political. Nothing wrong with that. That is a fact of life. That is the way it is. Nothing can be done about that. Nothing wrong with it, Sir, unless we do away with our political system and set up a dictatorship. We do not know who these gentlemen are going to be. I hope there will be a lady on the new commission. They have to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council and that is the government and the government are politicians. So what is so different about that than the way it was done before? Well, the minister laughs at that. Well, the minister will be one of the ones who will be called to make a decision down there on the eighth floor. I am sure that he might be influenced in some way or other by what the Minister of Finance will have to say or the honourable the Premier will have to say about who goes on that committee. The minister is a politician, I believe. The way the Minister without Portfolio talks about politician you would swear it was a dirty word.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot compete with whatever is going on out there in the corridor. It sounds like somebody is cracking the whip.

So there is really not that much difference in the old Civil Service Commission Act, which is going to be repealed and replaced by this. It is merely an updating of the old act. It was badly needed and we agree with it in principle. It is something which NAPE has been fighting for for some time.

Well, Sir, I would not apologize for the fact that it is politicians who have to make the appointments. The minister today is so self-righteous over there, so sanctimonious, talking about the opposition involving personalities. Twice in this House, Sir, we saw the minister drag in a member's mother and then drag in a member's father and then have the gall to accuse the opposition of dragging personalities into this House.

Well, Sir, sometimes you cannot help bringing personalities into it. You cannot help it sometimes.



I only wish this act could be retroactive to January 18, because, as it was pointed out by the Minister of Education who was flung out of the cabinet, that honourable crowd over there could teach Joey new tricks. So they could, Sir. We have seen more political appointments in the last fifteen or sixteen months, per capita, than we have seen in twenty-three years in this province.

It was drawn to the attention to the Premier here, on one occasion, about the wife of a well-to-do lawyer. You should have seen the honourable Premier trying to weasel his way out of that one, Sir, taking on the wife of a well-to-do lawyer, without going to the Civil Service Commission, for \$8,00 a year - completely demoralizing the staff of the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

What happened over at Exon House? The story was never told. What happened over at City Welfare on Harvey Road. These were not people taken on on a contractual basis - these were put in civil service jobs.

That is something that we never did, Mr. Speaker. Granted, we were probably guilty - I was myself when I was minister of the department - of exempting certain positions from the Civil Service Commission. That is the way things were done. Sir, we never, to my knowledge - Yes, we did on one occasion, and the Minister without Portfolio was in this House, and what a fuss he raised about it. It was an appointment down in the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources to a civil service post that was not advertised. That was the only time in twelve years that I have been in this House that I remember that matter being raised, Sir, and the gentleman today has got a promotion. He is promoted and working now for the Department of Rural Development. That was the only time to my knowledge, Sir, that it was done. It was wrong. It should not have happened.

It was equally as wrong probably to exempt positions from the Civil Service Commission so that the department could have a free hand to hire the kind of person that they wanted to hire. So, in that respect, Sir, it is an improvement. With my old trade union background, Sir, I have no choice but to go along with

this because anything that would eliminate abuse, anything that would eliminate getting a job based on court relations, religion, because you belong to this organization or that organization or you belong to that society or this society, whether you are wearing that kind of a ring or this kind of a ring - never did agree with it, Sir. It is against my old trade union principles. That has been happening. I would say most of the abuse and hiring practices in this civil service are not the fault of the politicians at all as my honourable friend would lead this House to believe. The fault rested, I would say a good many times, with the top civil servants bringing in their friends and relations. The politicians had to bear the brunt of it, had to accept the blame for it when this happened. I never did agree with it. I did not agree with it when I was in the trade union movement. As a matter of fact if my honourable friend had seen the contract that I negotiated with DOSCO maybe he might be able to improve on this bill today. This is the sort of thing that I hope that this bill will get at. The politicians are not as guilty now, as the Minister without Portfolio would lead this House to believe. There are other people who are more guilty, pick up the phone and call and say, "Me son" or "Me daughter". Son of a well-to-do lawyer - I have seen them - who get the jobs in the summer time in this province. Summer relief? The sons of the well-to-do people, the lawyers and the business men, they pull strings. I know. I had the pressure on me when I was minister down in social Services and Rehabilitation. You would be surprised, Sir, how they could worm their way in. Fantastic! I could resist it but they would manage to get in there some how or other. They would pull a few strings. Move around in the right cocktail set and you had her made, your son or daughter was on for the summer. They did not need the jobs. The poor, old people of this province who are struggling to try to educate their children and put them through, their sons or daughters did not get the jobs and they are not getting them today.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Name names.

MR. NEARY: Name names? No, the minister said he did not want personalities brought into this House. No, Mr. Speaker, I would not stoop to that level in this honourable House.

So, Sir, I hope that this bill will plug some of these loopholes. I have no doubt but it will but there are still a lot of outs in this bill, Sir. The minister has left it wide open and exempted the Premier's office. The Premier's office is exempted from this bill. She is well blocked down there now. It will be as big as the United States Army probably after this piece of Legislation goes through and anybody that comes along looking for a job in the future will be stowed away down in the Premier's office. It is so big now, Sir, that the Premier is talking about putting up a new building. This building is not big enough. He is moving the minister down in the Phillip Building down here on Elizabeth Avenue - even put in a new executive privy for him down there a couple of weeks ago, so I have been told. Afraid of the bacteria in the ordinary persons privy down there? They had to knock down walls and partitions.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is not true.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is true. Spent two or three weeks down there drilling holes and knocking down walls to get an executive privy in for the minister. He has come a long way from Duff's Supermarket.

Sir, I am sure that NAPE will welcome this piece of legislation. I approve of the principle of it. Probably the most significant aspect of it, Sir - the minister did not mention this at all - is clause 20, offences. Just listen to this, Mr. Speaker. "A person shall not directly or indirectly endeavour to influence improperly the commission, any member of a board of examiners referred to in section 15 or any employee of the commission with respect to the appointment of himself or any other person to the

public service or with respect to promotion of himself or any other employee in the public service . (2) any person who violates any of the provisions of subsection 1 is guilty of an offense and liable on summary conviction of a fine not exceeding \$500 and in default of payment to imprisonment for a term not exceeding thirty days."

Well, Sir, if that is strictly enforced half of that honourable crowd on the other side of the House will be imprisoned before a month is out. They will all be wearing their striped suits with their number across the front, Sir. I would like to know what is meant, I would like for the minister to explain what is meant in this clause by improperly. Does that mean now that if my honourable friend from Harbour Main has a request from one of his constituents up there for a recommendation, for a job in the public service, that the minister cannot sit down and write a recommendation, that could be misinterpreted? Could that mean that he is using improper influence on the commission?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Is that improper? I wonder.

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not know. I would like to know what - maybe it will not be improper if the members of the government do it. If the members of the opposition do it you might be wearing handcuffs, Sir, before the stamp is on the envelope.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Does the minister take any glory for ramming those down our throats?

MR. NEARY: I know the minister tried to ram the estimates through the House, \$600,000,000 in -

MR. ROBERTS: The least successful house leader we have ever had, Sir.

MR. NEARY: That is right. God, how we miss poor old Les Curtis in this House, Sir, how we miss him.

So, Mr. Speaker, I contend as good as the bill is, there are too many exemptions in it. There are too many outs. There are too many ways left open to ministers and their officials to

manipulate people into jobs. The minister is trying to tell us this is all finished, no more political appointments. Nonsense, Sir. Absolute nonsense. The thing is left wide open. All this act has done, Sir, is to do away with exempting jobs outside the civil service. That is about all it has done. It has laid down a penalty for anybody who might try to unduly influence or improperly influence the commission.

I would like to know, Sir, if a phone call to the chairman of the commission; 'My name is (-). I represent the District of Bell Island in the provincial House of Assembly. I had a phone call this morning from a young lady who is interested in a job as a stenographer in the Minister of Finance's office. I wonder, Sir, if this young lady will be getting an interview with the commission?' would that be improper? What is improper? The minister has dealt with this. Will he tell us? Especially now, Sir, when the vocational schools are closing, I will be getting numerous requests from young men and young gentlemen who will want a letter of recommendation. Would it be improper for me to send the letter of recommendation to the Chairman of this commission? I would like for the minister to tell us whether it is or not.

You talk about fairness in this province, Sir. You will be afraid to sit down and dictate a letter, afraid you might wind up in the hoosegow. So, when the minister is closing this debate on second reading I would like for him to explain this part of the act because it is going to affect my honourable friends over there as much as it is going to affect me. - more so. The only thing is that the government in power has the majority. They can abuse their majority any way they want to. They can come down on poor old individuals like us over here like a ton of brick. The minister has to approve the action. The minister is not going to give his consent to prosecute the Minister of Finance if he is asked to recommend a man for a janitorial position

down at the General Hospital as he was asked to do the other day because I sent the gentleman to him. He came to see me and I said "Who is your member"? He did not know it first. He lived up at Buckmasters Circle. He did not know who his member was. I must confess, Sir, I did not know either. I had to do a little digging before I found out that it was in the district of St. John's West. I said "Well, go and see your member."

I presume he went down to see his member. It would have fixed him up down there cleaning up the privy. I have to come down and see that. I have heard quite a bit about that new executive privy down there, Sir. It is coffee talk. Down in the barber shop, they are all talking about it. You could not hear your ears down there for two weeks with the drills going. I do not know if they have heated toilet seats there or not, Sir.

But, Sir, the principle of the bill is sound. We welcome it. It has not gone far enough. There are some things that have to be explained by the minister. The minister talked about this administration not going on a witch hunt. It is taking them a little while, Sir. They have learned their lesson about witch hunts and about police raids and all this sort of thing. They learned their lesson about that. The backlash they got was tremendous. It was terrific, Sir. Their popularity zoomed downward overnight. The Minister of Finance has learned that witch hunts do not pay off. He has learned that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Wait.

MR. NEARY: No, we will see. There are going to be a few more witch hunts. But, Sir, the Minister of Finance has had his eagle eye on some of these appointments, like the Civil Service Commission and the Workmen's Compensation Board and all these. He has had his eagle eye on it. He has had his periscope up. It was not a psychological moment to zero in on these. They are taking the long way around, Sir. They are down now off Australia with this bill - down off Australia. They are getting there. By the time they steam up the three present sitting members of the Civil Service Commission will be replaced by political appointments. Oh, yes, it is true. They will be replaced by political appointments. The minister has not told us what will happen to these honourable gentlemen, whether they will be retired, pensioned, given new jobs or just what will happen to these gentlemen. I would like for the honourable minister to explain that when he closes the debate.

With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anything else that I can say about the bill except we approve of it in principle. We wish it had gone a little further. Maybe when we take over two or three years from now, we will put some teeth into it ourselves.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for just a few brief moments on this bill which has been introduced here and worked on by the honourable House Leader for some time. This is a major step forward, Mr. Speaker, despite what the honourable gentleman for Bell Island has said. Any similarity between this bill and the Civil Service Commission Act is certainly purely coincidental. When you look at section 12 and section 13 of this bill, it is revolutionary in this province anyway, I do not know if there are similar sections in the other provinces. It says: "No appointments nor promotions to posts within the Public Service shall be made except on the recommendation of the Commission." That is completely different from the situation which existed under the Civil Service Commission Act where in the first place positions could be exempted if the government decided they should be, and that decision was frequently made. One of the reasons why that decision was frequently made, Mr. Speaker, was that the present Civil Service Commission has no expertise whatsoever in the field of personnel management nor in the field of examining techniques nor in any of the skills which are necessary if you are going to decide on appointments on a merit basis or promotions on a merit basis. The new commission to be appointed under this act will have to have these skills and will have to employ staff who have these skills or this will not work at all. By the passage of this act it becomes mandatory that the people appointed to the Public Service Commission must be people appointed on the basis of merit in the first place. It will only be political appointments in the sense if the government appoint them. It would be far too dangerous for any government to appoint two or three political appointees, to reward somebody by appointment to this commission, because they could make a shambles of the whole civil service.



As far as I can see, Mr. Speaker, there is going to have to be somebody appointed to this commission from outside the province, somebody who has experience with the federal government or one of the other provincial governments, in the field of personnel work and in the field of this kind of work. Somebody with a lot of that kind of experience is going to have to be appointed and I do not know whether we have anyone in the province now with that kind of experience. I can assure you that this government are not going to be silly enough to do anything other than appoint three very able people to this Public Service Commission, because the results will be a shamble for the government and for the civil service if they do not exactly know what they are doing.

Under section 13, Mr. Speaker, a revolutionary change, "All appointments and promotions to posts within the Public Service shall be made from within the Public Service except where in the opinion of the Commission, it is not in the public interest to comply with this requirement." It is not for the government to decide. It does not say, "where in the opinion of the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council it is not in the public interest." It says, "except where in the opinion of the Commission it is not in the public interest." We are going to be completely in the hands of this commission as to whether appointments and promotions must be made from within the public service. The bill is a complete departure from the past practice.

