



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 13

VERBATIM REPORT

FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is a pleasure for me to welcome to the galleries today a delegation from the Indian Bay Development Association of Bonavista Bay, Mr. Ern Rodgers, Mr. Geoff Brown, Mr. Tom Pickett and Mr. Ralph Yetman. On behalf of all honourable members I welcome you here and trust that your visit is most interesting.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the honourable the Minister of Education. I raised the question once before but I got somewhat of an abrupt answer. I was wondering if the minister -

HON. C.R. OTTENHEIMER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the honourable gentleman is going to ask a question, ask a question. But he does not have the right to debate what went on several days ago.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Okay, Mr. Speaker. I will rephrase the question. I will not even give the minister an opportunity of a slight preamble so he will understand the nature of the question.

Would the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, indicate what the government or his department is planning to do about the Offshore Manpower Needs Conference that was promised in the Throne Speech of 1973? Are there any plans to initiate or start this conference this year? If so, what parts of the province will the conference be held in and what will be the frequency of such conferences? They are supposed to culminate in a giant conference at the end, if I can remember correctly.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now, Mr. Speaker, I think my reply there will be sort of, if one wishes, point one and point two. Point one, that since that time the government or the Department of Education have decided that rather than these giant conferences, which honourable members will permit, in the Arts and Culture Centres with all kinds of charts and with Cecil B. DeMille productions, that these are not always the most productive in terms of ideas and views and that rather than

these gigantic conferences, which honourable gentlemen opposite will be familiar with, that it would be much better to have consultations, meetings, seminars, exchange of views and we have decided that that course of action is preferable to the previous system of gigantic conferences. That will be part one.

Part two is that the area and the manner of this province's participation in the offshore area is to a large extent, not exclusively, to a large extent, to a significant extent, related to the federal government's position. This government has been maintaining ever since its election that the ownership, jurisdiction and control of the development of the offshore resources, the resources of the Continental Shelf, that that ownership, jurisdiction and control appertain to the province. If and when Ottawa concurs with that position and if they do not, then if and when the adjudication, any adjudication or arbitration would decide that matter, then we would hope that the decision would be in favour of Newfoundland's ownership, control and jurisdiction. Because only in having this control of the economic destiny can we have control of the social destiny. So, we have to await either the decision of Ottawa, or a favourable decision from Ottawa, or a final adjudication or arbitration.

So, this, Mr. Speaker, under two headings would be my answer to the honourable gentleman.

MR. F. ROWE: Five minutes to say, another broken promise, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The honourable gentleman, he may like or dislike my questions, but at this particular period, the Orders of the Day, he has one right and that is to ask questions. He has the perfect right to debate under an appropriate motion, but not at this particular period.

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

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

MR. SIMMONS: To the point of order raised by the Minister of Education.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I have got all day. To the point of order raised by the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. Equally true is the fact that the minister in answering the question ought to confine himself to the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The question period has certainly got off to a rousing start. Certainly, the point raised by the honourable Minister of Education prior to his answer and following that is well taken. There should be no preamble or no comments about a minister's answer. Although a member may disagree with the answer provided by a minister, he still does not have the right to get up at this particular time and make a speech as to reasons why he disagrees with an answer. And just as honourable members' question should be precise and very brief, I submit, so should the answer.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROWE: I agree with that entirely, Mr. Speaker. Another question for the Minister of Education. Mr. Speaker, the minister mentioned that instead of these gigantic meetings, they were going to have or they have had seminars and or consultations with various groups throughout the Province. Would the minister indicate to this honourable House what seminars and consultations have been

held since that promise was made in 1973, what seminars and consultations have been held, where and at what time and what others are planned for this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, both through the department and through various educational institutions, the University, the College of Trades and Technology, the College of Fisheries and Navigation, Marine Engineering and Electronics, and indeed other agencies of government, the Department of Mines and Energy, the Department of Industrial Development, the Premier's office, indeed many departments, we are in constant touch with people concerned with and involved in the potentialities for the development of our offshore resources. This goes on on a continuing basis by not only people in the Department of Education but in numerous departments of government and indeed, I think, the record shows for itself that no administration has been more concerned with the proper development of our offshore Continental Shelf resources than indeed this administration has. The record is quite clear and this government's participation in that area and this government's efforts to assure that that jurisdiction and control and ownership belongs to this Province and not to Ottawa. That is a matter of record.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, we are in entire agreement with the stand with respect to offshore but am I to understand from the minister's, a supplementary question, that this Offshore Manpower Needs Conference concept has been cancelled entirely now, it has just been wiped out?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, all I can say to that is that this government does not go on the philosophy of the gigantic, chart filled, flow chart, -

MR. ROWE: Well, that is not in the Throne Speech. Answer the question.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I am going to answer it.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The honourable gentleman asked a question and if they do not have the courtesy or the interest to listen to the answer, they can do without the answer, Sir.

