



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 30

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 1974**

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

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

I would like to welcome to the galleries today sixteen Grade IX, X and XI students from the Churchill Falls High School, Churchill Falls, with their teachers, Miss Edna Turpin and Mr. Meaney.

I have been given some other information of some students from the Churchill Falls High School and in case it is not the same group, I think I should read that too. There are nine students from the Churchill Falls High School in exchange with some students from Gonzaga, with a senior student from Gonzaga, Mr. Ed Williams.

On behalf of all the honourable members I would like to welcome you to the House today and trust that your visit is most interesting.

PETITIONS:

MR. F. J. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from over fifty fishermen in Southern Harbour, in the District of Placentia East.

The prayer of the petition is that the present wharf that the fishermen use for tying up their longliners when fishing be extended. They state that the present wharf is only able to accommodate two crews whereas there are in fact over eighteen crews fishing out of the Community of Southern Harbour. In addition they maintain that there are no lights on the wharf and also that the pump on the particular wharf has not been operating. They also mention that there is a great necessity in the community for a longliner haul-out. This haul-out commenced in 1973 but to date has not been finished. They would like this honourable House to take note of that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are in this small community several fishermen who moved into Southern Harbour from the islands in Placentia Bay. They are some of the best fishermen in Newfoundland. They are very, very industrious and very, very successful fishermen. They are

operating under very extreme difficulties and any assistance they can obtain from this honourable House with respect to getting the wharf extended and also, of course, the lights and the pump repaired, would be of great assistance to the fishermen.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that wharves are a federal matter but I would like this honourable House to take note of it and I would ask that this petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates, which I think is the Department of Fisheries. I solicit the assistance, co-operation and endorsement of the Minister of Fisheries for the fishermen of Southern Harbour.

CAPT EARL W. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition presented by the Member for Placentia East. I think he is quite correct when he says that the wharves are the responsibility of the federal government rather than the provincial government. However, I can appreciate his presenting the petition here to focus the attention on the federal government. I am not too sure about the pumps. The pumps on the wharf may be the responsibility of the provincial government, I am not too sure.

However, there is no doubt about the quality of fishermen in that area. I think practically all Newfoundland knows what kind of fishermen they are and surely they are deserving of the facilities to enable them to carry on the fishery and make a decent living for themselves and their families. I certainly support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HAIG YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition of something similar to that from the Member for Placentia East. It is on behalf of the boat owners in the Community of Bryant's Cove. Their request, Sir, is for a small slipway in the community. It is signed by some sixty-eight residents of Bryant's Cove and some twenty-eight boat owners. This is a very unique community. Bryant's Cove has a nice beach and sand there. There would like a place near the wharf to haul up their small boats.

I ask, Sir, that this petition be forwarded to the proper authorities concerned.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the petition presented by the Member from Harbour Grace, on behalf of the fishermen in Bryant's Cove. I am very familiar with the people in Bryant's Cove, Sir, a good many of them worked on Bell Island when the mine was operating over there. I imagine now some of them have turned to fishing to earn their living, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, this appears to be a very reasonable request, Sir. I think the government would be well-advised to establish facilities for small boats all over this province. So, Sir, I hope that the Minister of Fisheries will be able to see his way clear when he brings his estimates into the House to provide the fishermen over in Bryant's Cove with these facilities.

NOTICE OF MOTION:

HON. T. A. HICKMAN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Maritime Hospital Service Association Re-Incorporation Act, 1949."

HON. J. C. CROSBIE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions for the granting of interim supply to Her Majesty.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Premier. Would the Premier inform the House if he has had any

correspondence from the Government of Canada, namely, the Federal Minister of Transport, the honourable Jean Marchand, in connection with the Bell Island ferry operation?

MR. MOORES: Question for the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, another question for the Hon. the Premier: Would the Hon. the Premier indicate to the House just what his Government's position is on this fool who is going around the Province ranting and raving, Brian Davis, about the seal fishery? Does the Government intend to take a position on this? If so, what is the Government's position?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I did not know which fool the honourable member for Bell Island meant there for a while.

MR. NEARY: Not the Premier.

MR. MOORES: Certainly, our position has been very clear on the seal fishery. It is a federal responsibility. It is something that the Federal Government has not seen fit to take any position on, other than one of basically waffling which is unfortunate but certainly this Government stands foursquare in support of the seal fishery.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, another question for the honourable the Premier: Would the Hon. the Premier indicate to the House what his Government's position is on the statement made today by an R.A.F. official in Gander, that the number of R.A.F. planes passing through Gander this year would be reduced by one hundred? Does the Government intend to make representation about this? Is there anything they can do? Can they put any pressure on to keep the same number of flights, R.A.F. flights through Gander that we have at the present time?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, Gander is of great concern and as the honourable member well knows, we are working and trying to do what we can, together with the Federal Government, on the TOPS Programme. As far as the R.A.F. is concerned we are having great representation with many British entities today and over the past few weeks but the R.A.F. has not been one of them.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Premier could nationalize the R.A.F., not yet anyway. Sir, I would like to direct

a question to the Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Sir, would the Minister of Finance inform the House if public tenders were called for a group insurance plan covering all the employees of the Linerboard Mill?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the honourable minister also take this question as notice. Will the minister inform the House if public tenders were called on the trucking of wood for the Linerboard Mill?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, there were no tenders called for the trucking of wood for the Linerboard Mill since the person from whom the wood is purchased arranges that, usually.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Hermitage.

MR. RODGER SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in the absense of the Minister for Rural Development, I would like to address a question to the Hon. the Premier. I think it belongs to the Department of Rural Development because it was that department which initiated the action, I understand in November, a matter to which I shall refer. Would the Premier indicate to the House whether it is the intention of the Department of Rural Development or some other department of Government, for that matter, to continue the construction of the road through the community of Gaultois which was begun mid-November and suspended mid-December?

MR. MOORES: Take notice of the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with Orders of the Day - at the close of yesterday's session the honourable member for Labrador North made an amendment to a motion. It would be very difficult for me to accept that amendment after having ruled that the honourable member for Bell Island had not established a prima facie case. Although the two sections in Beauchesne have already been referred to, I again refer to Beauchesne, page 169, section 202, subsection (6) which says: "It is not an amendment to a motion to move that the question go to a Committee", which this does, and on page 171, section 203, subsection (3), "An amendment

March 22, 1974.

Tape 763

RH - 3

setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved." I therefore rule that the amendment cannot be accepted.

On motion of the hon. the Premier a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Acquisition By The Province Of The Shares Of Brinco Limited, " read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

2365

On motion of the hon. the Minister of Finance a bill, "An Act To Provide Moneys For The Acquisition By The Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation Of All Of The Shares of Brinco Limited", read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. the Minister of Justice a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Child Welfare Act, 1972," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. the Minister of Justice a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Bills of Sale Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. the Minister of Justice a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Welfare Of Children Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Pension Of The Chairman Of The Board Of Commissioners Of Public Utilities," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Change of Name Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Co-operative Societies Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Maintenance Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.



On motion, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Adoption Of Children Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Pesticides Control Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Insurance Adjusters Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Department of Provincial Affairs and Environment Act, 1973," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Maintenance Orders (Enforcement) Act," read a third time, ordered passed and 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 title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Empower The St. John's Municipal Council To Raise A Loan For Municipal Purposes By The Issue Of Bonds," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Department Of Education Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The College Of Fisheries Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion (3) is the motion moved by the honourable Minister of Finance. The honourable member for Labrador North I think took his place yesterday, at least it is the opinion of the Chair that he has finished his debate but if he could have leave of the House he would be permitted to continue.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, just a matter of clarification. He sat down to allow a point of order and Your Honour to rule on the motion but he did not - he sat down to allow Your Honour to rule on an amendment made.

MR. ROBERTS: He did not yield his place.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member for Labrador North have leave of the House to continue?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order, Sir, it is not a matter of leave. In our submission, Sir, the honourable gentleman had not finished his remarks. He moved an amendment. There was a point of order raised by the gentleman from St. John's East, the honourable gentleman did not yield his seat, he sat down in the proper way while Your Honour considered the point and while the point of Order was argued. It is not a matter of leave, Your Honour.

MR. HICKMAN: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, you know it is a matter for Your Honour's observation. The honourable the member for Labrador North did indeed move an amendment to the motion. Looking from across here, he gave every indication of having taken his seat whereupon then the member for St. John's East rose on a point of order. But that is surely a matter for his Honour's discernment and observation.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I moved the amendment to the motion and while Your Honour was waiting for a ruling on the motion, I did take my seat. I did not finish what I was saying on the motion of the Minister of Finance and if with leave or without leave of the House I would like to continue.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! It is the opinion of the Chair that the honourable member had resumed his seat. I am asking if the House will permit to have the honourable member for Labrador have leave to continue his speech? Does he have leave? Agreed? Agreed.

MR. WOODWARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While I was delaying the House last evening, at the

late hour of eleven o'clock I was speaking on the motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance. I was at that time reiterating as this side of the House reiterated the disgraceful act of the Minister of Finance to bring such a motion into the House to have the Hon. Member for Bell Island expelled from the House.

Mr. Speaker, as I said then and I will repeat again, I support the action that was taken by the Member for Bell Island. I feel that he was right to bring this action into the House and to make the House aware of this particular transaction and indeed to make the people of this province aware of this particular transaction. The public treasury has lost \$407,000 and they did not make any endeavour to collect it from the people who took over Bison Brewing in Stephenville, namely the Labatts group. The Minister of Finance at one time acted as solicitor for them and indeed now the law firm that he was associated with is still acting for the Labatts Brewery. Sir, I say this is evidence enough to conclude that one of the allegations that was made by the Member for Bell Island, that the Minister of Finance was indeed in conflict of interest.

Now it will never be judged in this particular House because of the fact that it is merely a democratic process and there is no judicial right to judge one person, because of the number involved, as I stated last night. It was very evident that when the minister brought this particular motion into the House, it was very evident that our colleague, the Member for Bell Island, would be tossed out for whatever period of time the Minister of Finance wanted, whether it was fourteen days or he could easily have made it thirty days and toss the honourable member out and leave the people on Bell Island without representation in this House.

This is the first allegation of conflict of interest, which I support. The other allegations which have been made, as far as misleading the House, when I read into the statement and when it was

said in the House that there was no agreement - I concluded from merely reading into the statement that there was indeed an agreement and that agreement was binding if it went through the legal courts of this province.

I feel that that is the course of action that the Minister of Finance should have taken at the time and not merely to accept the advice of one lawyer in the Justice Department. When you think in terms of the amount of money that was involved in this particular transaction, a loss to the public treasury of some \$407,000.

I will not carry on for any great length of time. I think I covered most of this last night when I was delaying the House to wait until eleven o'clock. I frankly admit that that was my motive and that is what I was doing, Mr. Speaker.

I feel as do our colleagues on this side of the House . I think it is sad deed. It is a very sad deed indeed to have the honourable member suspended from the House for that period of time. I feel as all the members on this side of the House feel, that they are using their majority over on the government side of the House to stifle debate and to suspend a member from the opposition.

MR. H.W.C. GILLETTE: Mr. Speaker, we have been asked to debate and subsequently to vote on this motion which has been presented to this honourable House by the Minister of Finance. I have listened very attentively indeed

to the arguments for and against the motion. Naturally the arguments for the motion come from the Government side of the House. The arguments in defence of our colleague, in other words, the opposing conflict is from this side. That is only natural to assume.

It has been mentioned, I think, by most of the speakers if not all of the speakers on this side, of the style of our colleague, the member for Bell Island. His style, the words he used, the adjectives he used, not wrapping up at all, his accusations, therefore he has been brought to bear and brought to suffer because of it.

Now, at that time, Mr. Speaker, no check was made by any member on the Government side of the House, no check was made of his conduct by the Speaker of the House, therefore it could be construed that the blame can be cast upon the Government side of the House and also the reflection can be cast upon the Speaker in that neither side said that the entire sitting of the Government side or the Speaker came to the aid of one of their colleagues who was at that time absent.