I also regret, Mr. Speaker, that when an attempt is being made to change or reform a situation, it should be met with such cynicism as the honourable member for Bell Island demonstrated and as some of the media may demonstrate. We all know that it is possible to get around any piece of legislation. It is a question of how easy it is. Under this particular act here, it is going to be impossible in most respects to get around it at all. It exempts very few positions from the purview of the Civil Service Commission, only contractual employees or some employees in the Premier's Office, seasonal employees and temporary employees. Otherwise everybody is subject to this act but with the

exception of deputy ministers and assistant deputy ministers whose appointments are the prerogative of the Premier; private secretaries, executive special assistants, the staff of the Lieutenant Governor's establishment, chairmen and members of boards, firemen, policemen and penitentiary staff. There are very few exceptions. This is a revolutionary departure and instead of being met with any degree of cynicism at all, I would think that it would be much more wholesome for us to see what happens in the next year or two once this act is proclaimed and the commission is appointed.

Mr. Speaker, if there is going to be in this province a continual attitude on behalf of the media (I am thinking in particular of one paper) to any moves made to change things and to any reforms that are brought in, whether they are conflict of interest or whatever, then it will become obvious to everyone that it is useless to attempt to make any changes; that you are going to get no credit for it; that your motives are going to be doubted; that it does not matter what you attempt to do, for motives and sinister intentions are going to be ascribed to you and therefore, the only conclusion for politicians to come to will be that it is useless to attempt to make any changes because you will get no credit if you do. I hope that that is not the way that this revolutionary legislation is met with.

The honourable gentleman said that he hoped that one of the members of the commission would be a lady. Well I would be all for that if we can find a suitable woman for one of those three positions. She certainly would have to be qualified. As the honourable member, the House Leader, has mentioned, there is no way of bringing anybody out from under the ambit of the act. I have had doubts about the wisdom of that but that is being decided, therefore, we have to make sure that the Public Service Commission is a top-notch one.

The honourable gentleman wondered what is improper influence. Well improper influence is certainly not one of us writing this commission

and recommending John Jones or Shirely Jones for a position, because the commission will just file that away. They are not going to pay any attention to it anyway. An attempt to improperly influence the commission would be to phone them up and threaten them, "If you do not appoint so and so, I will certainly make it hot for you" or "I will try to see that you are not reappointed or that your staff will be cut down or some action like that" or "We will get you when we get back into power" or some statement like that, some threat or improper suggestion or promise of a favour if they deal with that person. That is improper influence. We are all going to be perfectly entitled to suggest to the commission that if somebody approach us or one of our constituents that his application be given serious consideration. There is nothing improper in that. The commission will proceed on and make its own decisions. It is quite clear, I think, what improper influence would be. It is attempting to promise a favour to the commission to get them to appoint someone or threaten them, if they do not appoint somebody, then you are going to make it, in some way or other, difficult for them. I think that that is clear, what is meant by improper influence.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is a completely revolutionary departure. I must confess that I have some fears about it. It will be a success if we have three good people and a good staff for this Public Service Commission who know what they are doing. The promotion is going to be by merit and there are to be written examinations, tests and the rest of it. They have to know what they are doing. They have to be very skilled in this kind of work and this is what we have to look for. The government have nobody in mind as yet. We have no one in mind for either one of these positions. A search is going to have to be undertaken now, within the next couple of months, to find the right people. I congratulate the House Leader on all the work he has done on this. I hope that we will be successful in getting good people and that they will emulate the Federal Civil Service Commission and have a record as good as theirs. I very seldom heard the Federal Civil Service Commission criticized.

I think, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that this is a major step forward in this province.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take the opportunity to congratulate the honourable Minister without Portfolio and the House Leader on bringing in this progressive legislation. In spite of the cynicism with which it has been met on the other side, I think it is indeed a very progressive step. I do not think any of us on this side or on the other side are inclined to think that we have struck the millennium by any means. We know that any particular legislation is not going to be the do-all and cure-all for everything that has happened in the past. It is a major step forward and it is certainly a step in the right direction. I might say that going back a little bit, the former government were indeed very fortunate in inheriting from the Commission of Government days some very well-trained and extremely able civil servants. Fortunately, some of them are still with us. These men were extremely well-trained in their particular fields and they have been of invaluable service to the government. Unfortunately, some of their best efforts were frustrated by the kind of staff that on occasions they had foisted upon them through favoritism and other means. It was a very deplorable situation which developed over the years.

I think the previous government made one very wise step, during the term that I was with them, in the public administration service which was appointed to classify the various positions in government and to bracket them. There has been a lot of criticism about this but it has accomplished a great deal and will be of inestimable help to any public service commission in being able to put people into the appropriate slots and to avoid putting square pegs into round holes. At least all of this preliminary work has been done and it is much easier today to find the correct place to put people on application for particular jobs, because these have been pretty clearly described and pretty clearly designated. I think that that was a major step forward, in spite of

the criticism and sometimes apathy with which that move was met. But as the honourable Minister of Finance has said, the success of this particular commission will depend entirely on the type of people who are appointed to head it up. It does not matter how good or how able they are, with a vast civil service of 8,000 employees there will be no three men selected that will have the ability themselves to classify and select the people for all the positions in government. Fortunately, the way that this thing will work, they will have available to them the most expert advice, which I am sure they will take, on the various positions which are to be filled. They will be able to draw upon experience and advice from people who know the type of person and the kind of person who is required for any particular position. I am sure that if this is properly functioned, with the proper person at the head, it will have a very great effect in upgrading the civil service and not only that but in encouraging those who are presently in the civil service to feel that merit will count for something and that in their positions they have a very good chance of advancement and promotion and that their positions are secure as long as they are able to do their job properly and are properly qualified for these jobs.

It is I feel a great step forward. Although it may take some time to see how it functions and how well it functions, at least the preliminary steps have been taken to have a good functioning body; to have a good organization and to have it working properly. I predict that in the field of civil service that this measure today will be hailed as a great step forward, particularly by the union movement which is now taking such great stronghold in Newfoundland. The civil servants themselves, who are becoming pretty well organized, I think in future years will themselves determine that the conduct of such a body and the methods of promotion and selection within the service will be properly and honestly adhered to. Frankly, I would like to see this sort of development because I think that the people who work for us and those who have been with us for so many years are themselves really the best qualified to give advice on the positions that have to be filled. I am sure their advice will be sought.

I can only conclude by saying that I think it is a most progressive step and I support it thoroughly.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, there is one feature of this legislation that I think deserves a minute or two of comment and that is the provision with respect to the duties of the commission. The duties of the commission to be created and appointed under this act include the laying down of standards and procedures to be followed in the recruitment of candidates for the public service. To me we have been woefully lacking in our approach to the general public with respect to civil servants and the civil service and the public service generally. I would like to see a commission with the expertise and the enthusiasm to be able to convince young Newfoundlanders, young, highly educated Newfoundlanders, that they will have a great opportunity to serve by seeking employment within the public service of this province. Part of the reason why we have not seen the enthusiasm that is so desirable is that Newfoundlanders are unaware of the opportunities for promotion, the opportunities for, not so much decision making because that has to be always done by the politician, input into the final decision that emanates from those who have been elected to make the decisions.

If you go to almost any high school in the province, where they have a careers night, you will see all the professions represented. You will see the Armed Forces, the police and others outlining to Grade XI students, who are about to graduate, the advantages of entering their particular avocation. I have never seen that same kind of input from the public service or the Public Service Commission mainly I suspect or one of the reasons is that we never had a commission set up in such a way that this could be done. We are starting to attract into the public service of this province some very capable, young Newfoundlanders. The Minister of Finance in particular has been exceptionally fortunate during the past year in attracting graduates or recent graduates from the university into the public service. If we can get a message across,

that attitudes should change. How often do you hear, "Well, if I cannot get a job in a particular profession or with a particular industry, I can always take a job with the government." This has been the theme for years. I suggest that one of the reasons for it is that the public generally are not aware of the great contribution that civil servants are indeed making to this province. They look upon them as people who have to bear the brunt of criticism, sometimes from a public that is not aware of their responsibilities. Quite often a civil servant has to carry out duties that deep down he may be in disagreement with, but that is not his prerogative. Decisions are made by the elected representatives of the people and the civil servant carries them out. Quite often, in the performance of his duties, he will come under criticism and this too does not help in the image of the service. By the same token, it has to be realized that competent public servants are placed in the position where they can exert a great deal of influence on the decision-makers of this province. If they had the capacity and the ability to do it, then there is a great deal of information, and new ideas which have come up through the long line of succession that you find within the public service.

If this commission can succeed in making the public service the kind of profession that young Newfoundlanders want to join, then apart from all the other good things that this bill envisages, I believe that this will be one of the most important features of the legislation that is before this House.

I too join with the other speakers in supporting the legislation. There is more to it than simply standing in the House and saying; "Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation." It should go further than that approach. What we have to do is to tell it as it is.

This is a good bill. I seriously doubt that there is a public service act in any of the other nine provinces today that is as good as the bill that is before the House - maybe because this is the last one. We have the advantage of learning from omissions of other legislation or

the difficulties that their commissions have found in operation. Be that as it may, it is good legislation; it gives the public service tenure of office and it ensures that if the qualifications are there, promotion will come in due course.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House is a welcomed one. It is unnecessary to say that because it has been stated already. It goes without saying that something had to be done sooner or later to try to put a semblance of order into the public service of this province. But like any other bill, any other act, any other piece of legislation, it is only as good as the people who are charged with the responsibility of administering that act. It is a sad commentary, I think, upon the state of the public service today, as the honourable Minister of Justice has said, that so many people have this feeling that to enter the public service is the opportunity of last resort, so to speak, that if you cannot go anywhere else, you can always go to work for the government. I think this has been caused primarily because in the past so much influence has been had on the public service by politicians, political favoritism and all the rest. We are gradually getting beyond that stage.

The public service is the backbone of the government. Politicians will rise and fall, ministers will come and go but the civil servants stay on. If there is not some kind of pride in the work, some kind of sense of being able to do a good job and being recognized as having done a good job, then we are not going to attract the kind of people into the civil service that we need. There is a notable lack of esprit de corps. I think this bill will go a long way toward generating that esprit de corps that is so necessary. The only thing I have to say that has not already been said is that the whole act will be worthless unless the commissioners themselves are the kind of people who have the vision to make the public service that kind of instrument that it deserves to be; that a young person entering the service or a person who has spent twenty-five years



in the service can look upon it with a little bit of pride and satisfaction. The key to the success of the whole act, Mr. Speaker, is going to be the calibre of the people that are charged with the responsibility of administering it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may add a few words to what has been said: First of all let me say, as my colleague, the member for Bell Island, has said, that of course, we support the bill. I think it is quite a good bill. Many honourable gentlemen on all sides of the House have said that. It does not need to be said again by me. I do, however, want to make two or three points which I think either have not been made or have not been made with sufficient force or sufficient elaboration. First of all, I was quite taken by the Minister of Finance's meditations upon the way in which proposals for legislation, proposals for new policies, proposals for new programmes, the way in which these were received, either by people on this side of the House or by the press or I venture to suggest by the people of Newfoundland at large, I was quite taken by it and I think there is a lot of truth in what he said, that almost any time a proposal comes up, somebody, be it on this side or be it in the press gallery or be it in an editorial capacity in one of our press, be it the newspapers or be it the electronic media, the television and radios or if not that general great court of public opinion that in my eyes is always symptomized by the public meeting in Northeast Groais, which is a small community just directly across from Southwest Groais, better referred to as Back Harbour, Conche. There were six or seven families there. Sir, they sit around, in my example, and they are representative of a great many people in Newfoundland, Sir, and they greet this with outright cynicism, to use the minister's word. It is a good word. He went further. He said; "almost enough to make one not bring in reforms." That is true. I do not think for a minute that he would be a quitter. There are men on the other side

who are quitters. I do not think the honourable gentleman from St. John's West is one. Whatever his failings, whatever his faults, whatever they may be (there are one or two of them I venture to say), he has a bulldog persistence and he does not quit. It has nothing to do with personalities. It is an attribute to the honourable gentleman's public career that I happen to admire. If the honourable gentleman for St. John's North had one-fortieth of the persistence, not to mention one one-hundredth of the ability that the gentleman from St. John's West has - the gentleman from St. John's North would not have been the only person since Confederation to be dismissed from a cabinet without any reason at all except, one assumes, general, incomplete and utter incompetence. I mean, to be humiliated in the way in which he was is. However, why flog it? Let the dead bury the dead."