MR. ROWE: We are listening -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I am not going to try to shout them down. If they want an answer, they can tell me. If they do not want an answer, then that is their privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: Give us the answer. Give us the answer. Give us the answer. Ask him again.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Want an answer?

MR. ROWE: I do not want convolutions. I want an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Yes or no. Yes or no.

MR. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Education indicate what progress has been made for a Province wide educational television system that was promised in the campaign speech by the Premier in October, 1971?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased. I am sorry the honourable gentleman did not get a copy of the Speech from the Throne and I would certainly instruct, or would request, the clerk to present him a copy. Of course, all the clerk can do is give him a copy. He cannot force him to read it. But, at a certain page in the Speech from the Throne it is stated that the Department of Education is entering into an agreement with the Educational Technology Branch of the Federal Departments of Transportation, whatever that particular - yes, with MOT - in terms of a federal provincial study with respect to the use of educational technology. That is clearly stated in the Speech from the Throne, Sir, and I am not sure if either an officer of the House has been dilenquent in giving the honourable gentleman a copy of the Speech and I would not think that that is the case and I am assured by the clerk of the House that it is not and all I can say is the honourable gentleman should read it.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the honourable minister that I have read the Throne Speech just as carefully -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Old Bully Boy again.

MR. F. ROWE: - surprised.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education has informed us of plans and studies. Will the minister indicate what progress has been made in establishing a province-wide educational television system? Not a study or plans. What about this television system that was promised back in 1971 by the Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not our Premier.

MR. F. ROWE: By the now Premier.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure what the honourable gentleman is really talking about, a province-wide television system. What the government have entered into - we have entered into an agreement with the federal government to make an assessment of the appropriate uses of educational technology, and that includes television, and it includes radio, it includes a number of electronic and technological media. This is a federal-provincial agreement, a joint federal-provincial study, the first time in my knowledge that an over-all assessment of the various potentialities on a province-wide basis has been entered into. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is not only in fact what the government should do, and is doing, that this is from any point of view what we should do - we do not just go out and establish television networks here, there, and elsewhere - you do it if it is for educational purposes then in terms of educational needs after they have accurately and intelligibly and sensibly assessed.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, another question for the Minister of Education. In view of the fact, Sir, that in the 1972 Throne Speech the government said that the government intends to establish regional colleges in various sections of the province, could the minister indicate what plans there are for other sections of the province and, indeed, in Labrador besides Corner Brook? And when

the government intends to initiate construction of such regional colleges, and where they are likely to be established?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to reply to that. The only criticism I have for the honourable gentleman is that I was hoping to get some mail signed, but certainly that can wait. I certainly enjoy very much the penetrating questions of the honourable gentleman.

Now, with respect to the regional college at Corner Brook, that is about, I would say, ninety per cent, perhaps more, constructed now. It will be opening in September, Sir. It will be the first time in the history of this province that the University Department of Extension activities, and various, you know, video taping and other activities very important - but the first time, you know, with this real kind of physical, and not only physical but intellectual and community presence outside of St. John's, and I regard that as a very significant accomplishment of this government.

With respect to the community college concept, I expect to be announcing within about ten days, two weeks the appointment of a director for the community college and community education facilities for that area. We are going to wait for at least a number of months, six to nine months, to benefit from the experience of this gentleman, and the committees, and people, and programmes that he will be working with - because I think we will learn a lot from that. Then we will be in a position to, whatever modifications are necessary, to provincialize that programme.

But I should point out to the honourable gentleman when he talks about where we are going to construction community colleges, that he thinks of education or adult education in terms of buildings, in terms of huge buildings. The honourable gentleman seems to want buildings to go up all over the place, the great construction complex that we went through for quite a period of time. What we are endeavouring to do is to maximize the use of the buildings and facilities we have to co-ordinate and develop and improve the educational programmes whether they come from University, whether

they come from the Department of Education, whether they come from private agencies. It is what we considered in terms of community colleges is development of services not the building of buildings, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: The minister, in answering this question, is putting words into my mouth, and the mouth of my colleagues, and the philosophy for which we stand. The question I asked was not based on anything that we had promised or had said -

AN HON. MEMBER: Order! It is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: It is a point of order, Mr. Speaker - but is based on statements made in Throne Speeches so concrete buildings did not come from this side of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Concrete buildings came from that side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Hon. Member for St. Barbe North rose on a point of order, not to ask a question. The Chair is willing to hear the Member for St. Barbe North and then make a ruling as to whether or not he raised a valid point of order. The Chair feels that he has not. The honourable member may disagree with an answer a minister has given but, as I mentioned earlier, that does not give him the right to debate that answer.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did I understand the minister to say that he is appointing a director of community colleges, Mr. Speaker, because I did not think that the regional college at Corner Brook was a community college, and indeed I am quite unaware of any community colleges in the province? What is the purpose and the role of a director of community colleges when none exist?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, nobody ever said that we were appointing a director of community colleges.