I have wondered, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member from Bell Island had taken another course, another tack, as we say in marine terms, and had simply taken the documents that he had, the letters to and from the officials of the Government and the officials of Bison Brewery, had he taken these documents, read them and then, after having read them, said something like this, "Mr. Speaker, with the knowledge of all this, the honourable minister told this House there was no agreement." Would he be considered to be using unparliamentary words? They both mean the same thing. Having knowledge of it and telling the House there was no agreement is deliberate but the word deliberate was not used in my example, therefore, I suggest that nobody, just nobody would raise a Point of Order. Nevertheless, I feel certain that the meaning is the same and would have been the same.

So we are using a Mr. Beauchesne to guide us in our deliberations but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that had he used different wording instead of holding as he usually does with the left hand to the microphone and

using his right hand to drive it home saying, "Mr. Speaker, the honourable Minister of Finance deliberately misled the House." I think the meaning is the same actually.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about the other two statements?

MR. GILLETTE: The other two statements -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The same thing.

MR. GILLETTE: I would suggest they are the same thing. They could be used, they could be dressed up a bit as well. They could be dressed up and presented in another word to mean the same thing.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. GILLETTE: As a chief officer of the Government in negotiating the cancellation of debt of the Province while at the same time he was associated in at least two ways with the purchasing corporation which had the most to gain by said cancellation of debt and this last one you mean that the

Minister of Finance abused the privilege of this honourable House and abused the privilege of his office for his own personal interest, so that immediate steps should be taken to consider his impeachment."

I think the word there is interest. What kind of interest?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Conflict of interest.

MR. GILLETTE: Yes. Not monetary interest. It might be just a personal interest and a friendly interest in the company. It could be any kind of interest.

However, Mr. Speaker, I feel somehow within my bones that this motion will go through. Something tells me that it will.

MR. NEARY: Thirty-two against nine.

MR. GILLETTE: The honourable member for St. John's South yesterday asked the honourable member for Bell Island if he would withdraw his statements. Now, if the mover of that motion had asked that question and had

given a qualification with it, then I would submit that the member for Bell Island would have had something for which to give consideration but I do not think he would have been naive enough to withdraw his statement which had nothing to do with cancelling the motion. Therefore, he would have withdrawn his statement and also been suspended for fourteen days. I gave him credit for having a little more sense than that, when the question was asked to him.

I have to agree, I think we all agree that the decorum of the House is not what it should be. The words used by my honourable colleague from Bell Island have been used many times in this House since I have been sitting in it and that is two years. These words have been used, immediately they have been used somebody, either the person against whom the accusation is made or some other honourable member, usually the member for Bonavista South, raises a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As far as I know, ninety, well a hundred per cent of the orders dealing with unparliamentary language have been successful, and the speaker has been compelled to withdraw or retract his statements.

As I said in the beginning, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately nobody

did that so that when the honourable Minister of Finance returned from the West Coast of Canada, he was told of the happenings and having perhaps lost what love he did have for his brother-man from Bell Island - if any, the member for Labrador North suggests - having lost his regard for him and perhaps wanting in some tangible way to punish him, he brought in a motion to have this honourable member suspended for fourteen sitting days; I understand something which has not occurred in this House in many a year if ever.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Or any other House.

MR. GILLETTE: Now, there is one way - there are two ways actually but I think perhaps the best way and the most manly way perhaps would be, now that it has been aired, it has been made public through the press and by radio and television - there is one way. I think it is parliamentary, I am not sure. That is for the mover, with the consent of the seconder, to withdraw his motion.

There is another way perhaps. That is for somebody to make an amendment not to negate the motion but either to take from or to add to it, make an amendment. I would love to see it come from the government side of the House



because I am sure they all have feelings, we do - but an amendment, Mr. Speaker, which would change, alter the number downward, substantially downward, the number of days of the suspension of my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to go into the details of the correspondence; that has been dealt with not only once but two or three times. I do not think it was possible to debate the question before us without actually making reference to the correspondence. We could have been ruled out of order I suppose but nevertheless I do not think it was possible to divorce them, separate them.

I have just this to say, Mr. Speaker, in cluing up, that I do support the motion or the allegations, accusations I suppose if you want to call them that, not the unparliamentary, which this motion does deal with actually. I realize that, Mr. Speaker. I am not that naive. But I have to congratulate the member for Bell Island in his findings of these documents, bringing them before the House, bringing to the attention of the House, in his own style, because of that he has been made to suffer but he did bring to the attention of this honourable House in his own style the fact, and I repeat, the fact that the Minister of Finance did mislead the House by stating that there was no agreement. I know he did qualify it. But nevertheless, I think that the government could have sought to collect that monies regardless of how the agreement was, verbal or otherwise, binding or otherwise. It was an agreement. It was an agreement not too unlike other agreements in which the government is seeking and determined to collect.

So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have to support my colleague and therefore I have to vote against this motion as it stands.

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

HON. T. HICKEY, Minister of Transportation and Communications:

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate and I am going to be very brief. I do so because my name has been mentioned on at least three occasions and also, Mr. Speaker, I find it necessary

to take part because of some of the reasons and some of the things that are being used by the opposition to justify the unwarranted attack by the member for Bell Island on the honourable Minister of Finance.

I want to first of all say, Sir, and I cannot go into detail because of a ruling by Your Honour, that the matter which is before the courts is not to be debated, I will certainly abide by that rule, I just want to say that I have not since I took my seat in this House in 1966 ever on any occasion initiated a personal attack on the member for Bell Island or indeed any other member who ever sat in this House since I have been here.

I go further, Mr. Speaker, honourable gentlemen have been heard in silence over on the other side and I suggest that I be awarded the same courtesy, that is, if the honourable gentleman wish me to be brief. If he should want me to go on all afternoon, that is fine.

MR. NEARY: Take all the time you want.

MR. HICKEY: I go further, Mr. Speaker, and I challenge each and every one of the members on the opposition side to produce Hansard, to look through Hansard for the day I took my seat in this House. I will go so far as to say that if either one of them can produce one single bit of evidence where I initiated a personal attack on any honourable member of this House, then I will gladly forfeit my seat. I would gladly resign, Mr. Speaker. I did not come into this House to involve myself in personality assassinations nor personal attacks nor slanderous statements. That is not my kind of debate, Mr. Speaker. I do not support it, I do not involve myself in it except when I am personally attacked.

Mr. Speaker, I have been the subject of personal attacks by none other than the Member for Bell Island. Unfortunately, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman has not learned. I have found it necessary to table documents in this House in my own defence, in defence of my employment record with the former administration. Personal attacks? Oh no, Mr. Speaker, I have not at any time initiated nor have I taken any satisfaction out of even commenting and involving myself in a debate which deals with personal attacks. I want that placed on the record of this House, Mr. Speaker. As I said earlier, if any member should wish to take me up on my offer let him do so, Hansard is there, the record is there of every single word that I have spoken, as it is of every other honourable member who sits in this House, since 1966, and that challenge is open to any honourable member who sits on the other side.

A red herring, Mr. Speaker, that is what it is. A typical red herring being brought into this debate to justify the actions of

one of their colleagues. The Member for St. John's East Extern, it was said, has on a number of occasions personally attacked the Member for Bell Island. What garbage! What misrepresentation of facts, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Speaker, if it were one of the new honourable gentlemen who sit in this House or recently elected honourable gentlemen I could forgive them because, at least, they did not sit here before. Where did those words come from? They came, Mr. Speaker, from honourable gentlemen who have sat here the same length of time as I have, since 1966. Those remarks, Mr. Speaker, have come from the honourable Member for White Bay South and the honourable the Leader of the Opposition. Unforgivable, total misrepresentation of the facts, a smoke screen, an attempt to evade the real issue and to drag someone else into the debate.

As if it were, Mr. Speaker, justification. Even if it were true that I had in fact been stupid enough and been low enough to personally attack anyone since my stay in this House, is that justification for another honourable member to do so? I say it is not. I say it is not. That makes the case put forward by the opposition so weak, so much so, Mr. Speaker, that they find it necessary to drag this kind of red herring. I have heard honourable members on this side of the House, my colleagues, say repeatedly that the real issue, Mr. Speaker, in this whole debate, has escaped honourable gentlemen on the other side. Indeed it has. Indeed it has. It has been clearly shown that the honourable the Minister of Finance, my colleague, has done no wrong,

has not misled this House nor the people of this province. It was stated last night by my colleague from St. John's South who is a lawyer and well regarded and respected in legal practice, he can find no case, Mr. Speaker, where the member for St. John's West, or the honourable Minister of Finance, has done any wrong. He is a rather outspoken honourable gentleman.

Would he stand in this House and come to the defence as strongly as he did last night if there were some reason, some doubt in his mind, or indeed any case against the Minister of Finance? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, he would not have. So, Mr. Speaker, the whole issue escapes honourable gentlemen on the other side. It seems that they are concerning themselves with the issue of Bison Brewery.

That is not the issue, Mr. Speaker, we are debating here today. The issue that we are debating here today and that we have been debating and the whole purpose for this motion, Mr. Speaker, is to raise the question as to whether or not honourable gentlemen in this House may slander, may destroy the reputation and character of another honourable gentleman and go unpunished. That, Mr. Speaker, is the issue.

Conveniently, as has been the case since this opposition sat in this House, at least certain members of it - I would not go so far, Mr. Speaker, as to say all of them because I do not think that is fair, I do not think it is true - but certain members of the opposition seem to be inclined continuously, when they find themselves in the spot where they do not really know where to go or what to do and what kind of a stand to take, they let the issue at hand escape them and they pull in another red herring to cloud the main issue that is being debated; and so we have it again on this one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have heard a number of members from the opposition remark the style of the honourable member from Bell Island, the style, his style. Are we now, Mr. Speaker, to adjust the rules of this House, are we to adjust the rules so that they cater to the

style of an honourable gentleman? If I have a style wherein I come in and slander everybody, should the rules be amended, should they be styled to suit my style? Is that the way we are going to operate in this honourable House from now on? What garbage! What foolishness! for intelligent people to suggest we are to absolve the honourable gentleman because of his style.

Well, Mr. Speaker, nobody knows more about the style of the honourable gentleman than I for I have been on the receiving end for a number of years. It is a good thing that I have a tough skin or I would have been gone long ago. It is pretty difficult to sit and take some of the garbage that comes across from the other side, from certain honourable gentlemen.

It is probably fitting, Mr. Speaker, that I speak in this debate. I probably have better reason to speak in this debate than anyone in this honourable House. I have felt the wrath of Your Honour's Chair on two occasions, from the former administration, a suspension for three days and subsequently two days. For what, Mr. Speaker, what was that suspension for? What were both of the suspensions for? Let us just consider them.

Was there a debate as to whether or not I should leave this chamber for two days or for three days? No, there was not debate. We hear talk of a Banana Republic. We hear talk about the brand of justice that we are dishing out here in this debate. Who do we hear it from, Mr. Speaker? Two former cabinet ministers, two honourable gentlemen who sat on this side of the House and passed judgement on me without debate and without discussion.

Was there a motion brought in by the former Premier to suspend me? Oh, no. Did the honourable the Speaker, did His Honour of that day want to suspend me, Your Honour? Let us ask that question.

Let me give you the answer. The answer is no. It is right here, Mr. Speaker, in black and white in Hansard. The Speaker of that day said I had withdrawn the remark when I called the former Premier a liar. I did not in fact refer to the former Premier in that way. I said that what the honourable the Premier of that day had said was a lie. I was then asked by the Premier of that day; "Are you calling me a liar?" And I replied; "If you say so it is fine with me."

I had listened, Mr. Speaker, for something like three days to untruths, falsehoods against the then opposition of three. Three or four? Four I believe there was. Complete falsehoods. I am the first to admit, Your Honour, that I could take no more. I am the first to admit that I was wrong then and wrong a second time as I would be wrong today to call anyone a liar when that language is unparliamentary

Since that occasion and again under the former administration, that word was bandied back and forth in this honourable House on numerous occasions by members who sat on the government side. Were they ejected from the legislature? No, No! That kind of justice, Mr. Speaker, was only meant for people on the opposition side, particularly myself.