I was also, Mr. Speaker, quite taken by the Minister of Finance saying that he gets discouraged or upset (I am putting words in his mouth but I think I have the thought captured accurately) by people sort of trying to question his motives. I do not know whether he said his motives but the motives of those who believe in bringing in new legislation or in making new programmes. I sat and listened to all that and I agreed with every word of it. It may be, Mr. Speaker, a symptom of a malaise in the body politic in Newfoundland or it may be general, I do not know. We sometimes, Sir, in this House get too parochial. We sometimes think that we are the only House that has difference of opinion or we are the only House in which harsh words are said. If honourable members opposite were to sit down and read the Hansard from Ottawa or the House of Commons, (I am sure the gentleman from St. John's West does and about the only one on the other side who reads it) would realize - if they read the Hansard from Westminster - Your Honour has just spent three weeks in the Mother of Parliaments and I am sure Your Honour would be the first to say that occasionally harsh words have been known. There have been some other instances. Winston Churchill once threw an inkwell

across the House - no, -I am sorry, it was the Standing Orders. Winston Churchill threw the Standing Orders across the House of Commons, at a gentleman who was tormenting him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Somebody threw an inkwell in the House of Assembly here.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, yes there were all sorts of things done in the House of Assembly. The point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that if in Newfoundland we have this, it is not unique and if we have it in Newfoundland to an extent greater than is natural or inevitable, we have it because of the political events we saw for the last four or five years. I am not standing to complain.

and I am not going to stand to say that my colleagues are blameless. Of course we are not. We have sat here now for a year and a-half, Mr. Speaker, and we will be here for another two or three years, until the honourable crowd opposite get up the nerve to go back to the country. Then we shall see what happens. We sat here and we heard our motives questioned, I heard my father attacked personally and falsely, completely irrelevant to anything. I reacted angrily to it, I should not have been angry I realize but there you are, there are some things. We have had our motives questioned, I have been blamed for acts that went on ten or fifteen years ago, the gentleman from St. Barbe North has been blamed for policies that his father brought in fifteen or twenty years ago, the gentleman from Bell Island has been accused of everything and has had to go to the extent of demanding a royal commission which will either prove his innocence, which is what it will do on the evidence that I have seen and what I know, or it will condemn him.

We sat on the other side, Mr. Speaker, but Your Honour was not then a member of the House. We sat there for two or three years and we heard motives questioned, we heard cynicism, we heard in every corner of the land, we heard it being spread that we were all corrupt, crooked, did not...

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: There we are! That is exactly the sort of thing that I am talking about. The gentleman from St. John's North is one of them. I do not stand to complain. That is part of the political game and if the other side choose to make it such, we will live with it. I am not complaining about that, if I were not willing to accept it I should not be in this House, I should leave it, I should not offer myself for election.

If the Minister of Finance feel at times that people look upon any politician with a jaundiced eye, he should look in

his own mirror as well. If the gentlemen opposite feel that their programmes are being treated with cynicism they should look to their own record, Sir, because the record of this administration in the year and a-half or the year and whatever it is that they have been in office has been as besmirched as any record. We have not brought out one-thirtieth of what we could have brought out.

The gentleman from St. John's North leaves the cabinet and says (I believe I am quoting him accurately) that this crowd could teach Joey Smallwood tricks about patronage. We have not brought out one-thirtieth of what we could bring out. We may not have brought out one-tenth of what we shall bring out. We have seen patronage on a scale that rivals anything the Liberals did or are alleged to have done. I did not hear the gentleman from St. John's East speak this morning, (I was off talking dentures with my dentist, who, by the way, is not in favour of the denturists if there be any question on that or any thought on it, so I did not have the pleasure of hearing him) but I gather he was up to his usual tricks. Let me say now, if there were patronage in the past, if people feel there was unfair political patronage, let us have an investigation. Let us have another royal commission now. We have had the manure spread, we have had the excrement spread all over everybody. Let me make a statement:

I became Minister of Public Welfare in July of 1968 and I was minister of that department until June of 1969 when I became Minister of Health. I was Minister of Health until the administration left office in January of 1972. Those two departments, Mr. Speaker, are among the largest department in the government in hiring, the Health Department in particular. It was not as large then as it was previously and it is not as large now as it was then, because the Waterford Hospital has come out, The General Hospital came out before my time but, even in my time, the Health Department hired three or four thousand employees. Now it must be what? Fifteen hundred?

Two thousand? About two thousand. It is a large department.

The Department of Welfare, as it was then called, and it has gone through a number of name changes since then, Sir, like the chameleon shedding the skin, it is still the same chameleon.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: That is seventeen hundred or eighteen hundred employees? I will make the flat statement that there was no political patronage that the minister was aware of. I can remember one case at the Brookfield Cottage Hospital where I intervened. (If the Minister of Health wants to speak to the officials, the associate deputy minister would be aware of it, where I said; "I make the appointment or the cabinet make the appointment, put this man in.") There was some doubt as to who should go there. It is the only case I can remember in two or three years, three and a-half years.

Let us have an investigation, let us get to the bottom of this, because once again we have seen everybody tarred. We have heard the hair-shirt from Fortune Bay get up, the man who was flung out of a cabinet, let it be recalled, flung out of a cabinet, humiliated, He was put out for a cause whether one agreed with it or not and one can argue that point. Now all we hear is how he was against everything. The man sat and he took the Queen's shilling year after year and then when he was put out it turns out that he was against everything. That is an example of courage.

The gentleman from St. John's West had the courage to leave the cabinet, the gentleman from Burin left the cabinet. That is fine, that is the honourable and courageous thing to do but we have heard that everybody was patronaged. I know of none. I asked my colleague, the member from Fogo, if he recalled any during his three years in the cabinet and he said; "Yes, there was at least one case." I said; "What was that?" He said; "We made Mr. Rupert Prince the fisheries development authority and that did not go through the Civil Service Commission." And it did not. I have no

idea what Mr. Prince's politics are or if he has any. He was with the Federal Civil Service but he came with us. That was a definite political appointment in that it was made at the political level. Mr. Smallwood, and I think Mr. Aiden Maloney was involved. Was Aiden still in the cabinet then? Aiden had left the cabinet but he certainly was consulted when Mr. Ross Young died and there was a great, gaping hole in that section of the administration.

That was political. It was not partisan but it was political. We have heard the brush smeared - well I make the statement now, let us have an independent investigation. Let us see, if we want to go back twenty-three years, fine, if we want to go back two hundred and thirty-five. Let us go back, say, ten years and let us look at every appointment made in the civil service or the public service at it is now called, every single appointment, every one. Honourable gentlemen opposite may scoff at this and scorn. I have the most to lose one would think, I am leader of the party which was in office for almost all of those ten years.

Let us go back to March 31, 1963, ten years ago. I first came in on the government payroll the year after that, May 1964 or June of 1964, whenever it was, so that there may have been many things happen that I do not know about even during the eight or nine years I was involved in the executive branch of the government. Let us have an investigation and let us once and for all lay this ghost, if it is a ghost. Then we will know, we will know how much partisan patronage there was. Let us find out for once and for all. Do we not owe that to the people of Newfoundland?

The Minister of Finance gets up and makes a very good point, that cynicism greets every act of government. I say that may be inevitable. If it is not inevitable, it has been caused in Newfoundland by the partisan controversies of the past few years and by the acts of this administration since they have been in. I

can name a dozen appointments that this honourable crowd have made, Sir, that I suspect were not strictly on a non-partisan basis. That is fine. So I make the statement; let us have, let us set up, let us get somebody in from outside the province and let us take every appointment made, every one and let us find out...

MR. CARTER: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. ROBERTS: No, I would not. Yes, okay! Go ahead! Sure! I am all benevolence this morning.

MR. CARTER: Is the honourable Leader of the Opposition now prepared to take full responsibility, political responsibility for all the enormities of the Smallwood regime?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman opposite is the best example I could conceive of what I meant when I said that there is a reason why we have cynicism and imputing of motives in Newfoundland. I am leader of the Liberal Party, I shall be leader of the Liberal Party until the Liberal Party choose another leader which may be tomorrow or twenty years from now. I am the political heir of Mr. Smallwood, as leader of the Liberal Party, and I am quite proud of that. I take full responsibility for what went on when I was a member of the administration, if I knew of it or not, even if it has been misrepresented in this House by honourable gentlemen opposite. That is all I will say, it is all I need to say.

The day confederation came, the 1st. day of April, 1949, Mr. Speaker, I was eight years old. Eight years old, eight and a-half years old. If the honourable gentleman opposite want to think I am responsible for what happened in 1949 and 1950, let him. The people of Newfoundland know what to make of the honourable gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, let there be an investigation. Let us have it out. For once and for all let us settle this question. Were the Smallwood years - was it true that you could not get in the civil service unless Joey put you in or unless you paid off somebody? I know of some appointments that were made, of course. Of course I do, just as I know of appointments that honourable gentlemen opposite



have made. That does not particularly concern me nor bother me. There was an appointment made to the Medical Care Commission yesterday - a very fine lady. It was announced yesterday, I do not know when it was made but as I heard on C.J.O.N. yesterday morning, a well known Progressive Conservative supporter in Central Newfoundland was appointed to the Medicare Commission. It then went on to quote the Minister of Health. I do not think the Minister of Health put it out. The lady has been president of the Progressive Conservative Womens' Association in Grand Falls, the soul and heart of it, for a number of years.

I do not mind that, she is a good citizen and will probably do a...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Of course she has. Mr. Gillett, who was there before her, we appointed. As far as I know she had no partisan awareness one way or the other but was equally involved in community affairs and I am sure did an equally good job on the commission. I hold no grudge against the lady, I am merely pointing out that - "Let he among you that is without sin be the first to cast the stone." I do not begrudge it at all, that is legitimate spoils of office. As my friend the former member for Bonavista South would have said, "The 'spiles' of office go to the victor."

Mr. Speaker, let us find out for once and for all, let us, if honourable gentlemen opposite want to They have been saying for years, they have been spreading this myth, cultivating it insidiously, then let us get to the bottom of it. Let us find out. It would be very interesting. I would be very interested to see, so I make that little offer today. I do not really expect it to be accepted but if they really have any desire to improve the quality of public life in this province, either they will stop the sort of thing they have been doing or they will put it to the test. I stand here willing to put it to the test. If the honourable gentleman from St. John's North is worried about responsibility, I know what I am

saying—

AN HON. MEMBER: What about cost-plus?

MR. ROBERTS: Anything the honourable gentleman wants to talk about, I am quite happy to - quite happy to. Sure!

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Newfoundland Leasebacks?

MR. ROBERTS: We will talk about all sorts of things. If the honourable gentleman want to, we shall. We will also talk about Mr. Saunders. We will have a long chat. There are lots of things we can talk about. We will talk about Archibald's Inn, we will talk about the curious goings on at the Carbonear Hospital and we will talk about Burgeo. If the honourable gentleman want to talk about Halfway House, I am quite happy to - quite happy to. I am quite willing to talk about anything, Mr. Speaker, quite willing to.

Mr. Speaker, let me say one other thing about this bill. It is a point that was made before and I think it is worth making once more for me, and if other members want to speak, of course, they have the right and they should. This bill is a paper tiger unless the commission are the right men. Because, Sir, if the commission, if the commissioners and the Minister of Finance made the point, the gentleman from Labrador South made the point and maybe other honourable gentlemen made the point, if the commissioners want to take the teeth out of this act they can, simply by that clause (13) that the minister read. It is as wide open, Sir, as the narrows should be if it were not for the fact that they are blocked with ice. You could drive a garbage truck through that loophole. "All appointments and promotions to posts within the public service shall be made from within the public service." That is magnificent. I am not so sure I agree with it completely but it sounds magnificent. Mandatory, "SHALL" then it goes on; "Except where in the opinion of the commission it is not in the public interest to comply with this requirement."

Mr. Speaker, if the commission choose, that one proviso

could destroy entirely and completely this act. I am not opposed to having it in there because I think it is a reasonable proviso. As a matter of fact, I think I am with the Minister of Finance; I am not so sure this act can work. I think in its full rigor it may very well be unworkable. I speak as one who was involved for seven or eight years at certain management levels, not in the public service, I was never a public servant but seven or eight years of being at the management level in one way or another. I am not so sure this is workable.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure that we have not taken a step back to one of the nasty hangovers from commission, the old departmental boards. Because I notice that while the chief executive officer may not participate in the recommendation of the commission, he does have the right to be represented and to be present at the interview with the right to participate in the interviewing. That is section 15(2). Mr. Speaker, that could, and I am merely pointing out danger, it will again underlie the importance of the commissioners - that could lead us back to the situation we had in Commission of Government where each department was a chiefdom unto itself and you could not get anywhere. If the deputy minister crossed you or if you crossed the deputy minister, you might as well leave, you were finished. I can name cases of that too, if we want to talk about things that have gone on in the past, some from my own personal knowledge and many more in law would be hearsay but I believe them. Just because they are hearsay evidence does not make them untrue.

Having the departmental people present may mean that in any given competition - sure he has no right to participate in the making of the recommendation but you are not going to tell me that if you have three civil service commissioners, Your Honour, and one or two or three of them sit in on a selection board and the chief executive officer, a deputy minister is there, true he cannot take part in the decision but he can take part in the interview, you

are not going to tell me he is not going to have a very great influence. If we have two candidates up before him and one happens to be a friend of that gentleman from the department and the other is not, I leave it to Your Honour to imagine what will happen. That did happen in the commission. It was one of the real weaknesses in the public service as the Commission of Government set it up and as was carried out in the first years of Confederation.

This underlines to me, Mr. Speaker, the crucial importance of the commissioners. I am not going to say that the Act is a bad one, I think it is a good one, but no judgement as to the merit of this Act is worth a damn, Mr. Speaker, until and unless we see how it is implemented. The act, very wisely, will come into force only on proclamation. I assume that means that until the government have the commissioners they will not proclaim it. That would be wise. The Minister of Finance says that they have not even anybody in mind. I believe that as a statement of his knowledge, I am not so sure he is aware of what is going on throughout the administration but to the best of his knowledge nobody is in mind. I note with interest he is not the minister responsible.

The calibre of the commissioners will determine whether this act is a good one or not. I do not think anybody in the chamber, Sir, or anybody in Newfoundland should be fooled or under delusion for any jot or tittle of time, to use that infamous phrase. If the commissioners are able men, if they are men of the calibre of - Mr. Avery has gone over to the Liquor Commission, as president of the corporation, I guess. the marketing, the merchandising business, the booze shops. That is fine. A capable man, I have every faith in him. If they are men of that stature and calibre, this will be a good act and it will work. If they are not, if they are men such as some other gentlemen who have been appointed by the present administration, then this will be disaster.

We shall have to wait and see.

There is only one other point I will make, Sir. I am delighted to see that it is no longer possible to exempt posts from the ambit of the civil service commission. I think that was the legal or the technical term. This was one of the great weaknesses in the old act. If the old act should be condemned on any one ground principally, in my view it is not partisan patronage because I really believe it when I say I do not think there was a great deal of it. I do not think there was any more than we have seen since the 18th. of January, 1972. I am willing to put that to the test by asking for an independent investigation. We will stand or fall by that. The weakness in it was, posts were exempted from the ambit of the civil service. I do not know this for a fact, I have never had it checked, I do not know where to look to check it but I would be willing to wager a considerable sum, Mr. Speaker, that as of today the only posts the civil service commission interview for are the stenographers and clerical and that sort of post. Almost every department at one time or another over the past few years, and the trend is still going on, it has gone on since January 18, 1972 just as it went on before that, almost every department has succeeded in exempting or having cabinet exempt almost every post they have from the ambit of the commission.

All of the welfare officers, all of the medical officers, all of the educational people, in department after department after department, all the lawyers - now that was the weakness in the act, not that it opened to partisan interference but rather that it opened to departmental patronage. That is where the patronage was. My friend from Bell Island says; "What ring did you wear? What school did you go to? When do you know? You have an uncle in the service as a clerk, grade IV; fine, we will get you a clerk grade II." That was the patronage. "Forked in" was the phrase they use - a less delicate phrase to exactly the same effect which I will not use, I do not know if it is unparliamentary but I suppose it is not overly

decorous. That is where the bulk of the patronage was and I fear this bill still preserves it. Although they have ended exempting posts from the ambit of the commission and that is a good thing, there is that massive loophole of section (15) of chief executive officers being present either personally or through delegates.

Having said that, I still think it is a reasonable clause to put in but it is open to possible abuse. Once again, it will depend on who the commissioners are and how they approach their duties. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the few remarks I was provoked into making by honourable gentlemen opposite. I shall doubtless provoke the gentleman from St. John's East into making a few remarks. I hope he will take me up on my request that we have an independent investigation. Once again today we have had it spread about: "All the dirty Smallwood Liberals! You could not get in unless you gave Joey money," all that sort of thing; let us put it to the test, let us find out.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Nobody said; "Unless you pay money." Nobody said that but that was the impression. The hair-shirt from Fortune Bay was at it again. He was opposed to everything when he was there except he did not have the courage to say so. I sat in cabinet with the honourable gentleman for a year or so as did my friend from Bell Island, my friend from Fogo and my friend from White Bay South. But anyway I do not want to. Why, leave the poor fellow alone; he has to live with himself and that is enough!

Mr. Speaker, I mean it when I say this myth is around, let us find out if it is a myth or not. The gentleman from St. John's West has put his finger on it when he says that this has perhaps helped to poison the political atmosphere in Newfoundland. Let us put it to the test. It is not a witch hunt. Let us, just for the historical record, have it laid out. Was it true or not? Was there patronage and if so, who was responsible? Was it the ministry?

Was it the Premier of the day? Was it the ministers of the day? Was it the civil service of the day? Was it the deputy ministers? We could go through the civil service, find little echelons. It is amazing what you could learn.

Watch deputy ministers sit down - talk about summer jobs, Have you ever seen deputy ministers create summer jobs for their children? I have seen it and heard about it, Mr. Speaker.

Having said all that, I do think it is a good bill and I think it is a step forward. It is a logical outgrowth of what has come on in the past few years, the classification plan, PAD Division, the strengthening of treasury board, all that sort of thing. Whether or not it will be of benefit to the people of this province and to the public service of this province will depend entirely on the commissioners to be appointed. The government will really have to stand or fall on that and we will have to suspend judgement on the merit of this piece of legislation and the merit of this so-called reform until we see exactly what the government do by means of the people whom they appoint.

I hope they will appoint them quickly and I hope they will get them to work quickly, because there is a job to be done and the quicker we can get at it the better. I shall vote for second reading, Sir.

MR. MARSHALL: Just a few closing words, Mr. Speaker, first of all I had no -

MR. NEARY: Before the honourable minister begins could we have a quorum count? Could the Clerk count the House, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Clerk count the House, please? There is a quorum present.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, most that needed to be said is already said but let me first say that I have no intention whatsoever of addressing myself to the exhibition of political paranoia that was exhibited by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition with respect

to investigations and the years gone by. The Leader of the Opposition together with so many of his colleagues belong to an era of the past and quite frankly, I cannot wait until the next election to see them recede into the past permanently.

With respect to this particular bill itself, I just on summary would agree with the observations made by most members and in particular the member for Labrador South and the Minister of Finance...

MR. NEARY: Count the House, Mr. Speaker. Count the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Clerk please count the House? There is a quorum.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour.

MR. MARSHALL: I agree as I say, Mr. Speaker, with the observations made by the honourable the member for Labrador South and the honourable Minister of Finance as well as many others who have spoken in this debate, that this commission or this bill will be as effective as the commission which is appointed. It has already been indicated that the government fully intend to appoint people who can do the job. The member for Bell Island, in his usual fashion, made cynical references to the fact that we are going to appoint - there are going to be political appointments. He said that you cannot avoid political appointments. Sure they will be but it is not going to be politicians in the sense that the honourable member for Bell Island was attempting to insinuate.

The only thing that had any merit at all in the observations of the Leader of the Opposition was the danger with respect, or the weakness in connection with the chief executive officer and the reference to the Commission of Government. I think he said that he agrees to this procedure and it is necessary. An independent commission should be able to get the benefit of the views of anybody. As for resulting in a hierarchy such as there was in pre-Commission of Government days, I would remind this House that what this bill does is attempt to really address itself to observations



that could become pertinent again in years to come, such as were put out in the Amulree Report at the time when we gave up our independent status in the 1930's and there was a large size, a great deal of criticism about the operation of political parties. One party would come in and turf the other supporters out of the government and back and forth. That is not the way in the twentieth century that a public service can effectively operate and therefore, underscores again the dire necessity of increasing and strengthening the fabric and the professional status of the civil service itself.

With respect to the observations concerning a lady on the commission; well, it is not precluded in this bill. Maybe there will be three ladies on the commission. We will not select a lady for the sake of selecting a lady nor a male for the sake of selecting a male. They will be selected on the basis of ability.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say in summary that this bill appoints an independent public service commission, stipulates the mode and method of effectively providing for appointments from outside and promotions from within to be on the merit principle. It includes all civil-servants and effectively cancels the very invidious proceedings which had occurred, of excluding, allowing the cabinet at will to exclude certain provisions from the ambit of the act and generally is a sincere attempt to, as I say, strengthen the public service. It will be as effective as the commissioners appointed and the regulations promulgated with respect to it but we intend to see that that is done with the same degree of care as the bill itself was formulated.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting A Public Service Commission For The Province." read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, tomorrow.

On motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Provide

For The Control Of Alcoholic Liquor."

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move second reading of this bill. I think, at best there are two bills here, this bill (107), "An Act To Provide For The Control Of Alcoholic Liquor," and the other one which is really a complimentary bill, (106) "An Act To Provide For The Establishment Of The Newfoundland Liquor Corporation." I think the easiest way to debate this is to debate them both at the same time, if that is agreeable to the House.

MR. ROBERTS: They are really the same.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I think that these are very far-reaching and well worth-while changes that provide for well worth-while changes in the whole field of the sale and control of alcoholic liquor and beer in the province.

MR. CROSBIE: The general principle of these two pieces of legislation is this, that we are going to separate the business of the merchandising and sale of alcoholic liquor and beer and wine from the business or the field of the control of the sale of alcoholic liquor, beer and wine.

The functions of issuing of permits, of inspection of premises and of transfer of licences, everything to do with licencing will come under the jurisdiction of the Newfoundland Liquor Licencing Board which is provided for in bill No. 107.

The business of carrying out the government's monopoly in the sale of liquor, beer and wine in the province will be handled by the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation which is provided for in bill No. 106 which is now before the House.

The reason for this, Mr. Speaker, what we need is a corporation which provides for the efficient operation of the business of the merchandising of alcoholic beverages, beer and wine. The purpose of which is to raise revenue really for the government of this province. That business does not have to be associated with the business of licencing and granting licences for the sale of beverages and in fact it is much better to separate the two.

The act for the establishment of the Newfoundland Liquor Licencing Board provides that there is to be a full-time chairman and two part-time members, a very important feature.

MR. NEARY: I wonder could we have a quorum of the House, Mr. Speaker? Could the clerk count the House?

MR. SPEAKER: Would the clerk count the House please?

There is a quorum.

MR. CROSBIE: That is very good of the honourable gentleman to be so thoughtful. There will be a full-time chairman, Mr. Speaker, and two part-time members on the Newfoundland Liquor Licencing Board. They are to be appointed for a term of three years and to serve during good behaviour. So they are not just appointed at the pleasure of the Crown, so they will have some independence.

MR. CROSBIE: I am on the most important change in that connection, Mr. Chairman, and that is that the legislation provides for or continues the business of the fact that you had to advertise before you get a licence. That if there are objections and the board feel that a public hearing is desirable that the people who object to granting them a licence will have to come before the board, present their objections at a public hearing and the person who is applying for the licence will have a right to answer the objections raised by the people who are protesting against the granting of a licence.

As the House knows, the previous practice under the previous legislation, still in effect now, is that people can object to the granting of a licence, their names do not have to be disclosed to the people applying for a licence. It can be done anonymously. There is no appeal under the act. A licence can be granted, suspended or taken away or a transfer refusal without any reason being granted and without any right of appeal.

Under the new legislation, there is a section of the act which specifically says that if a person is refused a licence he must be given the reasons for that in writing so that he is informed of the reasons why he is not granted a licence and he has a right to appeal to the District Court or the Supreme Court from that decision. If a licence be suspended for longer than thirty days, he has the same right of appeal. If a transfer of a licence is refused, there can be an appeal and if a licence is revoked there can also be an appeal. All of those are tremendous changes, a complete reversal of past policy in this respect.

One of the things that the new liquor licencing board will have to do when it is established, the chairman in particular, is to try to develop some criteria for the granting of licences, what criteria they have are to judge. The act sets out, of course, some criteria, some conditions that must be met: how the premises have to be kept, have to be in a sanitary manner and so on. But we have to develop some criteria to decide how many licences should be in a particular area, what is the right number. This has not been done. Because we cannot just continue

MR. CROSBIE: handing out dozens and dozens and hundreds of licences; there has got to be some control to it. The gentleman who is going to be made chairman of this board, and we do not know who that is going to be yet, will have to see what they are doing in other provinces and try to develop some sensible regulation that will govern the number of licences granted. So this will be a complete change from the present practice.

In connection with the merchandising - well I might give just some of the other major changes. The liquor corporation will have the exclusive right to purchase and sell liquor in the province and to control the establishment and operation of liquor stores and liquor agencies.