His Honour of the day had said I had withdrawn. I withdrew the remark, Mr. Speaker, when I was asked by the then Premier and I merely said when I withdrew it; "I will explain when my opportunity comes," meaning of course, that I would prove beyond any shadow of a doubt that the Premier of that day had deceived the House and in so doing deceived the people of this province by uttering falsehoods.

His Honour of that day accepted my withdrawal and when Mr. Smallwood asked His Honour if I had withdrawn he said; "As far as I am concerned the honourable member has withdrawn the remark." To which Mr. Smallwood replied; "I am the aggrieved party and I say he has not. He has not made an unqualified withdrawal and I will settle for nothing less." He cast the die then, Mr. Speaker.

The honourable gentleman of that day then passed judgement on me because he knew exactly what was going to happen. I had taken back what I had said and said that I would explain it when my time came but that was not good enough. He was going to make an example of me and he did.

He made an example of me all right, Mr. Speaker, over nothing. On a technicality, with absolutely no basis, because as I have pointed out, Your Honour, it is there in black and white for anyone to read. I had in fact withdrawn the remark but so be it, I went for three days! Did anybody say, on the government side then, did the Leader of the Opposition, did the Member for White Bay South, who now makes a big issue out of the fact that the Member for Bell Island has a certain style, did they get up then and say; "Oh that is the style of the Member for St. John's East Extern, that we really should not throw him out, that he really did not mean any malice? In fact, Mr. Speaker, what damage did I do to the Premier of that day? Did I slander him? No. Did I take a smack at his character? No. All I had said, in fact, was that what he had said was false.

That could be for any number of reasons. The honourable gentleman of the time might have forgotten, might have thought he was telling the truth and so on. There are any number of reasons why he might have made the statements he made although it was hard, it was rather difficult to understand because he was making them for three days.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, that was it. I went for three days



just because I had said, "That is a lie." I had then withdrawn it and I had committed the unforgiveable sin of saying that when my turn comes to speak I will explain why I said that and so on. So I was suspended for three days.

Now, Mr. Speaker, now we are being cautioned over here and we are being accused of passing judgment on the member for Bell Island without trial and so on.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER: Does the honourable member permit a question?

MR. HICKEY: Certainly.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: On two occasions when, by the former administration, the present member for St. John's East Extern was suspended from the chamber, on two occasion, how many days of debate were there on the resolution? Was there a lot more than there is now or was there a little bit less? I wonder if some honourable gentlemen were not here, it would be interesting perhaps for comparative purposes.

MR. HICKEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thank my honourable colleague. I had just mentioned that and I was about to cover it in a little more detail.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: There was no debate, of course, despite the attempts of my colleague, the honourable Minister of Education, who sat with me at that time and my colleague, the member for Gander, the Minister of Fisheries, and my other colleague, the member for St. John's Centre, the Minister of Social Services, all of whom attempted and of course, I should not forget, on the second occasion a very great effort by the Minister of Finance, the member for St. John's West, who then sat on the other side and attempted vigorously to debate and to pass for a debate to justify or to disagree with this kind of treatment, this kind of decision.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleague rightly points out, there was no debate because that was not the day of debate, Mr. Speaker. That was not the kind of administration that believed in debate, only in the kind of debate that they wanted. We heard talk of the brand of justice

that is evident in this honourable House today. Mr. Speaker, it is rather difficult to sit down and listen to it, especially when it comes from honourable gentlemen who were part and package of the former administration who never allowed debate only when it suited them, who threw the rules of this honourable House to the four winds; as we hear honourable gentlemen completely flabbergast when they do not get quick answers to all their questions.

Mr. Speaker, in those days you did not get any answers because you no sooner stood up to answer a question than you were ordered to take your seat and if his Honour of the day did not see you quickly enough, and do it, the Premier of the time was up and called it to his attention. I recall on a few occasions we managed to get a couple of questions in and a couple of ministers of the day attempted to rise and answer only to be told by the Premier of that time to sit down, and that was the kind of debate that went on. That was the kind of justice that was dished out, as the same brand of justice that was afforded me on two occasions and some other of my colleagues as well.

Mr. Speaker, it is incredible, nothing short of incredible to sit here and to hear some of the same honourable gentlemen who have now just only crossed the floor, the same people who were part of the former administration, now standing in their places on the other side, wearing different hats, of course, they are members of the Opposition now, but standing over there and saying, "What a brand of justice, finding the member for Bell Island guilty, not giving him a trial and passing judgment on him without debate." We have gone on and on in this debate and it is still going on, no suggestion, Mr. Speaker, on the part of this administration to expel the member for Bell Island without complete and full-scaled debate by every single honourable gentleman in this House who wishes to participate. Is there anything more fair than that?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, as my honourable colleague, the Minister of Education, drew to my attention a few moments ago, that is something like, something like the kind of treatment that I received at the hands

of the former administration on two occasions. No debate, shut up, get out, that is it, over and done with. A lark, in fact it was a complete lark to the former Premier because I can quote his words. I remember them for I shall never forget them, on my first suspension. I felt very, very strongly about that. I had not meant any malice against the honourable gentleman for it is not my type to injure anyone. Yet, Mr. Speaker, I was asked and forced to leave this Legislature for three days at the whim of a man who was drunk with power, so drunk with power, Mr. Speaker, that he did not listen to any one including Your Honour. When Your Honour did not do what he wanted, he ordered Your Honour to do it. I make no apologies. I said it then and I repeat it today. I make no apologies for making that statement and that is a fact.

One of the good things that happened when that administration changed, Your Honour, was the freedom and the dignity that was restored to this honourable Chamber. Where there is freedom of debate and where there are rules, for the most part those rules are enforced.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when those rules are abused, when they are completely ignored by the Member for Bell Island, we are asked to close our eyes and be good honourable gentlemen and just let him sit there. Well, Mr. Speaker, I make no bones about it, I will vote in favour of the motion put forward by the Member for St. John's West, my colleague, the Hon. Minister of Finance, with no malice; I hold no malice towards the Member for Bell Island or indeed any other honourable gentleman. I am not capable of holding any malice or vindictiveness towards any man. I will vote in favour of that motion with pleasure because I am completely sick and tired and I have had quite a job, Mr. Speaker, to sit here and remain quiet during this present session to hear the garbage, the kind of language that has been thrown back and forth and especially being initiated by the other side of this House.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing I want to say: I have been personally attacked, my employment record was called

into question, I was accused of personally attacking the Member for Bell Island. There was never a better misrepresentation of facts, Mr. Speaker, than that particular situation when honourable gentlemen on the other side accused me of personally attacking the Member for Bell Island. I defended myself I think on three occasions, against the Member for Bell Island, when he was a member of the former administration. I got my second suspension, Mr. Speaker, as a direct result of the Member for Bell Island, in a hot debate with him, when again the lord, king and ruler of this great province walked in the Chamber from his nap and made the irresponsible false statement again that he had heard this before, that he had heard those letters being read before, at which I again, I must confess, lost my temper and made the mistake again of saying; "That is not true! That is a lie!"

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question might be raised: Why did I not take that back that time? Why did I go out for two days? I had withdrawn the first remark and I still got suspended. There was no purpose, Mr. Speaker, in withdrawing the second one. My withdrawal on the first occasion did not get me anywhere but three days in the galleries so I was not going to have any part of that. The other thing, Your Honour, is that I could not in conscience take back anything that I had said that particular day because I meant it most sincerely. The Premier had uttered a falsehood. He had in fact told a lie.

Mr. Speaker, when we hear honourable gentlemen talking about suspensions - I am not proud of my record, Your Honour, not proud at all. I do not know how any one could be proud of being suspended from this Chamber. If there is anything that I regret in my career since I sat in this honourable House, it is those two occasions. Your Honour, I make no apology for it. If I had been afforded the kind of justice that the Member for Bell Island is being afforded today, I would not have been suspended. If I had been given the opportunity to explain and to show the Premier of that day how wrong he was, I think even he would have admitted and I would not have been suspended. That is why I make no apologies for them.

The second time, Your Honour, in attempting to defend my reputation - against who, against which member? Against none other than the member who is on trial today, the Member for Bell Island, who as per usual, by innuendo and inference in the House and by clear-cut statements outside the House, had cast doubt on my character and reputation. That, Mr. Speaker, I will take from no man, be he Premier, a member of the House, minister of the crown or any one else. That is a right which each of us have and that is a right each of us can stand on and defend ourselves against.

Mr. Speaker, I said a moment ago that I had heard queer things in my eight years, close to nine years now in this Chamber. I had heard some pretty sad things thrown across from one to the other. Mr. Speaker, I am the first to acknowledge, the very first to acknowledge that I do not condemn honourable gentlemen in this House when they get hot under the collar in the heat of debate who may very well be guilty of a breach of the rules of this House. It takes just as big a man, Mr. Speaker, to withdraw his remark as those who make it. That is not a sign of weakness but a sign of strength. To compromise oneself occasionally is no sign of weakness but a sign of strength, especially an acknowledgement that one has said something wrong or unparliamentary.

Your Honour, I will tell you why that I will vote for this motion with all the vigor at my command and with all the sincerity at my command. I would be inclined to vote for it anyway based on the unwarranted, unprecedented, unjustifiable attack on a minister of the Crown and an honourable member of this House. But, Your Honour, to use the old Newfoundland saying, what really put the cap on it was what I heard here the night the honourable the Premier spoke in this chamber to this motion.

When I heard the personal remarks and the gutter-type tactics used by the member for Bell Island against the honourable Premier and subsequently reported in the press, purely personal, purely family. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we are to allow someone of that caliber to sit in this House, then I say it is time we closed the doors and placed up the bar.

If my family or someone else's family is going to be called into question here, one by one, or someone's life style, then I say let us pack it up and close her up. But, Your Honour, I want to say this, that the member for Bell Island is a lucky man, rather lucky, he picked the gentleman with the patience. He picked a gentleman who does not lose his temper. I would not want him to pick some other. He would not have to worry about fourteen days suspension, he would be on the broad of his back for fourteen days or maybe fourteen months.

I think I could take anything in this honourable House. Abuse, yes, Mr. Speaker, I have had it! When your family is dragged into it, that is another matter. That is about as low as anyone can go. In fact that is the lowest of the low. I am so sick of listening; Your Honour, to people who have set themselves up as the standard of all for all to follow, the great guardian of the common man, the great hallmark of justice, the hallmark of morality, the great man who sets the standards for all. I have listened to it. I have heard it and I say it is complete rubbish for I know differently.

I thought, Your Honour, we all came in here with an attitude of live and let live. I thought we came in here to do a job for this province. I did not think we came in here to discuss one's personalities, their families, their relatives or anything else, but apparently we have. If we have, Your Honour, let me say this, let me say this in defence of what was said to the honourable the Premier that night. There is no man who sits here who may cast a stone at another. There is none, Your Honour, not one. If there be, we will have no problem in finding a pope when the present one dies. I did not know we had perfect people.

I am so sick, so sick of people pushing their standards down in everyone elses' throat when in fact they have no basis, no basis whatsoever for setting standards for anyone. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if there are very many people, if any, who have not made mistakes in their lifetime. If there are, I am not one of them. I have made plenty. It is not the subject for debate in this House though. It is my own business and so it should be. I do not think I have to come here and apologize to anyone in this honourable House for my mistakes personally or my problems. If anybody wants to take their life in their own hands, Your Honour, let them drag it in to any debate, because I think it is about time, it is about time then that we have evaluated the whole system; if we are going to listen to this kind of thing.

So, Your Honour, I do not need much reason to vote for this motion. As one who has been suspended twice for nothing, for relatively nothing, I do not need much reason. But if I ever needed one, if I ever needed one, Your Honour, I got that reason on the night of the exchange between the member from Bell Island and the honourable the Premier. I got that reason and so has every other honourable gentleman in this House.