Legislation provides that, in addition to the government having its own liquor stores, if the corporation, after they have studied this question, if they think that this is a wise thing to do, they can also provide for the sale of liquor through agency stores. In other words, it will not have to be a store owned by the government but if this is found to be feasible and there is a demand or a need for a particular community to have a liquor store there, that it could be done by way of agency. In other words, some established business in the community could be given the right to sell liquor as an agent of the board. Now it will be up to the corporation to decide whether this is feasible but the act makes provision for that to be done if they find it desirable and feasible.

It seems to me that there is no real reason why we should have to spend our own money in acquiring land and the buildings in every area of the province where there is possibly need for the merchandizing of liquor.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Well we rented a store, for example, in Gander, a few months ago, but it is at a much better rental. There will still be some need for renting premises. The rent that is now being paid is a lot less than what was asked for in the beginning. That will be a major change in it.

MR. CROSBIE: We want the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation to establish itself as an efficient business. It has not been that in the past and I will mention some of the things that were found wrong with it by the study we had done last year, by ADMARK Associates, with Mr. Roland Martin, Mr. Barnes, Mr. Lee Van Hall and one other.

MR. NEARY: Were they a company?

MR. CROSBIE: Well they were call ADMARK Associates. It was not a company.

MR. NEARY: With Mr. Martin director or what?

MR. CROSBIE: No it is not a company. It is a group of people from Memorial University Commerce Faculty who did this study for us last summer.

MR. NEARY: How much did it cost?

MR. CROSBIE: I thought the honourable gentleman would be asking that. There was Mr. Roland Martin, Mr. Jim Barnes, Mr. Gar Pynn and Mr. Lee Van Hall, all from The Faculty of Commerce, who last summer did a study of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission for us. The cost of it was \$20,000 in fees and \$4,800 in expenses.

They spent some two or three months going through the whole operation of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission in detail. They gave us a four volume report and I have a summary of their conclusions and recommendations here. They studied operations in the other provinces and what they found when reported certainly indicated that there had to be major changes in our setup. So perhaps I might give some of the things that they found.

I do not want to go into it in too much depth but they found that there was a total lack of any businesslike approach to the management of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission. That decisions with respect to expansion, new brand listings, purchasing, warehouse operation, granting of licences were generally made without regard for their repercussions in the financial area or for their effect in other areas of the commission.

MR. CROSBIE: There was no evidence of any form of evaluation of personnel performances. Financial data was generally absent for the purposes of making decisions. Areas of authority within the management group were unclear. The involvements of elected politicians in the operation of the commission have been frequent.

Political involvement even in rather mundane operations of the commission, such as the provision of stock for inventory, had become so accepted by personnel at the management level that they appeared to be unable to make decisions on those matters for themselves.

They concluded that the commission was being operated in a very inefficient manner, resulting in unnecessarily high operating costs. Revenues generated could be increased with improved organization. But in the past they have appeared to have been primarily a channel for political influence. The commission had and have little to do with the efficiency of the whole operation.

Those were their general findings, that the day to day operations of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission were characterized by an antiquated accounting system and an almost total lack of information for decision-making purposes. Records were outdated and inaccurate and necessary reports were nonexistent. There were no established criteria for the granting of licences or for the administration of the Alcoholic Liquor Act and regulations pertaining to licenced establishments.

Decisions respecting licencing and enforcement appear to be made without regard for the act and on the basis of emotional and political considerations. Then they recommended what in essence is now before the House, the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation, which would be a crown corporation and a separate liquor-licencing board.

Then they examined the whole thing in depth and the report dealt with finance and accounting. The warehousing procedures were complex, inconsistent and inefficient. They deal with every aspect of the operations of the commissions. It would take too long to go

MR. CROSBIE: into detail on all the things they found that needed to be corrected. In their report they deal in detail with the changes that should be made and are now being made by the new management.

On the listing of liquors, they found that there is no systematic procedure for new listings or for what quantities should be purchased, that the licencing, pricing and distribution of foreign wines are inefficient. That the public was not receiving good service in the area of promotion or display of new brands. That the listing decisions were inconsistent and disorganized as to whether or not a brand should be delisted because it is not selling in sufficient quantity.

MR. ROBERTS: Does the minister mean taken out of stock?

MR. CROSBIE: No, taken off the list. It is no longer listed for sale in the stores. But it would no longer be stocked.

Now as a matter of fact when they did their study, there were over 700 brands listed. One of the things that were wrong with the commission was that they had too many brands. Three-quarters of all revenue comes from the sale of twenty-seven brands, twenty-seven items.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not know whether that is so or not. Somebody must be getting married and they are checking into the champagne situation. We have to decide when we are going to have our stag party for the honourable gentleman too.

There were 677 listings when they did their study last summer. It is down I believe now to just 500. They said that the product line of 677 listings was too large. There were serious inconsistencies and imbalances.

The merchandising of beverages through the conventional retail store was inefficient and did not provide quality service to the customer. Decisions to list new brands and to order quantities of those brands had always been made by one of the commissioners and



MR. CROSBIE: in most cases influenced by political considerations. No records were kept with the sales record and new listings and in many instances the initial quantity ordered resulted in low inventory turnover and so on and so on.

They recommended a listing committee should be formed to deal with all matters pertaining to listing and delisting of brands. That is now being done. They recommended that the policy of the commission in the future should be to open only self-service retail stores and to convert all present stores to self-service when this becomes possible. That is the policy of the commission now. They are planning to change the Grand Falls store to a self-service. I think that is underway and the same with the store in Corner Brook, in the shopping centre there. That will be made a self-service store. It takes less staff and it is much more efficient because all the brands are out on the shelves and the customer can see them. It is the same principle as a supermarket, impulse buying.

That will be the policy of the commission in the future. They will only open self-service stores. The inventory situation and control of inventory was bad. The warehousing was inefficient, the ordering process - it is long. Anyway, the sum and substance of it all was that it was not being run efficiently, the trucking, the purchasing decisions usually were based on political considerations.

The blending department was operating at a low level of capacity and they make a lot of recommendations about the blending department. The bottling line is inefficient. They are bottling several low volume, high cost brands.

The purchase of casks and subsequent resale of casks as swish barrels, at \$3.00 per cask, was a costly practice. I am glad to announce to the House, Mr. Speaker, that if you want to buy a swish barrel now you have to pay \$10. The price is gone from \$3.00 to \$10.00. The enthusiasm for swish barrels has declined as a result.

AN HON. MEMBER: How can you get one?

MR. CROSBIE: Oh you apply to the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation.

MR. ROBERTS: Is there more swish left in the barrel now?

MR. CROSBIE: I have never tried the swish but the practice of selling swish barrels was costing us thousands of dollars a year because you could buy the barrel for \$3.00 and get swished.

They recommended that the price be made \$10.00. That has been done. They found that the growth in the number of retail stores took place with little regard for whether or not a store was required. There was a lack of autonomy at the retail store level and so on. Anyway, there were a lot of things there that need to be corrected and the correction is now underway.

They recommended that new stores should not be opened unless they can be expected to attain sales of between \$250,000 and \$275,000 annually.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Well we have about five or six stores that sell less than \$250,000 a year. These are the figures from 1971, 1972. The store with the largest sales was Philip Place in St. John's and in that year they sold \$2,052,000 worth of liquor - that is Philip Place. This is the total sale. That may go up a couple of thousand a year.

The next highest was the NLC building in St. John's - that is on the Kenmount Road - \$1,879,000. The shopping centre in Corner Brook was \$1,131,000 but then it goes down to St. Lawrence. The sales in St. Lawrence were only \$145,000; in Buchans only \$95,000; Flowers Cove only \$93,000; St. Anthony only \$184,000; Catalina - \$126,000; and Bonavista - \$147,000. Now there should not have been stores open at these places. The volumes are too small. They do not justify the opening of a store.

The stores are there now and I will presume that they will be continued although this is a matter for the commission, but they have to have our consent. There is no plan at the moment to close any stores. So there is a wide discrepancy between the volume of liquor sold in various stores.

MR. CROSBIE: Deer Lake, for example, is \$274,000 in that particular year; Mount Pearl - \$397,000; and so on. But there will not be stores open in the future unless they can attain sales of at least \$250,000 to \$275,000 annually.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: That is not his store, that is Mrs. Vardy's store. The store in Stephenville, let us see - Stephenville - \$741,000, very respectable. Bell Island, not too good - \$215,000. It is better than Buchans and Flowers Cove and St. Anthony. This was 1971-1972, The honourable gentleman was still the minister then.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, these are the general findings of the commission and this is why steps had to be taken to change this now. As the House knows now, in anticipation we hope the House in enacting this legislation, the government, has recruited the president for the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation and a vice-president of Finance. The president is Mr. Roland Avery and the vice-president of Finance is Mr. Greg Canning. I think in these two young Newfoundlanders we have a very fine team. Mr. Avery is in the gallery now. He is a young Newfoundlander, age thirty-four. He has his degree in civil engineering and in advanced business administration. He had worked in the province, with Canada Engineering Foundation of Canada and Lundrigan's Limited, and he has come to us from Lundrigan's Limited where he was manager of one of their divisions at Lundrigan's. He has been on the job now for I guess about two months and the salary I believe is \$28,000 a year. Unfortunately he gets no commission on sales but we will be watching his performance with great interest.

Mr. Avery will be president of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation. It will have a board of directors of seven, one person from the Department of Finance, one person from the Treasury Board. There will be the president, Mr. Avery, the vice-president of Finance, Mr. Canning. That is four and there will be three outside people appointed to the board of directors. We have not decided yet who these should be but these would be three people who have some experience in business or

MR. CROSBIE: commerce who can give general advice and attend board of directors' meetings once or twice a month and generally make a contribution we hope to the operation of this as a business.

AN HON. MEMBER: Salary?

MR. CROSBIE: They will not receive salary, they will probably get the standard \$35 a directors' meeting. The representatives of the Department of Finance and Treasury Board -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: They may be able to get swish barrels for \$9.99 instead of \$10.00. We are very pleased also in being able to get Mr. Greg Canning as the vice-president of Finance. He is a Newfoundlander, born in Merasheen, in 1937, married with four children. For four years he was manager of systems and procedure section in the Finance branch of the National Capital Commission, when he came to the commission he was manager of the financial information module of the Canada Post Office, a professional accountant with an R.I.A. degree. He has a lot of experience in the finance field, computers and all this kind of thing and we think he is going to do a very fine job there. He is a cousin by the way of the former member for Placentia West.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Well I will not go that far, but we cannot deny that he was the former member for Placentia West..

Now they are already started with making the necessary changes at the Newfoundland Liquor Commission. At the moment they are both members of the commission until these bills are acts that the House agree to and proclaim.

Now just some information on licences the House might be interested in, there are 530 licenced establishments in the province as at March 31, 1973. There are 153 with club licences; 16 with hotel licences; 76 with hotel and lounge licences; 50 with restaurant licences; 6 taverns; 21 military messes; 183 lounge licences; two club and restaurant licences; 12 lounge and restaurant licences: one airport

MR. CROSBIE: establishment; four brewery licences; six warehouses. That is 530, There are actually 621 licences issued because some establishments have more than one licence - they might have a hotel lounge licence and also a restaurant licence.

The number of licences issued in the last year, from April 1, 1972 to March 31, 1973, was 71. 12 club licences; 3 hotel only; 6 hotel lounge; 32 lounge; no tavern licences; 13 restaurant; 4 restaurant lounges and one military mess and 125 brewers' agents.

There is a tremendous desire in the province to be a brewer's agent because there are hundreds of applications from people who want to be brewer's agent.

So including the brewers' agents' licences, there were 226 issued last year. The total number of brewers' agents now licenced, at the end of March, was 724; 79 distributors, licenced and 66 sub-distributors, representing the four breweries; the total number of suspensions last year on licenced establishments was 20, there were 20 suspended, no cancellations; the number of brewers' agents suspended was 15.

MR. ROBERTS: Does he have anything for prior years?

MR. CROSBIE: No, last year there was a question asked and it was given for the year before that but I only have last year's.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I think so.

Last year there were fifteen suspended brewers' agents and 6 cancelled. We have at present 130 applications not dealt with and 362 for brewers' agents, people who want to be brewers' agents. The brewers' agency business appears to be a very popular one in the province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: The brewers' agents - 362 and 130 for other kinds of licences, some of which were granted just recently where there were no objections, so the 130 is a bit less than that now.

Now what are some of the other changes, Mr. Speaker, in the legislation? The new Newfoundland Liquor Corporation will have to have its budget approved by the Minister of Finance and the government. They

MR. CROSBIE: will have to make a report every year to the minister on their operations. It has to be audited by the Auditor General and that will have to be tabled in the House.