I want to say one other thing, Your Honour, before I take my seat. When this motion comes to vote, honourable gentlemen on the other side may think that they can vote as a block. They may think

because they are Liberals they vote in favour of a Liberal. Your Honour, that is not what is on trial here today. It is not Tories and Liberals that are being decided here today or what is on trial here today. It is pure decency, respect for one another that is on trial in this chamber today and being decided here today. This is the exact and only issue, Your Honour, that is going to be decided when this vote is taken.

Honourable gentlemen on the other side are going to vote against this motion because of the style of the honourable member for Bell Island. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that be the case, then they need very little justification to change their minds. They can throw principles around very easily if that be the case. The dignity and respect for honourable gentlemen who sit in this House, who come here to do a job, must mean very little to them.

I might say that I commend my honourable friend from Labrador South who clearly stated where he stood when he spoke in this debate. He did not agree with everything, Your Honour. No one expects him to. No,



nobody expects, Maybe honourable gentlemen over here do not agree with everything on this motion, maybe, I do not know. It is a free vote. It is the only time that I have ever heard this in this chamber since I have been here. A Premier of the province saying, "You may vote as you see fit. I am not going to tell you how to vote." I have never heard that before. What I was used to was the Premier saying, "You will vote this way." This is a free vote Your Honour, on this side, hopefully it is a free vote on the other side. Let honourable gentlemen vote as their consciences dictate and let it be said, Mr. Speaker, and let the record show that any honourable gentlemen who vote against this motion, I would hardly expect the member for Bell Island to vote for it because it deals with the honourable gentleman. I do not think his vote would count as such. I do not think it would be expected that he get up and vote to suspend himself.

But any other honourable gentleman, Your Honour, who votes against this motion must only be voting for the continuation of the downgrading and the destruction of dignity in this honourable House and further, the continuation of the slandering and destruction of character and reputation of the honourable gentlemen who sit in this House now and in the future. Because Your Honour, once this vote is taken it becomes part of the record of this House. It will never disappear. It will be called upon as a precedent and looked at as a case by comparison as have been my two cases which are no more, Your Honour, no more alike by comparison to the cases before us today than chalk is like cheese but they have been brought into this debate. So will this debate be brought in to debates in the future. We are not only deciding an issue on the member for Bell Island, I suppose the honourable gentleman would not believe it if I told him that I do not want to see him suspended from the House. He probably would not.

MR. NEARY: Vote against the motion.

MR. HICKEY: I wish I could, Your Honour. I wish I could. I wish I could vote against the motion, I wish I could in conscience vote against the motion, if it were to convince the honourable gentleman that I to this day hold no malice towards him. We will disagree and we will debate back and forth and while I certainly do not hold with his kind of debate, I hold no malice towards him and I have never in my life, since I have sat in this House, have done anything to personally attack the honourable gentleman nor will I, nor any other honourable member.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will support this motion because I cannot in conscience do anything else. My little bit of advice to the honourable gentlemen on the other side, for what it is worth Your Honour, is let their conscience be their guide. If they vote against this motion, they will live with the record that will remain part of this House for years to come. I suggest, Your Honour, that if they do they will have difficulty explaining it in years to come when other issues such as this will undoubtedly come before the House.

Your Honour, it is not with pleasure that I support this motion but there is nothing else I can do. I have no alternative because to vote against this motion, as I said before and as I have repeated a half a dozen times in my remarks today, to vote against this motion is a vote against the integrity of the House and the decency with which business is carried on here and the character and reputations or the preservation of characters and reputations of its members.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some remarks on motion number (3) the motion of the Minister of Finance to suspend the honourable the member for Bell Island. Much has been said during the past few days when this debate has been on about the commendable quality of the justice which is being administered

here. We are reminded of what it used to be like and what it is like now. I was not here during the earlier period so I have to depend on the second-hand reports of gentlemen like the Minister of Transportation to know what did go on.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, this debate ought to involve itself in whether what we are doing now is better or worse than before but whether what we are doing now is adequate or right. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that this debate is really the debate that ought to be going on here right now. I have my views, which I state during the course of my remarks on the allegations which were made by the honourable the member for Bell Island. The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, no matter what I believe about them or what the honourable member for Bell Island believes or what any member in this honourable House believes, the fact is that these issues were never put to the test.

My first question to those who may be contemplating voting on the motion either for or against, my first question is how can they in conscience make a decision to vote for the motion unless they know of a certainty that the charges that the member for Bell Island made are indeed false? Are they false because the Minister of Finance says they are false? Is that enough to prove them false or could we not instead have had them put to the test, as the member for Bell Island suggested in presenting his documentation?

Mr. Speaker, had that been done and had his charges been proved false, then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it would be the time for the motion we are now discussing. Then all members who had participated in the debate would know of a certainty whether indeed the member for Bell Island ought to be suspended from the House for a period because he had accused the Minister of Finance of things that subsequently proved to be false. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we do not know any more today, we do not know any more today than we did on the day that the member for Bell Island made his

charges, we know no more as to the truths of his allegations, his charges or as to their being false. We do not know any more. Here we are voting on an issue, voting on a motion which itself is predicated on false charges and we do not know whether they are false or not, Mr. Speaker, we have no way of knowing in this present situation.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled when I hear all the discussions

about conscience, searching your soul and that kind of thing, I am puzzled how people can stand up and without equivocation say they are going to vote for this without indeed knowing whether the basis of the motion, namely; the truth or the falseness of the charges involved, without knowing what the facts are in connection with the charges. They just do not know and these are the same people, if you check the record of the House on division, so far, my count shows that the people who have said in this House, in this present debate, that they are going to vote for it also voted against having a discussion on the matter which the Member for Bell Island raised.

MR. BARRY: It is irrelevant.

MR. NEARY: It is not irrelevant.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not irrelevant.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so foolish.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Placentia West would like to speak I would be delighted to hear him say something substantial on the point. I have been sitting here for several days wanting to hear some good reason why people ought to vote for this motion. I am willing to be convinced, Mr. Speaker, and I believe -

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

MR. NEARY: Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker, the time for the honourable member to speak is when he stands and is recognized by the Speaker. I will look forward to listening to him at that time and I trust, in view of all that has been said on the airways and here in this House, all that has been voiced about the shock on the part of government members at the lowering of the dignity of the House, and all that has been said about the constant interruptions by the members of Opposition, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Placentia West will not be caught associating himself with that kind of practice of interrupting speakers while they are speaking.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot get excited about the sterling nature of the justice, the quality of justice that has been going on here in the last few days. I understand that all kinds of things are getting to be unparliamentary so I would not mention what I believe about the kind of court it is. I would not assert for the record that it is a kangaroo court, as far as I am concerned, but were I able to do so, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly do so. I would certainly assert, Mr. Speaker, that this, whatever the expression you put on it, and if that expression wants to be withdrawn - I see, Mr. Speaker, the honourable the schoolboy debater is getting all worked up about the subject at hand so I will withdraw it because there is nothing I want to do more than keep him happy.

I will withdraw that comment but let me say that if I were allowed to say it that is what I would call it, Mr. Speaker. That is what I would call it.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: There are other ways, Mr. Speaker. There are other ways. You can get a parliamentary majority and then you can call a member a totally useless individual and get away with it. I cannot do that, Mr. Speaker. I shall only say that the kind of justice that we are seeing here now is not exactly the kind of justice that we are told by government-side spokesmen that we are seeing. We are not seeing what it is claimed we are seeing.

I just heard the Minister of Transportation, Mr. Speaker, and I was shocked to hear him first of all contradict himself on a point and Hansard will prove me out on this. I heard him say early in his comments; "I will take pleasure, Sir, in voting for the motion." I heard him say in the last minute or two of his speech "I take no pleasure" and he got on with this "Mr. Clean" aspect, this baring your soul complex all of a sudden.

Suddenly he took no pleasure, it was a most distasteful thing and indeed he loves the Member for Bell Island. Such hypocrisy,

Mr. Speaker: I also heard him say, Mr. Speaker, that he could in all conscience vote for this. No question, never anything in his whole life that he knew he was so sure of doing the right thing, He had his reasons. The reasons were based on the attack that the Member for Bell Island was alleged to have made on another member of the House, namely, the Minister of Finance. He had his reasons. These were his reasons and if conscience did not dictate, he would not do it that way.

Having said all that and I was beginning to believe the man and check Hansard, Mr. Speaker, here is what he said after; "If ever I needed a reason to vote for this I found it on the night that I was kicked out of the House." Obviously, what has happened on this date did not decide what he was going to do. For him it is a vengeful act, Mr. Speaker. He is getting back. He is getting back right from the time back there when he was kicked out. Check the Hansard Record and you will find that this afternoon the Minister of Transportation said and I quote; "If ever I needed a reason to vote for the motion -

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order please! The honourable member is pushing himself into a bit of a frenzy concerning things the honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications may or may not have said. I ask the honourable member to direct himself to the matter under discussion and be relevant.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am discussing the reasons why one ought to vote for or against the motion. I said a moment ago that I listened with intent to the remarks of the Minister of Transportation and that while I did not subscribe to his case I certainly saw where he could himself believe in it. I continued to subscribe to that position until I heard him contradict himself. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, and I believe I am addressing myself very much to the motion, or else, of course, it is your duty and responsibility to rule me out of order, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the issues that make up the minds of members in voting for or against this resolution ought to be present issues. That, Mr.

Speaker, is my point. They ought to be issues which pertain to this particular date. It ought not to be a matter of delving back into the past to draw on some score that has to be settled. I appeal, Mr. Speaker, to the members of the House to make a decision on this motion, on the issues at hand.

I listened also - while I am talking about the comments of the Minister of Transportation - I listened with some interest to his emotional and heartfelt plea that we ought to in this matter get away from personalities. I was rather puzzled how he could at once make that kind of an appeal and yet throughout most of his comments confine himself to a rather vicious personal attack on the gentleman who is the subject of this motion. That, Mr. Speaker, is not the kind of statesman we need in this House of Assembly.

I also heard him say, of course, as other members did, that he was sick and tired with people pushing their standards down other people's throats. On that the Minister of Transportation and I are in accord. I am sick and tired too of having people push standards down my throat and down the throats of other members. If the Minister of Transportation is as much in accord on this matter with me as I think he is, he must be sick indeed of the way that the Minister of Finance continues to push his standards down people's throats in this particular matter.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with considerable interest as the Minister of Finance spoke in leading off this debate. At one point the Minister of Finance asserted that had the Member for Bell Island wanted he could have asked questions. He could have asked questions of the Minister of Finance concerning the



issue about which the member for Bell Island introduced the documentation and no point in reading but the Minister of Finance is to be found on page 2039 of Hansard, number 25, in which he says that the member could indeed have asked the questions. The fact is that the minister himself pointed out the fact is that the member for Bell Island did ask question, Mr. Speaker. He asked them a month before to the day.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Exactly.

MR. SIMMONS: He asked them on February 8. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have looked at the documentation and I stand to be corrected but I believe that all the documentation antedated February 8, all before February 8.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: All before February 8, Mr. Speaker. On February 8, the Minister of Finance answered questions of the member for Bell Island. On March 8, he says, "Why did the member for Bell Island not ask me some questions?" The fact is that, on February 8, the member for Bell Island asked questions. All the documentation that has been introduced antedates February 8, was presented before February 8. Therefore, the minister was in full knowledge of all the facts on February 8 that he was on March 8.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: My question then, Mr. Speaker, is this: Is the minister admitting that he did not give all the pertinent information on February 8? Is he admitting that he deliberately kept some information from the member for Bell Island when he asked the question on February 8? If he had more information to give on February 8, why did he not give it on February 8 or is it part of this game that we go through in the question period, the much-talked-about free question period? We will get an answer if someone feels like it. That is part of parliamentary process I realize, Mr. Speaker, but Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance used his prerogative not to answer a question fully, if he used that prerogative on February 8, let him not try on March 8 to beat the member for Bell Island over the head with that fact. If the minister used his prerogative not to answer the question, let him not blame the member for Bell Island for not asking the questions. He asked the right questions but he did not

get the answers until he had the courage to bring the answers into the House himself and then the minister said, "Why did you not ask me before? I would have told you."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A good point.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it has been charged by the Minister of Finance and by other speakers, subsequently, that the member for Bell Island was trying to destroy him. Mr. Speaker, what kind of double standards, what kind of double standards allow the Minister of Finance and the Premier of the Province to make any charges about members of this House but refuses the same license to the member for Bell Island?