The Liquor Licencing Board will also have to make a report each year which will be tabled in the House, with respect to licencing and suspensions and what actions they have taken all year. The corporation will be an agent of the Crown.

The new legislation has detailed financial provisions which were not in the previous legislation. It should give more accurate control to their finances.

The only licence that the Liquor Corporation will deal with is the licencing of their four breweries. The breweries will get their licence from the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation. They also have the right to appeal if their licence were taken away. Other than that, all other licences will be dealt with by the board, as will inspection and enforcement.

The members of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission hold office at pleasure, which is the normal practice. They will not hold office during good behaviour, just at pleasure. They will be in the same position as other members of boards of crown corporations. The licencing board, as I said they will hold office for three years, subject to good behaviour.

As I mention now, the absolute right that was in the old legislation, to issue, cancel, suspend or refuse licences, will be gone. Reasons must be given in writing for their actions. Public hearings will be held. That is a very major change.

There are some other anomalies in the Alcoholic Liquors Act that have been removed. For example a Canadian citizen is allowed to bring into Canada a prescribed quantity of liquor, duty free, but under our act when it was brought into the province, that was a breach of the Alcoholic Liquors Act. For example, if you got off the plane at Gander, you were allowed to bring into Canada a couple of bottles of liquor, duty free, but our act said it was an offence

MR. CROSBIE: against the act to bring it into the province.

MR. ROBERTS: Was anybody every prosecuted?

MR. CROSBIE: No, I do not think so but we have all been violating that provision. There was a provision in the old act that the -

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Right, but that is changed now. It is permitted under the act to bring a couple of bottles in.

Under the old act, the Newfoundland Liquor Commission could refuse to supply liquor to any person when in the opinion of the commission he habitually drank liquor in excess. That was a power that the Newfoundland Liquor Commission had, We feel it is improper for the Newfoundland Liquor Commission to have that power to decide if a person drinks too much and forbid him to drink. That is changed and in the new act. Now that right is vested in the magistrate who would issue such an order only after all the evidence had been heard.

There are other provisions in the old legislation that dealt with the right to enter dwellings and search without a warrant, if it was in connection with an offence under the Alcoholic Liquors Act. Presumably they were there because in those days the act was quite an old one, and in those days there was considerable rum running and smuggling and I suppose they felt those powers were necessary. We have changed it now so that an officer will not be able to search any place, including a private dwelling, without a search warrant. They do not need search warrants in certain cases but to search a private dwelling, they will have to have a search warrant.

There are other peculiar sections in the old legislation that -  
MR. NEARY: Could we have a quorum in the House please?

MR. SPFAKER: Could the clerk count the House please?

We have a quorum.

MR. CROSBIE: So Mr. Chairman, these two pieces of legislation are a major step forward. They were promised by this administration. I would like, by the way, to mention Mr. Cyril Greene, O.C., who drafted these. He did an excellent job in drafting them because they are both large and complicated acts particularly the one with control of alcoholic liquor.

The House might be interested in knowing what percentage of sales is spirits, wines, and beer. In the year 1971-1972 we sold \$17,896,000 in spirits or eighty-one percent; \$1,015,000 in wines, nine per cent; and \$1,913,000 worth of beer or eight point nine per cent. This is what was sold through the government liquor stores. So the revenue totalled \$31,524,000, and to that the commissions on beer in that year came to \$7,990,000. That is the profit of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission on beer sold not through government liquor stores. Among the \$7,990,000: licences \$394,000, commissions on ship stores \$17,000. That totalled \$29,025,000. Other revenue on licences, fines brought it up to \$30,193,000 the cost of operating were \$13,051,000 so that the net revenue in the year ending March 31, 1972 was \$17,142,000. For the year that just ended that was \$20,247,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Shame!

MR. DOODY: A half a quorum.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: .... Gander for the weekend.

MR. HICKMAN: Is the honourable member coming out?

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am getting discouraged here now. I think I will clue this up. I did ask the President of the corporation. I will give the Leader of the Opposition a copy if interested, outlining their plans for what changes they are going to make in there this year, and how they are tackling these changes that need to be made to turn the commission into an efficient operation. The object of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission will be that it will be their responsibility to provide the Newfoundland public with a balanced choice of



alcoholic beverages in the most efficient and profitable manner possible. That is their objective. The second objective is to make as much revenue for this province as they can and to provide the Newfoundland consumer with the opportunity to choose alcoholic beverages from a well balanced assortment of products. Secondly, through efficient management techniques to provide the one shareholder, the Minister of Finance with the maximum revenue possible from the distribution and sale of alcohol beverages. Then they outline in this memorandum how they hope to achieve this in a two year time frame.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Well only if it goes up from the supplier.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Well it varies from forty-one per cent to sixty odd per cent.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: It is here somewhere in the report. I do not want to give inaccurate information because this may have been changed now. But the remark was mentioned in here somewhere. As far as agents are concerned now we have no control over agents, anybody can appoint whatever agent he likes.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman never had any control.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, I will not go into that.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Senator Petten adopted it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: No, I do not think so. I have the markups here. Mr. Speaker, since March of 1972 it is a matter of indifference to the Newfoundland Liquor Commission who has an agency, because no one is required to have an agent. They can have an agent if they want one or they can establish their own employee here or they can sell direct. The purchasing of liquor and so on is done on a completely unpolitical basis.

AN HON. MEMBER: How green does the honourable minister think we are?

MR. CROSBIE: The purchasing of liquor and so on is done on a completely unpolitical basis.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I mean if I wanted to go in there before, we all know it was not run on a businesslike basis, and how it was run, but this has been changed. Now when this legislation is passed it will be put beyond doubt.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Now I am quoting from the report of last summer. "Markups on spirits ranged from forty-three point seven per cent to sixty-one point three per cent. On Canadian wines fifty-one point seven per cent to fifty-nine point seven per cent and on imported wines thirty-five point eight per cent to sixty point nine per cent. This results in sales being influenced by inconsistent pricing and the consumer often paying too much or too little for selective brands." Now the markup system has been changed since then.

MR. ROBERTS: They will be in effect at standard markups?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes. They will not all be exactly equal but there will be more comparable so that nobody is being prejudiced against.

So anyway in this memorandum they have outlined, and I will not go into it all in the House here now, if the Leader of the Opposition is interested in it now he can have a copy. Steps are taken now to change the accounting, purchasing, auditing, the store operations, restructuring and management. They are going to appoint three regional supervisors, so that there will be three regional supervisors about the province to supervise the branch stores. They are converting the stores in Grand Falls and Corner Brook to self service. A major surprise was in their discovery that the Canadian National Railway Gulf Ferry Service did not purchase any liquor from the Newfoundland Liquor Commission; they bought it in Nova Scotia. This is now changed and the Canadian National have agreed that they are going to buy now at least

half of their requirements from the Newfoundland Liquor Commission.

MR. ROBERTS: What about Eastern Provincial Airways and Air Canada?

MR. CROSBIE: Eastern Provincial Airways purchase from the Newfoundland Liquor Commission. Air Canada; that is being taken up with them now but they have not been.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: All right. Well I do not think there will be any difficulty with them. But now that Canadian National is being approached that will mean sales of several hundred thousand dollars a year. That is the ferry across to Port aux Basques and the one to Argentina. They have agreed now to buy from our Newfoundland Liquor Commission. They intend to introduce the display of brand and price list boards in all conventional stores. That should certainly be done. "Establish a policy regarding new store locations including the determination of the desirability of agency stores!" There are a whole list of things here. They hope to convert two other conventional stores this year to self-service outlets. It looks like it may be Wabush and Stephenville, this is not finally decided since some of the stores they have now cannot be changed to self-service because of their physical layout. They are looking at the feasibility of a second major warehouse in the province. It should be of advantage for us to have another warehouse on the West Coast. That is being examined now. They are going to convert the warehouse here to a total in-bond system. They are evaluating the bottling plant. They have established a listing and delisting committee which will list or delist on merit, a property committee and a planning committee. They are going to look into advertising.

So, Mr. Speaker, there might be some questions and there might be some detailed information when it goes through committee, but I am very happy to move second reading. I would like to move both pieces of legislation. I think it is a tremendous step forward. We have a good team now at the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation. What we will have to do, if the House pass this legislation, is to appoint a

very capable chairman of the Liquor Licencing Board, with two part-time people who will sit part-time to hear applications for licences or appeals. They will have to be very carefully selected because this is a very important and onerous task.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the member for Bell Island.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is nice to hear that the honourable minister is going to establish the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation. It is very good. I give him all credit for it, Sir. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minister of Finance had to spend as much time trying to get the development of the Lower Churchill started as he has spent on this that Newfoundland would be better off. Nobody can get wild or enthusiastic about whether or not the government are going to establish a new Liquor Corporation. Most of the people in this province who are interested in beer, wines and liquor are only interested in the price.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: "Are interested in how it is going to be run?" Over in my own District of Bell Island, I do not think they could care less, Sir, how it is going to be run. I agree that it should be run in a businesslike manner.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is the reason why it is not so slack.

MR. CROSBIE: But nobody cares.

MR. NEARY: Most of the people that I talked to, Sir, are interested in the price of beer, wines and liquor in this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Homemade champagne.

MR. NEARY: If the minister had come into this House today and announced that the government were going to fulfill a promise that it made in two provincial elections, namely: reducing the price of beer in this province then I think that would be welcome news, Sir. They have not done it, another unfulfilled promise!

I do not know what can be done about the price of beer, Sir. I have had a number of complaints myself, I am sure the minister has had a number of complaints about the price of beer. The price varies

from tavern to tavern, from club to club, from hotel to hotel, Sir. I would like to ask the minister when he is winding up this debate if he can tell us if anything at all can be done to standardize prices right across the province. Can anything be done to control the price of beers, wines and liquor?

Sir, in this province I think you can safely say that the tavern is more for the ordinary Joe. The ordinary Joe cannot afford to go to a night club where they provide entertainment, where he has to pay one dollar or one dollar and a-half or two dollars on the door to get in. These are public places, Sir, all our people should have access to them. This should be one of the conditions of granting a licence, that they should not turn it into a racket, turn it into legalized bootlegging. They have a licence to run a public place and all of our people should have access to it and not just turn them into eliteist clubs like we have now and the ordinary person cannot afford to go there. Some of the clubs in St. John's I am told you have to pay \$1.25 I think it is for a bottle of beer. It is certainly more than \$1.00, the ordinary person cannot afford that when you have to pay on the door to get in. You have to pay on the door so they can provide the entertainment and the customers are paying for the entertainment, paying for the orchestra, paying for the go-go girls and the strippers that they have in these clubs and taverns, and the ordinary person cannot go. Probably most of them would not want to go, maybe their wives would not let them go.

But, Sir, I claim that if these operators are going to be granted a licence then every person over the age of nineteen should have access to these places if he has a dollar in his pocket. I think that they should be compelled to do away with charging admission on the doors to get into a public place.

This is what the ordinary person is concerned about, Sir. They like to go out after a hard week. After working hard all week, they like to go out on a Saturday night, to sit down, have a chat with their friends, play a game of darts, probably have a game of cards. I do not know if you are allowed to play cards in these places or not but

they cannot do that now. Sir, most of the places are very exclusive, and the price of beer, wines and liquor is too high. This is what the people are interested in.

The minister spent an hour or so this morning telling us about all the wonderful things that the Newfoundland Corporation are going to do. Well and good! Good for them! But, Sir, I claim that if the minister had spent more time trying to get industry into this province or as much time trying to get industry in this province as he did on this establishment of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission, then I might congratulate him for it. But I cannot get wild about this. I just cannot get enthusiastic about it, Sir. There is nothing worse I suppose than a reformed drunk. I just cannot get myself up on this thing, Sir.

But there are a couple of points that I would like to make, Sir. It is not very often that I acknowledge receipt of an unsigned letter but I have one in front of me now, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to read in this honourable House. It is signed; "Yours truly, Worried Parents." Then it has written in in ink; "Your Friend." It was written on April 12, Sir, right here in St. John's. It was written to me. "Dear Sir: I am writing this letter to you in order to see if there is anything you can do for me and the many other fathers in my position. You see I have a young daughter who is working in a job where she does not have to go on shift until after dinner. As a result, she is spending her nights in some of the local night clubs until the very late hours of the morning. Sometimes, in fact very often she does not get home until after five o'clock, which is too late. She says that the clubs are able to remain open because they have political influence." The minister just told us there is no political influence with this honourable crowd. "They are able to remain open because they have political influence." That is that someone in the government would have an interest in them, I presume. I do not know, Sir, if the author of this letter is presuming too much or not but I have heard certain rumors myself. Perhaps the minister can clear up these

unsubstantiated reports and rumours when he ends up this debate.