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to substantiate, to document the implication in my question. Anybody who wants to follow with me, I am looking at Hansard for Friday, March 8, Hansard number 25, and on page 2042, 2043 the Minister of Finance - Now, Mr. Speaker, keep in mind that this is the man who is not going to engage in personalities. He is far above that. No way is he going to be caught dipping to the levels that the member for Bell Island has allegedly dipped in. As far as the Minister of Finance is concerned and here is the Minister of Finance, Mr. Clean himself, way above all this kind of thing, saying at the bottom of page 2042 and the top of 2043, in reference to the member for Bell Island, "If he" (the member for Bell Island) "If he had a streak of decency in his whole body," that is pretty impersonal, Mr. Speaker, that is terribly impersonal, "If he had a streak of decency in his whole body".

The Minister of Finance has been asking regularly during his comments in leading off a debate why, why the member for Bell Island was allowed to continue with his charges? What he is really doing, of course, Mr. Speaker, is questioning the ruling of the Speaker and he, more than any other member of this House, should know the proper procedure for questioning the ruling of the Speaker. Aside from that, Mr. Speaker, aside from that, if he can get away with asking that kind of question, I am sure I can.

I wonder why one member of the House is allowed to say this kind

of thing about another member,"that he does not have a streak of decency in his whole body." I wonder why he is allowed to say that kind of thing without being called to order.

Mr. Speaker, there are other examples. Perhaps we could look a little further on in this same Hansard, on 2048. How is this for an impersonal comment? How is this for sticking to the issues, Mr. Speaker? We are still quoting from the Minister of Finance who does not get into the personalities involved and here he is, in reference again to the member for Bell Island, saying, "Perhaps he," (the member for Bell Island) "perhaps he has no character or reputation that is worth defending?" How is that?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The Minister of Finance said that.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, Hansard, I hardly believe it, Mr. Speaker, but Hansard quotes him as saying that.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I did not think he said anything like that.

MR. SIMMONS: This, Mr. Speaker, is what puzzles me.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Is that parliamentary?

MR. SIMMONS: Well, obviously, it is parliamentary, Mr. Speaker, because he did it in the record and I see no Point of Order on the subject and I see the Speaker not having ruled against it. So, it is in the record that the Minister of Finance, who does not at all get involved in the personalities of the issue, says, "Perhaps he" (the member for Bell Island) "has no character or reputation that is worth defending."

Of course, Mr. Speaker, at the risk of sounding like I am getting into a lesson on basic dictionary explanations, the Minister of Finance ought to know that while a fellow has no reputation or to wit a bad reputation, he certainly has character. He might be despicable, might be honourable, he certainly has character. I do not quite know the import of what the Minister of Finance was getting at but I can certainly read into the lines that he was not trying to be particularly complimentary of the member for Bell Island.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He would not be trying to attack somebody's character though, .... (Inaudible) .. character assassination.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I asked a minute ago what double standard permitted the Minister of Finance and/or the Premier of this Province to make personal attacks and personal charges and innuendo but refuse that same license to the member for Bell Island?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Or any other member.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, of course, the member for Bell Island or any other member, the fact of the matter is I do not believe I or the member for Bell Island or any other member of this House particularly wants that kind of license. That is not my point, Mr. Speaker. It is not that we want that kind of license. It is not that we are asking for that kind of license. We are saying, "Let us not have the pot call the kettle black," as it were, or worse than that.\* Let us not have this double standard. I ought to substantiate that part of my question which implicates the Premier and so I shall on page 2170 of the evening Hansard of Friday, March 8, Hansard number 26, on page 2170. My honourable colleague, the member for St. Barbe North quoted this to you yesterday. I think it is, I was going to say worth, no, Mr. Speaker, it is not worth quoting but I think it is relevant that I quote it.

The Premier in referring to the member for Bell Island, the context clearly shows that he was referring to the member for Bell Island, he said, "It is a matter of listening to the absolute bile that comes from the guts of a totally useless and absolutely incompetent individual." Mr. Speaker, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why do you not read what he said ... (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker,

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Is that the leader .... (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the member for Trinity North says, why do I not read what came before? Mr. Speaker, suppose I do read it and suppose we find out that the member for Bell Island said something even worse. Is that relevant? Mr. Speaker, the point I make is this: This is not a tit-for-tat game. This is a matter, if the Premier stands up or if the members of the Government side stand up and call on us to deal with the issues and not with the personalities,

then these people in particular ought to abide by the rules they are establishing. I am saying, irrelevant, irrespective of what the member for Bell Island has said - I am prepared to read what the member for Bell Island said - but irrespective of what he said, does that give the Premier the license to say something about the absolute bile that comes from the guts of a totally useless and absolutely incompetent individual? That too, Mr. Speaker -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: And then the member for Trinity North parroted it the other night on television, parroted it.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): The two honourable members are engaging in a debate here, neither one of which has the parliamentary right to do so. The honourable member from Hermitage has the floor.

While these remarks may be interpreted as being provocative, I ask all honourable members to accord him the courtesy of silence.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have referred to a couple of sections in Hansard, a couple of pages to point out that the Minister of Finance and the Premier of the province indeed have been guilty of the double standard, have indeed advocated one course of action but pursued another course of action themselves. To put it another way; do not do as I do, do as I say.

Mr. Speaker, referring still to and further to the remarks of the honourable the Minister of Finance during his lead-off in the debate on this motion, I mentioned also already that he had questioned the Speaker's ruling on a number of occasions in connection with the breach of privilege issue which was raised by the member for Bell Island. Indeed he goes so far at one point - this rather shocked me as I sat here and listened - I will find the actual reference first.

He questioned the ruling of the Speaker pretty directly, Mr. Speaker. I am sure he knows the method for appealing the Speaker's

ruling. Yet on page 2038 of Hansard, number 25, March 8, Friday, the afternoon sitting, he said, "Those three statements, Mr. Speaker, which were unparliamentary and I do not understand how he was permitted to make them." I shall leave that point where it is. I am disturbed that one member of the House should be allowed to question so directly the Speaker's ruling in an improper manner, as the Minister of Finance has done on a number of occasions, but I think that is another issue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in the debate in the last day or so the member for St. John's South said, in talking about the motion, in talking about Mr. Neary's statements of March 4 and referring to Hansard, The Member from St. John's South, with the kind of sincerity that he is able to muster said; "If somebody reading this, the Hansard record of Mr. Neary's" - I am sorry, "the member for Bell Island's comments of that day - "If someone reading this, the Hansard record" - I am sorry, I am not quite right. I will quote him more correctly, Mr. Speaker.

He said, without the if, "Someone reading this could only conclude that the Minister of Finance had done something disreputable." Two points, Mr. Speaker, first of all I say, if only someone reading that could also have the advantage of reading the record of the debate on the issue that the member for Bell Island raised, if they could only have the benefit of doing both, reading his charges and then reading a full debate on the issue, then that person could decide for himself whether the Minister of Finance had done something disreputable. But, that potential reader will never get that opportunity because that debate was cut off before it began.

So, if indeed, at the concern that has been expressed by the member for St. John's South, if a person reading the Hansard at some time in the future gets the impression that the Minister of Finance did something disreputable, I can only say to the Minister of Finance and to the member for St. John's South that unfortunate situation will

transpire because the Minister of Finance and his colleague - not the minister himself, he slipped into the House when the vote was being taken, Mr. Speaker - but the other members, his colleagues in government, prevented the debate from happening, prevented the opportunity of getting into the records the truth about this matter.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, if someone reading the member for Bell Island's comments of March 4 will get the impression that the minister had done something disreputable, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what will that same reader conclude, what will that same reader conclude when he reads the comments that I have just quoted from the Minister of Finance about the honourable member for Bell Island, the comments which stated that the member for Bell Island had not a streak of decency in him or the comments from the Premier which say that the member for Bell Island is a totally useless person?

I was somewhat disappointed in the member from St. John's South yesterday that he was concerned about how the record would reflect on the reputation of one member of this House but did not say a word as to how it might reflect on the record of another member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, having addressed myself to the motion and in relation to comments made by other persons in this debate, just allow me to say some things on the motion itself as it reflects some of my views on the subject. I have scrutinized the documentation at some length. I saw it before the member for Bell Island presented it to the House, just a minute before, if you like, or an hour or so.

Mr. Speaker, quite apart from party lines or partisan alignments or obligations or loyalties, I agree with the Minister for Transportation and the Premier on this point, that this is not a time for partisan loyalties to take precedents. So, quite apart from any partisan loyalties which involve men, I must say that having read the documentation

before it ever came to this House, it raised by suspicions, I wanted to know some answers. I still want to know the answers, Mr. Speaker, and I do not have them throughout the course of this debate. It is largely or partly because, of course, the real debate, as I have said a couple of times, never got off the ground. The questions are still in my mind. You can kick the Hon. Member for Bell Island out as many times or as many days as you want, Mr. Speaker, the majority can, the fact of the matter remains that no amount of kicking him out will answer the questions of itself. The questions are still unanswered and unless we agree to come to grips with it in the proper parliamentary fashion, the questions will be the subject of suspicion for some time to come.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I had my doubts before the session sat that day and I still have them because nobody has given me the answers. Mr. Speaker, I do not subscribe - I have known at least casually the Minister of Finance for some time. I do not regard, although he regards another member of this House in this light, him a totally useless individual. I do not regard him as lacking in integrity; I do not regard him as lacking in basic honesty. The fact of the matter is that I only know him casually and insofar as I know he could be the most soundly principled man in all of Newfoundland. He could be the man of the most integrity in all of Newfoundland. Then perhaps he may not be. I hope he is a man of the most integrity and as a Newfoundlander sitting almost side by side with him in this House, I would like to think he is a man of integrity. I would like for him to be given an opportunity to prove that the charges made by the Member for Bell Island are false. I would like for him to avail of that kind of an opportunity, produce the documentation or better still, Mr. Speaker, because as the Minister of Transportation and Communications said in reference to the Member for Bell Island, he did not expect the Member for Bell Island to vote for the motion because it was too close to home, for that same reason, Mr. Speaker, because the Minister of Finance is directly involved here, perhaps the place to settle this is not in this House of Assembly at all, because there are a couple of mitigating factors: (1) that he is so close to it;



(2) that there are party loyalties involving him and indeed involving those of us on this side of the House as well as his colleagues on that side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, whatever the method, I believe in the interest of getting some real answers, when this issue is dealt with itself, the motion, we ought to find a mechanism for getting the answers to these charges. The country will be no wiser, Mr. Speaker, when they hear tonight or tomorrow night or whatever night that the motion is passed, that the Member for Bell Island is out of the House for fourteen days. They will be none the wiser. When it is all over, of course, one of the questions that will be unanswered is: "Was there any truth to the allegations that precipitated this whole matter two or three weeks ago?"

Mr. Speaker, if I, who have sat through this debate, right here in this House for most of the time, have not found the answers, how about the average person around this country whom we are duty bound to represent here, how confused must he be on this particular issue?

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is any miniscule or small issue or any issue that ought to be downgraded. We are talking about or just about \$500,000. Mr. Speaker, I can think of a lot of things that can be done in my District of Hermitage or indeed in any other district of this province with \$500,000, things that are not being done because we are told there is a shortage of available funds.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few puzzling questions that bother me on this subject. I do not know if they bother anybody else or if anybody else in this House has thought about them but I have a feeling they have. What puzzles me most of all is: If the debt were uncollectable, why do you need an Order-in-Council to decide not to collect a debt that you cannot collect anyway? It defies reason. I am ready to listen to the reason; I am ready to listen to the answer. What is as puzzling or

more puzzling to the people of this province, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, or to those who followed it all closely, the career of the Minister of Finance, the gentleman who is going to straighten things out for good, who is going to bring efficiency to government and he did by the way, Mr. Speaker, (That is a subject for another occasion.) the kind of efficiency that the Member for Bonavista North talked about, the kind of efficiency that ignores what a government is all about, that ignores the fact that a government is not a business but a service to the people of this province and when we get that kind of efficiency, of course, we ought to review our priorities somewhat, Mr. Speaker, here is the efficient Minister of Finance, a man billed for his efficiency, his persistence in collecting bills for the government and yet on this one he is most anxious to prove that the \$407,000 was not collectable. I wonder why.

and I would like to know the answer to that question.

Mr. Speaker, there are other questions that could be asked and if we get the appropriate debate on the subject I would like to ask them, or perhaps the proper committee or whatever, but I think they need to be answered in the interest of the Minister of Finance and in the interest of the conduct of this House they need to be asked, they need to be answered.

The motion of the Minister of Finance, seconded by the honourable the Premier, in my view is the culmination of a rather pathetic sequence of events that we have seen since the House opened here, right from Opening Day, with the mover of the Address in Reply, the member for Bonavista South. Certainly that is a performance that he can take no particular pride in. Certainly it is not a performance that the other members of this House could take much pride in. We have seen on Opening Day but particularly since Opening Day we have seen a number of members of this House introduce the vindictive approach. I have been called just about everything under the sun, not through the loud-speaker system, Mr. Speaker, but across the floor and I will just use me as one example. I am by no means the big victim here, I am sure there are others who have managed to accumulate more names than I because they have been here longer - or the member concerned happened to be looking in their direction more than mine.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are terms I have heard sitting here that - well unparliamentary is being kind, to call them just unparliamentary. They are also unrepeatably in the hearing of decent people. I could name names, I will not. The people concerned know whom I am talking about. I have heard some fairly vile language. I was shocked the first while I was here, then I kept saying to myself, 'Simmons you are just a big green boy, Settle down, you will get used to it.' But I was rather distraught the first few days at the tone of the language and I was beginning to fear this is par for the course and then I decided that if that be the case, well I am not particularly interested in the course. I have heard some pretty raw stuff in off comments.

Then of course the evitable happened, because the government side realized that they were losing badly and somebody, Mr. Speaker, somebody cracked the whip. I am glad it happened. I only wish it had happened before. But somebody cracked the whip and suddenly the members who spent most of their time heckling and interjecting became, one, awfully silent and secondly, awfully pious, to the point where one member of this House even left for a while because it was not up to his standards. But he is back, Mr. Speaker, he is back and I can only say that certainly the standards must be elevated because he is my authority and he certainly would not be back here, if we can take his word, because his word was he was not coming back until an improvement had been made. So I thank the member for his compliment on my performance and the performance of the other members on this side and indeed the performance of the other members on the other side, that he has deemed it possible for him to come back here and join us once again.

Mr. Speaker, the question period I mentioned earlier, I have never seen, Mr. Speaker, a bigger charade, a bigger mockery by supposedly intelligent men, never seen a bigger mockery. It is a complete joke. The expressions on the faces say far more than the answers you get or do not get, complete mockery.

I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, to use the question period for what it is intended, if not - sure Mr. Speaker, we are partisan animals. We are people whose party loyalties come to the fore at times and very often in our questions we introduce a partisan note and if I were the minister being asked the question on that occasion, I would get a little riled up and I would probably dodge the guy too or tell him no answer, or put it on the Order Paper, or whatever. But these occasions aside, Mr. Speaker, these occasions aside, I have seen occasions when members on this side of the House have asked legitimate questions, not loaded questions at all but legitimate, honestly seeking answers. I have seen them told that it was not urgent or the minister concerned was not disposed to answer the question and it

was dropped.

Do not tell us about how democratic the question period is in this House, Mr. Speaker, unless you want it demonstrated by the democracy of your answer period. The questions alone are no good, Mr. Speaker, unless we get some answers. I agree from what I know of the past, second-hand, that the question period is a lot more democratic but I cannot say the same for the answers or the lack thereof.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we come to another point in relation to my overall asertion, my overall asertion being that this motion before us now is but the culmination of a rather pathetic sequence of events which started on Opening Day with the comments of the mover of the Address in Reply, with the heckling that we have heard from the members of the government side since the opening until somebody cracked the whip and told them to shut up, in caucus, a good thing, a smart thing. I commend whoever did it.

I mentioned the question period and what a charade it is and of course, as anybody knows who has sat in this House, there has been no substantive legislation, with two exceptions I shall mention, no substantive legislation given notice of in this session. The two exceptions I think are quite known to all concerned, the Forestry Bill. How substantive that is I shall be saying when I get an opportunity to speak in the debate on that.

MR. MORGAN: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, to a point of order, We are debating a

motion put forward by the Hon. Minister of Finance with regard to the expulsion of a member from this House. We are not debating whether or not legislation is brought forward to this House of Assembly in this session or not; we are not debating what type of legislation will be brought forward to the House. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member who is speaking in this debate be relevant.

MR. NEARY: Very good, Mr. Forsey.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the point of order by the returnee, may I submit, Sir, there is no point of order. The honourable gentleman from Hermitage is being perfectly relevant. He is making a point that is directly related to the motion before the Chair now. All he is doing in making his point is buttressing a very sound argument and buttressing it further by reference to the abysmal lack of legislation introduced in this session by the government. The honourable gentleman from Hermitage is not being irrelevant. The only one who is being irrelevant is the gentleman from Bonavista South who is obviously trying to harass the gentleman from Hermitage.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

The Chair does have the feeling that the Hon. Member for Hermitage was not being as relevant to the motion as perhaps he should be. I urge him to be more relevant to the said motion as he continues.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the ruling. I am not sure I know what it means, but thank you for it. I shall attempt to be more relevant. I have the limitation of having to write my notes myself, Mr. Speaker, and having to decide what I think is pertinent to the resolution. I shall depend on your guidance to tell when I am out of order. I thought though that my assertion that the motion before us is but the culmination of a rather sick and pathetic series of events, I thought that that was certainly open to being substantiated or else refuted. I thought if I am going to make that statement directly on the motion, I should be allowed the follow-up liberty of addressing myself to it.

Mr. Speaker, if members of this House think that it is not important that we do not pass any legislation, except the Forestry Bill, which I will talk about later and, of course, the bill to take over BRINCO, which is certainly substantive, and I will be speaking on that probably when the occasion arises, I find that this motion today is but part of a series of events which shows a lack of direction on the part of the government's side of the House; not knowing where to go next. I would say that it is lucky for all concerned that the BRINCO issue, which we are told is not an overnight thought but one that has been going on for some time - I can only regret that the planning was such that it interfered so completely with the House sittings and we had to be away for some time, when we could have been dealing with this particular issue. That really is another point which we will get to later.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we have seen in this session of the House the kind of bizarre performance on the part of government and its members that one would hardly credit and the most bizarre of all being this particular motion by the Minister of Finance.

The Minister of Transportation and Communications talked about red herring and the Member for Placentia West mentioned red herring yesterday too. Somebody got to him, Mr. Speaker, and told him what a red herring is. Aside from that, of course, Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of people better able to recognize red herring than the Minister of Transportation and Communications and the Minister of Mines and Energy. If ever there were a red herring, it is this particular motion. The real issue is not getting dealt with. I have already dwelt, Mr. Speaker, for some time on that issue, and I shall not pursue it further at this particular time.

There was a charge by the Minister of Finance and by other people speaking in his defence. Why the Minister of Finance needs to be defended on this issue, I do not know. I really do not know, Mr. Speaker. I believe we ought first to find out whether any

defence is needed and I do not know yet because I do not know what the answers to the questions are. Since everybody else is speaking in his defence in the motion, I would presume, Mr. Speaker, that their comments having been made and gotten into the record without being ruled out of order, I would presume, therefore, that a comment on their comments is also in order.

The day the Minister of Finance came back and stood in this House, with considerable emotion (I would suggest not in sufficient command of what he was going to say - I mean that emotion, not in command emotionally, Mr. Speaker, not sufficiently cooled off if you like) he talked about somebody on a character and reputation assassination.

Well as I alluded earlier, Mr. Speaker, I cannot completely follow the minister insofar as he talks about character. There is only one person, Mr. Speaker, in this House or in all of Newfoundland or in all of Canada or in the world who is responsible for the minister's character and that is the minister, be it good, bad, perfect or what. He is stuck with his character, Mr. Speaker, and he cannot blame that on the Member for Bell Island. I would agree that there are aspects of his character that he ought to concentrate on but it is hardly the time to give him advice on that particular subject. Of course, I am open to advice from him on the same subject. I would rather come to the subject of reputations. Your reputation is what people believe you to be, not necessarily what you are. I will talk about that in a minute. It is a distinct part of the minister's character that he is a poor loser. He not only has a reputation for that but he has demonstrated that on a number of occasions. Of course, the most dramatic occasion was at the St. John's Memorial Stadium in 1969. If you wanted to see a good loser that night, go back and get the prints of the tapes that were played on television.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: It is also known, Mr. Speaker, that the - I am sorry I did not read



that point because I am not anxious to discuss 1969 as such. I have no licence to introduce irrelevant material into this debate and my reference to him being a poor loser, of course, is that I feel this is one of the motivations for the kind of garbage, and that word is - it must be parliamentary because I heard the Minister of Transportation use it extensively this afternoon - the kind of garbage that is the motion before us right now. He must be a poor loser. He has to be.

It is well known, of course, around the province, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance is also a very supersensitive individual, very, very sensitive, to the point that sometimes reason does not prevail. I would say to him, Mr. Speaker, that if he had not been so sensitive on this matter, had only allowed the second thinking process to take over, if he had only had second thought on what happened here and not gone off in a rage at the Member for Bell Island, had he only had second thought on this he would have seen that in his own interest what is happening now is the wrong thing, because six months from now who will remember what? They will remember that the Member for Bell Island raised some questions. They will remember that for introducing evidence in the legislature which was never disproven by any impartial body, for doing that he got kicked out of the House. That was his price for doing what he thought to be right.

AN HON. MEMBER: For doing his duty.

MR. SIMMONS: I cannot see, Mr. Speaker, how anybody who had second thoughts on this, on this, being at the centre of it, I can appreciate if I were in the Minister of Finance's situation in Vancouver and heard this kind of allegation, I would have been mad too, Mr. Speaker. If he had only allowed some second thinking to take place, if he had only allowed himself to not blow into this place in a rage, but rather allowed himself to become calm over the issue and say; "What really is best here for all concerned and for me as the Minister of Finance?" I do not think, Mr. Speaker,

he would have taken this particular course of action.

Mr. Speaker, I have been talking about character and it is more for him to tell us than for me to tell you about his character. I can tell you about his reputation. I can tell you what the people around this country think of him. I can tell you what they think of him as a result of this particular move, this motion. Without appearing to represent all the people of Newfoundland or without appearing to have done a poll representative of the people of Newfoundland, just let me say that, in an understatement, let me say that they think less of the Minister of Finance now than they did the day before he made this motion. They think less of him now than before he refused, with his colleagues, to allow this thing to take its normal course in the House.

Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said about what the real issues are. I can only venture to you, Sir, what I feel the issues are and I am sure there will be disagreement. I believe there are two or three issues floating around here, Sir, and one of them is whether a member, in this case the Member for Bell Island, whether a member shall have the freedom to bring to the attention of the House of Assembly documentation which in his opinion, now he may be all wrong, he may be wet as can be, (I do not mean he the Member for Bell Island) but he, whoever he is, that brings that documentation. But the first question, Mr. Speaker, or the first issue is whether any member, whoever he may be, shall have the freedom to come here with documentation that in his opinion, however worked, however wet, however what, in his opinion constitutes a case that requires investigation by this House.