The letter continues "My wife is very perturbed about this, in fact, she is nearly out of her mind with worry. We are afraid to castigate our daughter too much as she may leave home altogether. She is wonderful except for staying at night clubbing until too late. I thought that all night clubs had to close at 1:00 P.M. How come some are able to disregard this law? Are not the laws the same for the rich and the poor, politicians and non-politicians? What about the conflict of interest law? Does this not apply to having an interest in some liquor dive? If not," then she mentions a name which I will not mention here, Sir, "So and so was right when he said that half the government members should be put in garbage bags or something like that."

This letter goes on to say, "You can say in the House what we cannot say on the street especially me because I work for the government. Anyhow I have to keep my mouth shut. My wife typed this for me and her. Yours truly, Worried Parents, Your friend."

I would like for the minister to deal with this. What are the hours?

MR. CROSBIE: It is signed.

MR. NEARY: It is signed. The minister was out of the House. I said, very seldom do I acknowledge an unsigned letter. It is just signed, "Your friends."

But, Sir, I was tremendously concerned with this when I received this letter. I certainly was, because I have heard rumors. I am so naive and gullible, Mr. Speaker, I am such a country hick that I believe every word the minister says when he says there is no politics involved in the liquor commission at the present time. I believed him, Sir. That is the kind of fellow I am. I accept the minister at face value. I am really green, Sir, that way, naive and green. I would like to know why there was such a rush to change liquor agencies and wine agencies and distributorship following the March election last year. Where was the rush? The honourable minister's bagman is one. There was a bigger rush, Sir, than you

would see at the pari-mutuel betting windows down at the trotting park when people are lining up to get their winnings. The honourable minister knows that.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not know that.

MR. NEARY: The honourable minister does know it. But I am so green that I would swallow that nonsense hook, line and sinker. Who has the Chateau Gai distributorship in Newfoundland now? Would he be recognized by the new -

MR. CROSBIE: He could not sell anything for one year because it had already been sold in October just before the elections, a year's supply of Chateau Gai.

MR. NEARY: Do not be talking such nonsense!

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable member "do" not talk such nonsense. If it were the price the honourable member wanted to dig up, we will give the facts on that.

MR. NEARY: - I am not digging up anything.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable member is making unsubstantiated allegations, and untrue ones. Chateau Gai.

AN HON. MEMBER: Iraudible.

MR. NEARY: That is right. But I want the minister to tell us just what the hours are for these taverns and night clubs. What are the hours? Do they have any set hours? Can they open at their own leisure?

MR. CROSBIE: Do not be so silly.

MR. NEARY: I was driving downtown one morning at five o'clock, I was going fishing down off Torbay with a group of fishermen. I saw a crowd outside of one of the clubs down on Water Street, where there was a fight going on at five o'clock in the morning -

AN HON. MEMBER: He was going down to Water Street to get to Torbay?

MR. NEARY: I was picking someone up to take down to Torbay with me. The honourable member has a devious, suspicious mind.

AN HON. MEMBER: I was wondering about the honourable minister's compass.



MR. NEARY: No. that is right, Sir. Five o'clock in the morning, Mr. Speaker, five o'clock in the morning -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down.

MR. NEARY: a fight going on outside of a certain club down on Water Street.

MR. CROSBIE: What club? Did the honourable member phone the police and report it?

MR. NEARY: No. The police were on their way there when I drove by.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: They were on their way there. But, Sir, this is not a bit funny, not a bit funny. They are hangouts at four or five o'clock in the morning.

AN HON. MEMBER: Name names.

MR. CROSBIE: Name them. Where are they?

AN HON. MEMBER: Name the place.

MR. NEARY: There are people on the opposite side who can give the names.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I would like for the minister to tell us just what hours these clubs and taverns and bars can stay open.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which one?

MR. CROSBIE: Call up the Liquor Commission. They will tell you it is in the regulations.

MR. NEARY: It is in the regulations. Why are not the regulations enforced?

MR. CROSBIE: They are enforced.

MR. NEARY: Can they stay open all night?

MR. CROSBIE: We have closed two places down in two weeks.

MR. NEARY: Can certain night clubs in this city stay open all night as they are right now?

MR. CROSBIE: There is no place that will stay open if there is a report made to us that they are violating the law, and that is shown, not

a place.

MR. NEARY: There were two closed last week, the honourable minister just said. Well there should be another one added to the list this week.

MR. CROSBIE: Give us the name.

MR. NEARY: I will give the minister the name outside of the House if he should want it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

So, Sir, these are the kind of things that people are concerned about. They are concerned about the prices. What is the chance of getting the price of beer down? We were told so often by the Minister of Social Services, he is not in his seat today, about the poor man's champagne, and the promises that were made about reducing the price of beer. This is what people are concerned about. They are not concerned about whether so-and-so is appointed president of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission at \$26,000 or \$28,000 a year. What is it going to do for the ordinary person? What is it going to do for the price of booze and beer in this province? Nothing. It is going to do nothing, Sir. We will probably have an increase next year if anything.

Sir, members are on their way to Gander this weekend, on their way to Gander, Sir, probably the weather is too cold to make a little visit down to the Gander Lodge and take a dip in the Gander River but I imagine the members will manage to wet their whistles all right, Sir, I hear the hotels, the clubs and the bars and the taverns in Gander are well stocked for the weekend. Well stocked! They are well stocked, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: We will be out there for three days. Now, come out and join the Progressive Conservatives.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I have a word of advice for the members before they take off, I understand we are going to rise the House at 1:00 o'clock. We are going to co-operate with the government, always willing to

co-operate, so they can get their business outside of the House done. They are going to rise the House at 1:00 o'clock, have a half holiday so that they can drive out to Gander. Before they leave, Sir, I hope that they will remember that the RCMP will be out in full force this weekend with their breathalizers -

AN HON. MEMBER: Especially the blue licence plates.

MR. NEARY: They will be watching the blue licence plates and any suspicious characters that drive by, Sir, that may come along, they will be there with the breathalizers ready to give the test. I hope on Monday we will have no problem keeping a quorum in the House, Sir.

Before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister what the prospects are of getting a liquor store in Burgeo?

AN HON. MEMBER: Where?

MR. NEARY: In Burgeo.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not a chance.

MR. NEARY: Not a chance. Well the minister is probably aware for the past four or five years Burgeo has been trying to obtain a liquor store, without any results so far.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I beg the honourable minister's pardon?

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I do not know. It is a fairly prosperous little community and could serve -

MR. CROSBIE: Bell Island only does \$214,000. How could Burgeo do more?

MR. NEARY: the South Coast.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I was asked to make this request in the House and I am making it.

MR. CROSBIE: To move it from Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Putting it on the record: Well, the honourable minister may get a little placque if he starts to move it from Bell Island.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the real issues are not the ones

that the minister talked about today but it is the price of beer, wines and liquor in this province and the hours that these clubs and bars and taverns are kept open. Sir. I would like for the minister to clear up some of these matters when he is closing the debate in second reading of this bill.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on it. Either we will call it 1:00 o'clock and go at it Monday or if the House wanted to sit fifteen or twenty minutes, I could say what I have to say.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to go over the ground. My colleague has stated the points he wished to make and I think they have been well stated. Essentially all we are doing really in both bills, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, is that we are doing two things. First of all we are updating the liquor legislation of this province which was badly out of date. I do not know when the main act was done, I suspect it was done in 1949 or 1950 or 1951. It has been nattered at and amended since then. Really, this was a job that badly needed doing ; to have a new act.

The other thing that we are doing is separating the marketing functions from the licencing and control functions. That makes sense. I do not know if other provinces do it but if they do not they should. Because on the one hand, as the minister has reminded us, we have a legal monopoly, the state have taken unto themselves, as they have throughout Canada, the monopoly on the retail sale of liquor by the bottle and wines and other spirits. On the other hand we have the public interest of licencing liquor and controlling its sale.

So I think that is a good think. It is not the most earth-shattering reform that has ever been introduced into this House. There will be little dancing on the streets I suggest in Gander tonight because of this. There may be dancing for other reasons but not because of this bill.

There are some things that I do welcome. I am very pleased

about the appeal provision and the fact that objections now have to be made public. We saw in the past the suspicion. Now I do not know if there were, there may well have been incidents. I do not know about them and I mean I do not know about them but there may well have been incidents where natural justice, as the lawyers would use that term, was not carried out, it was denied in effect. I think that is probably true across Canada because as I recall it our act was basically the same as other provinces, very arbitrary licencing authorities.

Well there is no reason for that I can see. Now that we have a new regime in the liquor field, I am quite willing to welcome it. Now, as I understand it, if you do not get a licence you can appeal,

That is not as important as it sounds because it is still within the discretion of the board to refuse the licence. All the court has to do is say that the board will exercise their discretion and that is that. Much more importantly is that the board has to give reasons for their action and objections have to be made public. I think that is a good thing because in the past often people did not have the courage to state publicly their objections. They were in the same position as the gentlemen or ladies for that matter who send letters to the paper and do not have the courage to sign their names or the people who get on "Open Line" and do not have the courage to give their name and then proceed to libel, attack and defame people.

There are just one or two minor points that I would like to make, Sir. I would ask the minister if he would agree and assuming he agrees, if he would take the necessary action to have put in the estimates items of perhaps one hundred dollars or one thousand dollars, whatever the token is, for the Liquor Corporation and for the Liquor Board. Otherwise there is no way in which this House can debate the matter other than a resolution being put down or something. These agencies will obviously be not only self-financing but extremely profitable. The Liquor Corporation, the marketing agency, will make fifteen, twenty or twenty-five million dollars a year and more to come. I think there is something to be said for putting in the estimates a straight token item of one hundred or one thousand dollars or whatever the administration choose, so there could be debate, if honourable members wish it, on the items, on the two corporations.

I would ask the minister if we are going to codify and update and publish the regulations governing the Liquor Control Board, the licencing board? I am told that this has just never been done. There is no reason that I know of. It is much like the rules of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland which I understand are still not obtainable. They are being worked on. A young lawyer who wants to get the rules of the Supreme Court is advised to start at the 1916 Consolidated Statutes and look at every issue of the

"Newfoundland Gazette." I think that that is basically it. The gentleman from Placentia East is a learned member of the House. There is no little book of the rules of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland as there is in other provinces. There is no little book of the regulations. The one that I am aware of is I think twenty years old. There have been amendments since then. It is pretty hard for people to live up to regulations, Your Honour, if they are not aware of what they are. There will be something said for publishing the regulations.

I do not presume to know much about marketing but I am a little quizzical about the minister's announcement that the number of listings is going to be reduced. Obviously there is a point below which, unless the sales fall below that point, it is not worthwhile to carry a listing. When one gets into such things as wines and liquors and that sort of thing, there might be something to be said for having at least one store in the province with a complete selection of wines, even those that only sell a case or two a year. People would obviously have to pay for that service. I am not suggesting that they be subsidized. The fact remains that a private individual cannot write off to a wine supplier and order wine because only the board can do that. Maybe that could be solved. If an individual should wish to order three or four cases of a certain exotic variety, he can go to the corporation, the corporation will get it for him and they will charge him the normal market, whatever it is, and then he carries it home. I assume that that still can be done. If not, it should be. It is not our job to run a marketing agency to meet exotic and quixotic tastes but at the same time, since we have a legal monopoly, we the state, on liquor, we should not prohibit people who wish to indulge their more exotic tastes.

I was somewhat bemused by the minister's statement about the stores. I find the figures interesting. In his desire to run an efficient corporation, which is a good thing, we should not overlook again the accessibility facts. The reason there are stores in places

like Bonavista, St. Anthony, Flower's Cove and so forth is straight accessibility. If the minister is going to establish or if the corporation are going to establish a dividing line and say that unless the sales are X dollars per year we shall not open the store, which makes sense, I hope the minister then will authorize agencies. The point I am making is that we have come a long way. A few years ago in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, the thought of liquor being sold was anathema. Really there were three or four stores in St. John's, I suppose one in Corner Brook and one in Grand Falls and you took your little book down (the books were only done away with three or four years ago) and you went in at dead of night; you looked around first to make sure that your neighbours were not looking or there was nobody on the street who knew you and you snook into the controllers and you sort of sidled up to the counter and in a low, hushed voice you slid your money across and said, I would like a bottle of this, please. Well that was only four or five years ago. I think it was in "Come Home Year" that the books got the axe, the permit, a hangover from a prohibition era. Now we have come to the point where many people have strong views on it, of course, and liquor can be a very mixed blessing. It is by far the worst drug we have, Maybe tobacco is worst. Liquor is by far the worst drug problem we have in Newfoundland or in Canada. We have come to the point where if people want to drink, the state is willing to allow them to drink in return for paying the state a very healthy profit. We are now in the marketing business, well and good! That means that liquor should be accessible on reasonable terms to people all over the province.

If it is not worthwhile to have a store in St. Anthony, (I realize the minister is not saying that it is going to be closed) if it is not worthwhile to maintain a separate store, a government store, there should be somebody or more than one somebody allowed to buy liquor and to sell it at the same prices. That is not a new principle really. The brewer's agent principle is essentially the same principle. I do not want to



let it go unnoticed. There was a conscious decision by the government to open these stores three or four years ago. There were requests from town councils. I remember the amazement that struck the cabinet the day when the Town Council of Grand Bank, of all the Methodist strongholds in Newfoundland, submitted a formal resolution, a formal letter, with a resolution to the council in it, saying that we ask that a liquor store be open. The Town Council of St. Anthony took the same action. Again it is astounding to one who thinks of twenty years ago or ten years ago but not astounding in 1970 or 1971 or whenever the stores were open.

The point remains that if the stores are not justified, I do think we should at least provide the stocks so that people in St. Anthony do not have to drive three hundred miles to Deer Lake or do not have to pay somebody else to do it. That is what was happening in the past.

Finally let me add my voice, Mr. Speaker, to the ministers or to the other honourable gentlemen who spoke of the staff. I do not know either Mr. Avery or Mr. Canning personally. I know a great deal of them, by reputation. I think they are extremely well qualified for this. The marketing agency is big business. The liquor store sells about thirty or forty million dollars a year, the liquor business in this province. It is a lot of money. It is one that will only go up. The prices will go up from time to time and the consumption goes up. It is an interesting fact. Three or four years ago when the price of liquor was increased, the number of unit sales went up. The price of liquor apparently has no relationship to whether people buy it or not. If people want liquor, they will buy it whether or not the price has gone up or gone down. I think every government in Canada has discovered that to the ultimate cost of the purchaser or the consumer. It is big business. These are well qualified young gentlemen. They have a big task ahead of them. I feel that they are well able to discharge it.

Having said all that, Sir, I am quite prepared to vote for both bills. My colleague and friend from Bell Island has made the important point I think. The bills by themselves are okay and it is all very fine and worthwhile and worth a certain amount of effort. Really it is not the most important thing facing this province now. Let us get this out of the way and let us get the corporation at work, let us get the appeal board or the liquor licencing board at work and let us get down to the infinitely more important business of trying to develop this province and trying to provide our people with jobs for a decent way of life. If jobs do nothing else, they will give them money to go into the liquor store and buy liquor if they wish. The way prices are these days, they will need jobs to buy it.

I think the minister deserves a word of praise. He does not get a great deal from us because we do not feel he deserves a great deal. On this, I think he has done a good job. It is a very workmanlike job and I think it bears out the oft stated observation of Mr. Smallwood that the gentleman from St. John's West would have made a great deputy minister. He is one of the great organizers, one of the great administrators and would make a great deputy minister. I think this is great deputy minister stuff and I congratulate the minister in that way for doing it.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to speak to any great length in closing the debate but now I have changed my mind. First, of course, I have to say that I am delighted to have this high praise from the Leader of the Opposition. It is good to know that I will have a job if the government ever change hands, perhaps as a deputy minister somewhere.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a little bit amusing to hear the Leader of the Opposition or somebody across, when legislation like this comes before the House or the Public Service Commission, which they have to agree with, have to support it and have to say it is all right, to damn it with faint praise. They end up. "Well, you know

this is very good but it is only a minor thing and we have to get on with the major business of the province and this is not really it.' That must be the explanation, Mr. Speaker, of why the Newfoundland Liquor Commission was allowed to grow into the monstrous condition it was in when we took over office in January of 1972. Now anybody that raises for this province revenue of \$20 million - the \$20 million that the Newfoundland Liquor Commission raises would be at least one-seventh, one-sixth of the revenue raised locally, almost as much as we get in the personal income tax, about half of what we take in the S.S.A. Tax and for any one to say that this is only a minor matter, strikes me as most peculiar. This is a body which raises one-sixth or one-seventh of all the revenue we raise locally in this province ourselves. It was in horrible, terrible shape when we took over the government of this province in January 18, 1972. Not only that I do not consider it to be minor, this body which had such tremendous powers in the liquor and beer business. I do not consider it minor that we are making a change now so that everybody can stand on their own two feet and do not have to fear that they are going to lose their licence without having any recourse at all, just at the whim of the premier or some cabinet minister or the government. I do not consider that change to be minor. I came across it in 1969 very frequently, as I said in this House before. Two or three years ago, we had quite a debate on it.

During the 1969 Liberal Leadership Convention, I actually went into people's premises to see them in an attempt to gain support and they turned pale and shivered because I was even seen in their place because they had a licence to distribute beer or they had a liquor outlet. That was the situation in 1969, Mr. Speaker, and it was the situation up until January, 1972. The pressure was put on them and I know people who had phone calls and who were told they had a half hour to announce that they were supporting somebody else and not me or they would lose their licence to distribute beer. I have had that experience and other members here have. I do not consider it to be minor that we

are changing a state of affairs that would permit that to happen in any province. That is something that this legislation does. I do not consider it minor, a minor change, that the listing of brands is now going to be done by the independent corporation themselves and by a listing committee, based solely on the fact whether the brand will sell or not, instead of, as it used to be, based on the fact whether the person involved was a Liberal or not. All purchasing of liquor and all listing of brands was done by one of the commissioners of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission. That was his job. He made the decision, what brand was listed and how much of it was ordered. He made that decision on whether or not you were a supporter of the Liberal Party and how close you were to the Premier or to the party in power when he made that decision. That is how it has been done for twenty-three years. I do not consider it to be a minor change but that now has been stopped and in the future the whole thing will be done on the basis of merit. The study of the Admart Associates that we had done last summer confirmed every suspicion that we had, that this was the most inefficiently run operation in the Province of Newfoundland and that politics permeated it from top to bottom in every decision. This we have changed already, without this legislation. We have changed all that. With this legislation, it will be changed for good, unless some other party gets in and changes it.

Now as to the statements about agents changing after the change of government, that is not true. There may be some Liberal agents who gave up their agencies. They had made so much money over the fifteen or twenty years they had these agencies, they gave them up. Chateau Gai was mentioned. In October, 1971, just before the election, the gentleman who had the agency for Chateau Gai, Senator Petten, sold to the commission enough Chateau Gai wine, enough pinky to last for a year.

That is what the commission purchased in October, 1971, and you do not purchase it in quantities like that, because it goes off and goes bad if you have that kind of stuff for a year. He sold a year's supply. After the election, he gave up the agency. Well he might give it up! He could not sell any more Chateau Gai to the commission anyway, for a year. He had already sold it all, anticipating a change of government. This is the kind of thing we have changed. Then to have the member for Bell Island get up and to get on with the nonsense he got on with of how agents changed and so on after January, 1972, it just has to be answered because it is complete falsehood.

The policy now is that we do not care who the agent is, whether he is Liberal or Progressive Conservative. We have nothing to do with it. The company decides if they want an agent. We do not have to approve it. They can have their own employee here or they can sell direct. The only thing that matters is their brand, one that will sell in the province that we can make money on. That is the way it should be.

The honourable gentleman said: "What is this legislation going to do for the people of the province?" What it is going to do is give them an honest, efficient merchandizing enterprise in control of the monopoly selling liquor and beer and it is going to take the licencing out of the hands of the government altogether and put it under an independent board so that the members can no longer influence who gets a licence or who does not. Now if that is not something that is for the people of this province and in their interest, I do not know what is. To suggest it is doing nothing for the people of this province shows why it was allowed to get into the shape it was before we took over. He says there will be little dancing in the street about this reform. Well whether or not there is dancing in the streets, it is still worthwhile doing.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition suggested an item in the estimates for the corporation or the board. I certainly have no objection to that. If there is no item in the estimates, then it can be discussed on the minister's salary, in the Minister of Finance. When that item comes up each year, these two agencies which report to the Minister of Finance, can be debated then. The regulations are going to be revised as soon as the House is closed now and the lawyers can spend some time on that.

They are already looking at the question of having specialty stores for the sale of brands and so on that will not have a wide sale but that there is a small market for. There will probably be a specialty store established. Agency stores I have already covered.

Mr. Speaker, this is a complete revolution. This will culminate in a complete revolution in the administration and sale of liquor and beer in this province. It is a major step forward, not a minor one.

If the honourable gentleman wants to know what hours taverns and so on are allowed to be open, he can call the Newfoundland Liquor Commission and they will give him the information quite readily. As far as enforcement is concerned, it matters not who owns any agency or premises in this island, if they are open after hours and we are given the information and it is confirmed, they will have their licences suspended. There were two suspended here in St. John's two weeks ago, one of which the honourable gentleman is hinting at or referring to. They will be closed again or will be closed for good if they continue to be open after hours or selling liquor to minors. It does not matter who owns or operates them. It matters not a whit. I have not had, Mr. Speaker, one person try to put any influence on me as to whether a place should be closed or open. They know better than to try it. That is the way now that this is being run. Once this liquor licencing board is established, we will have no influence over it anyway.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a great step forward. I am glad the opposition is supporting it, although I do not see any basis why they should not support it. It is long overdue. I feel sure that our two new managers of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission are going to do a great job for us. Within the next two years, we are going to see a completely revamped operation. The present employees by the way are all going to be retained. There is nobody going to lose his job. They will all be retained there. Of course, new people will have to be hired from time to time as other positions come open.

MR. WEARY: What about the price of beer?

MR. CROSBIE: The price of beer is like the price of everything else, Mr. Speaker, it is unlikely that the price of beer is going to drop. I must frankly confess that this is unlikely. If we can find anyway to do it, then certainly we could. I do not see the price of anything dropping with the rate of inflation we have in this country today.

The situation with respect to what price is charged in night clubs and so on, Mr. Speaker, is that it is up to these retailers of liquor. They buy the liquor from us. It is up to them what price they sell it at. If a person feels, if he is charged one dollar for beer at the Killick Lounge, that it is too much, he does not need to go to the Killick Lounge, he can go down the street and get it for sixty cents.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: That is still there I think. That special thing is still there. The Botwood Hospital charge is still there.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to move second reading of both bills, Bill No. 107 and Bill no. 106.

MR. SPEAKER: I suspect each bill will have to be taken individually. We are presently on Bill No. 107.

On motion a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Control Of Alcoholic Liquors," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Establishment Of The Newfoundland Liquor Corporation," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Monday at 3:00 P.M. and that this House do not adjourn.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, before the adjournment, would the honourable gentleman from St. John's East indicate what we might see next week? We have made a real hole in the Order Paper. The only major acts left are: Conflict of Interest, the collective bargaining one, which has not yet been distributed, and the Financial Administration Act and there is a mysterious one about the Marystown Shipyard which may or may not be major.

MR. MARSHALL: Is that the Kennco one?

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. MARSHALL: Is that the Kennco one?

MR. ROBERTS: No. I was thinking of one to provide subsidies. Apparently there is to be a new scheme of subsidies, Bill No. 122.

MR. MARSHALL: That has not been circulated yet.

MR. ROBERTS: It has not been distributed.

MR. MARSHALL: No. I can inform the House, Mr. Speaker. As the honourable Leader of the Opposition has indicated, to date there are nine bills in committee stage; seven bills for second reading, involving the major conflict of interest, the industrial development corporation and the Financial Administration Act and probably four other minor bills. We will be considering those on Monday and will be going into committee on Monday. I would hope that we would be able to get some of the other legislation up from the printers by then. We are a little bit ahead of the printers. This is what we will be considering: conflict of interest on Monday and the Financial Administration Act.



MR. ROBERTS: Does the honourable minister envisage finishing off the session next week sometime?

MR. MARSHALL: It depends, Mr. Speaker, really on two factors, one of which is the printing and the other is the final vetting of this collective bargaining legislation. We would hope to be able to.

MR. ROBERTS: It is expected to have that for debate next week?

MR. MARSHALL: We would hope to have it but whether we are going to actually, Mr. Speaker, debate this next week, the collective bargaining aspects. There is a mammoth amount of labour bills that are to come before the House that are taking quite a bit of time and taking quite a bit of consideration even though some of them are at the printers and some of them in the course of final consideration. We might possibly have to consider next week, when we get this through, adjourning for a while until we have all the views that government must obtain before pursuing further with those bills. I will be able to give a more definite indication on Monday. I am afraid that that is about as far as I can go right now.

MR. NEARY: Does that mean that we will adjourn until the fall of the year?

MR. MARSHALL: The fall of the year? No, we will have to deal with these bills before I would anticipate the fall of the year. They are important measures and the honourable member, being the shadow minister on labour and being a former minister of labour, would realize that we are going to get them considered as soon as possible, that is ASP.

MR. SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until tomorrow Monday at 3:00 P.M.