The fact is that the Member for Bell Island is none the wiser now than he was on March 8, on this issue, because nobody has given him any answers. He does not know. Now he knows there has been a beig debate and he knows he must have put his foot in it because they are going to try to kick him out. He knows all that. He knows

he trod on toes somewhere but he does not to this day, Mr. Speaker, know whether he did - I know he must know he did the right thing in bringing it in. I would be disappointed in him if he had that information and did not bring it in but he does not know to this day whether the documentation he held in his hands was indeed the clincher. He believes it was and let me say also, Mr. Speaker, I believe it was. I believe it was.

In any impartial way nobody has taken this documentation and said; "Neary, you are all wrong! Crosbie, you are all wrong! Minister of Finance, you are all wrong! Member for Bell Island, you are all wrong!" Nobody said that in any impartial fashion except it has been said many times but by people who have been, who are influenced by other factors. Their party loyalties, which I talked about earlier, their relationship to the Minister of Finance, as a friend and as a colleague, these factors are preventing us from getting a clear-cut adjudication of what this documentation constitutes.

That is the first issue, Mr. Speaker, whether a member will have that freedom. The record will show that the last guy who did it got kicked out for fourteen days. That brings me to my next question. What kind of evidence do you need before it constitutes a breach of the privileges of the House? What kind of evidence? If the speakers say that what the Member for Bell Island had was not enough, will they tell me what is enough? What is enough? Must you take it to a court of law and get a judgement there first? Then, having a judgement come in and say; "Look, I know this is right because I have a judgement in a court of this land. It is right. At what point on the continuum do you say this is not enough evidence, but this is enough evidence?"

On top of that, of course, the threat of a sentence hanging over you in the future, whether it is fourteen days or ten or whatever figure comes into the Minister of Finance's head the next time he writes one of those motions. With that hanging over you, unless you feel awfully strongly about your job

in this House, as a member, you think twice before you come in here and introduce documentation involving a member whose party commands a majority in this House. You will think twice because on one side you have your conscience pricking at you as to whether you should do what you know is right and on the other you have the pull of trying to decide whether you want to be kicked out of the House for a week or two weeks or fourteen days or whatever.

The effect of this motion, Mr. Speaker, if carried, will be to introduce that kind of indecision I have referred to, will be to place on the member, wherever he sits, that extra questioning, "Should I do it? What should I do? Should I protect my own hide and stay in the House or should I do what I know is right irrespective of the consequences?"

Mr. Speaker, something else needs to be said here too on this subject. It is possible. I have told you how I believe about the documentation. I believe, I thought, I believe that it makes a case. Mr. Speaker, I never said, I never said that every iota of what the member from Bell Island said I would endorse, I will come back to that in a minute, because I do not know, I do not think like he does. I do not think like any other member in this House. Nobody else here thinks like I do, thank God! But looking at this evidence, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is enough substantive evidence here to require a full-scale investigation. Mr. Speaker, I also believe that that debt was collectible. I believe it was collectible but I am not the judge, Mr. Speaker, I am not the judge and I would like for somebody more impartial than I on the subject to take it and tell me once and for all. Mr. Speaker, as one member of this House, I will abide by the decision and I challenge the Minister of Finance to make that same kind of a statement. Will he allow the information to be taken and impartially adjudicated and will he abide by the decision?

I think, Mr. Speaker, that is the real issue. It is not whether or not the member had enough documentation. Let us find out if he did by the enquiry. Let us find out. He thinks he did. I would say, Mr.

Speaker, that is sufficient reason to bring it in. If you, as a member, think you have enough documentation, I think on the rules of this House you are duty bound to bring it in and let it stand the test and if you are wrong that is par for the course. You do not expect that every time a member makes a decision in this House, he is going to make the right one, do you? There are times that a member is going to faux pas, times that a member is going to do the wrong thing and perhaps if we had gone through the sequence of events and the member for Bell Island's documentation had gone to an independent enquiry and the result of that enquiry was that the Minister of Finance had been vindicated, for example but then at that point the member for Bell Island would have to consider one of two conclusions for his own peace of mind. He would have to make up his mind whether still he felt he had done the right thing or whether at that point he would have to go to the Minister of Finance and say, "John, boy, I was wrong!" But we have not allowed that course of events to take place. We have not allowed that to take place, Mr. Speaker. We do not know, we do not know, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It was brought in properly.

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

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, would the Speaker indicate how much time I have to finish?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has approximately twenty-eight, thirty minutes left to speak.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Pardon? I believe the honourable member for Bonavista South had a message for me.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: He has resumed his ordered silence now, Mr. Speaker, so I shall continue. Mr. Speaker, I was saying that there are a number of issues here. One is whether a member shall have the freedom to come into this

House with the documentation which he thinks, however warped his thinking, whatever which he thinks, is sufficient to require an investigation to see if another member has misled this House. I believe that is one issue and I believe it is an issue that we are skirting all around. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that another issue is whether a member of this House, in this case the Minister of Finance, whether a member of this House shall be permitted to kick a tantrum in this House and question the Speaker's ruling in kicking his tantrum, question just about every decision that was made in his absence, not every decision, I am sorry, question on the procedure that was pursued in his absence in the House, kick a tantrum and then use his parliamentary majority to give his tantrum some respectability.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what has happened in this particular issue. We have seen a member of this House kick a vicious, emotionally charged tantrum and we have seen him then use his parliamentary majority to give his tantrum some respectability. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Province, they are to decide, would say that we have far greater issues at this time than that kind of an issue, whether a member should kick a tantrum and then get away with it.

Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said about the style of the member for Bell Island. Well, all I want to say is that is his style. I notice a style in the two Speakers, the two gentlemen who have just exchanged the Chair in the last half minute, distinct style. You have to adjust yourself to each style. I have now to be careful in a completely different than I was up until the last minute or so because of the different style of the gentleman who is now the Speaker. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, for using you and your predecessor of a minute ago in that example but I just wanted to make the point that all of us have our own style. It is not that it is better or worse, it is just unique to us. I would not do it the way the member for Bell Island did it. I would not do it the way the Minister of Transportation did it just now. I am sure he would not do it the way I am doing it now, not only in the substance of our argument, Mr. Speaker

the style of delivery, in the way we choose to make our points known to those who are listening. Sure his style is Steve Neary's style. That is fine. I do not worry about that. I am not worried about the style too much. If that be the issue, if that be what everybody is all worked up about, I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, what about if the Leader of the Opposition, what about if the member for White Bay South, what about if the member for St. Barbe North, what about if any other member on this side of the House introduced that same documentation?

Am I told, am I being told by the speakers opposite that that would have mattered very much? Am I told that then the documentation would suddenly contain more illumination, that the documentation would suddenly be loaded with facts? It would have been the same documentation, Mr. Speaker, I suggest with the same result too. I suggest it would have been given the same snow job that Mr. Neary's documentation was given. It was not given a hearing. I would say no matter who introduced it, I would say something else would not have happened. I do not think there would have been a motion to suspend the Leader of the Opposition for fourteen days because of the kind of evidence I produced just now and the best evidence was that the man stood there, the Minister of Transportation said it himself.

What he said in effect was , "Look, I do not care what goes on in this debate, I made up my mind several years ago how I am going to vote in this one." That, Mr. Speaker, is why, if the Leader of the Opposition or the member for White Bay South had introduced this same documentation some weeks ago, we would not be involved in this debate or a similar debate, not because the style of the individual is different but because the name of the individual is different, because there is not the same motivation, going back in some cases several years, as the Minister of Transportation admitted, not the same motivation to suspend the Leader of the Opposition or the member for White Bay South or possibly

any other member on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I find, Therein is what I find to be the most despicable aspect of this whole charade, this whole debate. That is that the issue, and I hate to have to use the expression but I think it says it better than any other thing I have said in this particular last few minutes on the subject I am speaking to right now, that in every sense of the term I am convinced that this whole exercise, taking up all the time it has in this House, valuable time when we could be doing other things, this entire issue can be labelled strictly and completely and absolutely, knowing the motivation of the Minister of Transportation, knowing the motivations of the Premier on the subject of the individual involved, knowing the motivations of the Minister of Finance who moved the motion and the Premier who seconded it, knowing all that, Mr. Speaker, I believe this entire exercise can be labelled as only one thing and nothing else, completely a "Get Neary Movement", completely.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): The honourable member, as he was leading up to his expression, thought that I might interrupt. I must draw his attention to Beauchesne which says that the imputation of bad motives calls for prompt intervention by the Chair.

I interpret his remarks as the imputation of bad motives to the honourable members who have spoken and ask that he withdraw that remark.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, first of all the question was just my personal opinion. Secondly, I would be very happy to withdraw the remark and thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I take considerable delight in the fact that I construe from your comments, Sir, that you construe the suspension from the House of the member for Bell Island as a bad thing, a bad motive. So do I, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): The honourable member is not being called upon to quibble with the Speaker's ruling. The honourable member is being called upon to withdraw his remarks, and I now call upon him to do so.



MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the record will clearly show that I have withdrawn my remark. If there be any doubt, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): The honourable member. The record does not completely show that the honourable member has withdrawn his remarks. The honourable member is now called upon to withdraw his remarks without equivocation.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, for the second time and as the record will show, I now withdraw my remarks for the second time.

MR. NEARY: Got to get on your knees?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Order, please!

I now draw attention to the honourable the member for Bell Island. While he does not have the floor, his remark, which may or may not appear in Hansard, is one that is extremely derogatory and certainly is not condoned by the Chair. I ask the honourable member to refrain from remarks of that nature.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, as I am in this House a little longer, I shall learn to say what is on my mind without being at all unparliamentary. I have been somewhat conditioned, if you like, Mr. Speaker, because having read about vile and useless people and that kind of thing, I began to forget what was parliamentary and unparliamentary. My humble apologies for saying something which was unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): If the honourable member would resume his place. The honourable member is to direct himself to the matter at hand. There has been a ruling from the Chair. The honourable member is now proceeding to discuss that ruling.

The honourable member is to direct himself to the matter at hand and not be irrelevant.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in all honesty, Sir, I have difficulty at this point because I am not sure - and I am not discussing your ruling - but I felt - I will try this statement and you can decide to rule me out if you so wish, but I was saying that I would like to be able to say what I think is the essence

of this matter and at the same time not be unparliamentary. I would dearly want to be able to do that, to be able to say what I think is the essence and not be unparliamentary.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, I shall have to clean up my language and find other ways to say it. I know in my own mind and heart what I feel is the issue here and unfortunately having withdrawn it, of course, I cannot repeat it.

Mr. Speaker, I, and it must come as no particular surprise to you, Sir, I will be voting against the motion. In doing so, Mr. Speaker, I do not prescribe to the interpretation or the analysis placed on things by the Minister of Transportation who suggested that anybody who voted against this is voting for downgrading the dignity of the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is one freedom still left in this House it is the freedom to vote how you want and to do it for your own reasons and I would like the Minister of Transportation and anybody else who knows how I vote on this, and the whole country can know I am voting against the suspension of the member for Bell Island.

I am doing it not because I have been coerced into doing it by some party loyalty, not because in voting one way I de facto am voting against the policy on the other side, that is not the kind of reason, Mr. Speaker, I am taking the position I am on this motion. I have tried to state as articulately as I can what my reasons are, My limitations in terms of what is parliamentary has constrained me somewhat but that is my problem.

If I have not conveyed my reasons explicitly enough, Mr. Speaker, I would just like the Minister of Transportation and anybody else in this House and outside to know that I know why I am voting for this motion. If I have not communicated it too well that is beside the point. I shall do it, Mr. Speaker, because I believe in what I am doing. In doing it I do not believe at all that I will be downgrading the dignity of the House.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if this motion should pass, as I expect it

will, I do not know about the dignity of the House but I certainly feel that the precedence set by the vote on the motion will seriously confine or restrain people who would consider introducing what they feel is legitimate documentation to support a particular case, I think it will constrain them for the reasons I gave a few minutes ago, because they will be torn between doing what they think is right and doing what they think is pragmatic, having in mind their desire to stay in the House rather than watch it from the gallery.

But I will suggest, Mr. Speaker, although I am not going to say that all the people who vote for this are villains, I am not going to say that all those who vote for this are downgrading the dignity of the House. I am not going to ascribe motives to people who vote for or against this motion but I will say that those who vote for it, if it is enough to carry, and I suspect there will be enough to carry, those who vote for it will de facto, whether they mean to or not is not the issue, but they will de facto do an injustice to the procedures of this House. They will de facto, having in mind that a precedent will be on the books for future cases, they will de facto somewhat limit the freedom of members in the future to introduce documentation. So in that way I think it would be unfortunate for this motion to carry.

Whichever way it goes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly am not going to have the Minister of Transportation tell me why I voted for or voted against a particular resolution, I would be happy to have a private discussion with him or in this House and tell him why I generally feel I ought to vote against it. That is the reason I am going to vote against it, Mr. Speaker, because I feel I ought to and I have my own reasons inside me for that.

Mr. Speaker, a government spokesman, I think it was the Minister of Transportation again, mentioned that on this matter the Premier said there ought to be a free vote, Well, I said a minute

ago that certainly I agree that there ought to be a free vote and it so happens that there are some constraining circumstances here that I would predict when it is all over all the people on one side might vote one way and all the people on one part of another side might vote another way and a person sitting off by himself may vote or will vote I suppose with one or the other or abstain, as the case may be, or be absent.

I agree that there ought to be a free vote. Mr. Speaker, what I would like to know, of course, what I would like to know is whether the comments of the Premier on this subject about the free vote, indeed properly conveyed what was said to the government members in caucus on this particular subject. I have not said, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier gave a different instruction in caucus because that would be to ascribe wrong motive to him, but I have questioned as to whether the caucus, the P.C. Caucus, the government caucus consensus on this point is indeed - and of course, the Premier may or may not have been present at that particular caucus meeting, but whether his comments in the House, about how he wanted the people to vote on this, indeed was in coincidence with the caucus decision of the government on this particular matter.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that insofar as the government caucus is concerned, the matter of free vote does not come into the question at all. It is a matter of sticking behind the member on the government side who has moved a motion. Mr. Speaker, I find that that is the case, I find that to be extremely unfortunate and I want this House to know that in voting against the resolution I am not particularly standing with the Member for Bell Island. As it happens de facto I am.

Mr. Speaker, in voting against the motion I, and I believe this applies to all the people who have spoken on this side who will be voting against the motion, in voting against the motion, Mr. Speaker, I am doing what I believe to be right. Having in mind the concerns of this House, the protection of the freedom of this House, I believe I can do nothing else only vote against this particular resolution.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I did say earlier that I would come back to one particular issue and that is the issue of where I stood in reference to the matters which were raised by the honourable the Member for Bell Island. I do this because in laying out my proposal earlier about what could have happened, I did not

want to clutter it by taking sides and such, so I tried to lay it out, if you like, in the third person and what would happen 'if' - if the member were right and if the member were wrong and that kind of thing. I would not want that discussion which I had a few minutes ago to be misconstrued as any lukewarm feeling on my part in relation to the matter at hand.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, very strongly about this particular issue. When the Member for Bell Island made this documentation available to me just before coming into the House of Assembly, I had time to read it in some detail and ponder over it and re-read it. I was shocked, I was certainly very suspicious and I wanted answers. In my naivety, Mr. Speaker, as a new member of this House, I actually felt we were going to get some answers. I actually felt - I said to some of my colleagues in caucus: "Well, you know, there is no question, I mean, if it should be decided

that there is not a case here. Well, at what point do you have enough for a case and at what point do you not have enough? There is only one way to find out. Let us put it to the test and see whether there is enough information here.

Now, had the member brought in something that was obviously a forgery, had he said, "Someone told me there was an Order-in-Council," and could not produce it, had he said, "I have a typewritten letter here that is reported to be from Leonard Martin although he did not sign it but I am told he signed it", had he had that kind of information, then I would say: "Well, you know, you hardly have a case there Mr. member from Bell Island."

That was not the kind of case. We had orders-in-council We had signed documentation and I believe on that basis there ought to have been an enquiry, Mr. Speaker, on this subject, on the issue at hand. I do not mean the issue in this debate because that is so extraneous to what really matters that it is pathetic except for some of the issues I mentioned. When I say the issue is extraneous I mean the issue of trying to boot a member out is extraneous to what is really going on here, the issue of this documentation. The real issues are contained there and I spell them out for you: Whether a member would have the freedom or whether or not a member would have the freedom to kick tantrums and then try and support them with his parliamentary majority, trying to give it respectability with the parliamentary majority. These are issues that I have dealt with.

I believe that on the issue of the documentation, Mr. Speaker, that I stand full square with the member for Bell Island and with the other members who have spoken in this debate. I maintain unequivocally that there is sufficient documentation here for an investigation. I maintain that the evidence is certainly there, that the minister did deliberately mislead the House. I maintain that. I can read the others if you want but I think you know the charges by now. I maintain that the charges placed before this House by the member for Bell Island

are very serious ones indeed and that instead of it being gone about in this matter, this red herring approach, Mr. Speaker, I believe had the debate been allowed to take place, had the hearing, or whatever independent enquiry could have been set up, been allowed to go forth, then we would have been much wiser today, much wiser men than we are on this particular subject.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I do support the right of a member to bring in this kind of documentation. I do support the contention of the member for Bell Island that the minister has misled the House. I do support him in all the other charges that he has made. I will be the first to his door, to the Minister of Finance, the very first knocking on his door to register my apologies if a subsequent enquiry shows that he is above board in all of this. If a subsequent enquiry shows that he is clean, I will be the first to his door, Mr. Speaker.

There is nothing I deplore more than to have a man continue to suffer psychologically and socially and otherwise for something he was charged with but did not do. Now much has been said on that subject, and the courts, by the very nature of their process, go through this all of the time. We often charge men who are subsequently proved innocent. There is one of the hazards again, Mr. Speaker, in our system of government and society, that you often charge men who are subsequently proven innocent.

Now, the Member for Bell Island had reason to believe that there had been some wrongdoing here and he has raised the matter. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, if this should come to an enquiry and the Minister of Finance be vindicated, if he should be vindicated, as I sincerely hope that he would be (I sincerely hope that he would be) if he should be vindicated, I shall see to it that for my part after



this debate and because I owe it to him as a man and as a Newfoundlander, I shall see to it that not only do I get to him with my apologies but I will see to it that the whole province knows where I stand on the issue, where I stand will be as follows, I will stand with the minister. I will say he is above board, and not by innuendo, not by any way at all shall I ever imply otherwise if he should be vindicated on this particular matter

Mr. Speaker, could you indicate how much time I have left?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): The honourable member has about seven minutes left. It is 5:57 P.M.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am glad. I thought I was running out of time but I was not so good a clock watcher as those who were -

MR. ROBERTS: You have said more than anybody over there said in seven days.

MR. SIMMONS: I told the Leader of the Opposition so many times not to be unkind to weak people. It is not in your nature. I shall find my other page and then I shall continue.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): Is the honourable member going to speak?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak. In my haste to get through in time I overlooked a couple of tidbits which I can now go back to. I believe though now I have made my essential case but I think I would like to reiterate a point that I skipped rather quickly over a little earlier. It is this: I fail to see how anybody in this House - and I am really talking about the people who would contemplate voting for the motion because there are a number of reasons why you can vote against the motion or abstain. Certainly one of them is not having enough information to in all conscience vote for it. So you defeat it, not because you do not believe it should be done but because you do not think there was enough evidence there to justify the course of action implicit in the motion and so, voting against the motion is somewhat of an easier decision than voting for it.

It is like a jury trying to decide in a criminal matter,

Unless they can find enough reasons to convict the person, then they ought in all conscience to not contribute towards a unanimous jury verdict. I think this is the kind of situation we have here that unless we can find some pretty good reasons to vote for a motion, we ought either to abstain or to vote against the motion. So, as I say, it is considerably easier to vote against this or to abstain but the most difficult thing of all in this particular motion Mr. Speaker, must be to bring yourself to vote for it.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the consensus that I wonder about in the government caucus, I would hope that consensus did not take place. I hope the Premier is indeed representing the views of all the government members when he said it ought to be a free vote. I would hope

that because of the kind of issue which we are dealing with right here. We are dealing with an issue which is going to set a rather important and, depending on how the vote goes, unfortunate precedence and how anyone - Here is a question I put rather quickly before; how anyone in all conscience can vote against this motion, vote for this motion, I am sorry.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Tell the truth.

MR. SIMMONS: Vote for this motion.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: My colleague from Burgeo, I would not hurt him for the world. He has such affection for me. He thinks of me as a baby, touching, most touching. I never, every thought of him as a baby, Mr. Speaker. How anyone - I thought of him-

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

While honourable members may have on occasion interjected a remark and certainly that cannot be retracted, I must draw the honourable member's attention that these sort of remarks will not be tolerated indefinitely.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me add, of course, that I certainly thought of him as other things other than as a baby and if I get the right opportunity at the appropriate ceremonial dinner, testimonial dinner, I shall say those things, those comments which I have in mind on the subject of my colleague from Burgeo.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, when he, so wise as to notice I was capable of error and said against instead of for it, I was saying that how can anyone in conscience vote for this motion? I have not said, Mr. Speaker, that those who vote for it have no conscience. I am just puzzled, I am asking how and perhaps some subsequent speakers on the other side or not necessarily on the other side but subsequent speakers on any side who intend to vote for this motion, will tell me how. I will listen but in the meantime let me ask a question. How can anyone in conscience vote for this motion without knowing whether or not the charges were true or false?

If the charges are false, then the member for Bell Island has indeed done the Minister of Finance a great injustice.

MR. NEARY: And would apologize.

MR. SIMMONS: And would apologize, he tells me here on the side.

MR. NEARY: I would certainly, I would make it public, but let us have an enquiry first.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, until we know and perhaps the way to get to know, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Finance would agree, I am not going to do his rebuttal for him but I would tell you what the rebuttal is going to be that my question is off the subject and the real issue is whether one member of the House is allowed to make unparliamentary statements about the other. I have shown you, Mr. Speaker, that not only one member of the House has made unparliamentary but three members have made unparliamentary statements. So, if that be the issue, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Minister of Finance that he not only put the name of the member for Bell Island in the motion but also the name of the member for Humber West, the Premier and the member for St. John's West, the Minister of Finance.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: And every other member of the House.

MR. SIMMONS: Because all three, all three and certainly the latter two are guilty beyond parliamentary language, Mr. Speaker. So, to my mind it is the issue of how in all conscience you can vote for this unless you know whether the charges are true or false. Are they false just because the Minister of Finance says they are false? That is not enough for me Mr. Speaker, as much respect as I have for his integrity, that is not enough. I would like an impartial enquiry to do this.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against the motion on this motion.

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

HON. L. D. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, before I adjourn the debate, I would just like to say that the only thing I could agree

with in all that the honourable member opposite just said was the last point he made that virtually ninety-nine per cent of his remarks were totally irrelevant, that the sole issue on this motion is whether this House is going to permit its procedure to be made a shambles of by conduct such as the Hon. Member for Bell Island engaged in several days ago in this House. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow I will attempt to fully rebut the remarks made by the last speaker and to show why I am going to have to, as much as I hate to, much as I find it a hard thing to do, support this motion. Because I think that only by supporting this motion will we be able to drag the discussion in this honourable House up out of the gutter where it has been ever since we came back for this session.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I move adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): On motion debate adjourned.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): This House stands adjourned until Monday, March 25, at 3:00 P.M.