MR. F. ROWE: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: If you will listen and hear, you will hear what I said. If you listened the first time, you would have heard it. You did not listen the first time so now I am going to make it the second time, and if the honourable gentleman listens the second time, he will hear it, and if he does not listen the second time, he still will not hear it, Mr. Speaker. I have already made the point once. The question was asked and I made the answer. Now I am willing to do it twice, and I suppose three times is lucky so perhaps I will have to make it again, which is fair enough, too.

MR. F. ROWE: So, I get three times to ask it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: What I said is that within a two week period, I expect to make an announcement in the Legislature with respect to the director of a community education service or whatever its specific title is.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, you did not.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, certainly I did.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, you did not.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now the honourable gentleman there, the assistant to the deputy understudy for the education critic, the associate education critic is now interrupting me, Sir. What I said was that within about two weeks I planned to make an announcement in the Legislature with respect to the appointment of a director of community education services for the Stephenville-Port au Port, that entire area. That is what I said. I said it once, I said it twice.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: You know, he is no better when he is sober.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Labrador South.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, before we get on with Orders of the Day, I have a couple of questions, the first for the Minister of Labour.

Could the honourable minister tell us whether or not he is aware that certain units of the labour movement are suggesting and actively promoting a general strike in support of the trawlermen's strike? And, if so, what is his department doing about it?

HON. E. MAYNARD (Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations): There has not been anything communicated to me, Mr. Speaker, regarding a general strike in sympathy or otherwise for the trawlermen's strike by the labour movement. The first I have heard of it was the mention just made by the Hon. Member for Labrador South.

MR. MARTIN: Okay, I will accept that, Mr. Speaker. I have another question for the Hon. Minister of Education. I wonder if he can inform the House as to what progress has been made with respect to the Forteau school situation? Can he report on the visit of the medical health officer on his visit there recently?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable gentleman knows, I think it was a couple of days ago when we met in my office with respect to this, and since then my department has been in touch with Dr. Gordon Thomas, and a doctor from that area was going to and, I think, has visited the area to make a medical report. I have endeavoured today on a couple of occasions to get back to the doctor, but I have not in fact been able to make telephone contact with him. It may well be, I would hope that I would be able to before the day expires. Until I have that, naturally I would not be speaking from first hand information, which is what I would wish to do.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question, I guess it is really for the Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment. In his absence and in the absence of the Premier and Deputy Premier, perhaps I should address the question to the Minister of Industrial Development or the Hon. House Leader.

In reference to the situation in Grand Falls, the pollution problem, the residents in the immediate area of the mill are experiencing the wood chips and the sawdust problem, I wonder would the minister indicate to the House whether government has received any complaints concerning this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. DOODY: I honestly do not know, Mr. Speaker, As the member has indicated the question should properly be directed to the Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment. If there has been such communication I am not aware of it.

MR. SIMMONS: Would the minister be aware if the government has undertaken any investigation of the situation to which I have referred, or if it intends to do so?

MR. DOODY: -Once again, Mr. Speaker, you know it is properly the concern of the Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment. If no request for government involvement has been received, and I doubt very much if government is going to volunteer to get involved unless it is - I know nothing of it, Sir, except what I heard on the radio. I suspect that the same is probably true.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Mines and Energy, would the Minister of Industrial Development be able to indicate to this House what the situation is regarding the trucking of ore from the Daniel's Harbour mine site to Hawkes Bay. The Minister of Mines and Energy indicated before that it was a private corporation involved, in the mine of course, but people up there had trucks and they are trying to get jobs trucking the ore to the Hawkes Bay area from Daniel's Harbour, would the minister indicate whether tenders are going to be called or whether they have been called or whether the contract has been awarded for the trucking of the ore from Daniel's Harbour to Hawkes Bay?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer for the company. It is a private company as the honourable member has indicated. How they conduct their business affairs is certainly their own right and privilege. If they wish to call tenders they have every right to do so, if they want to give the contract to somebody or if they want to do it themselves, **Certainly** we have no involvement. There is no provincial government money invested in their company. They are not responsible to us. We have nobody on the board of directors, nor do we have a right to have anybody on the board of directors.

The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy indicated at the time the question was asked before that he would make representation to the company and ask them to give the local firms in the areas who are interested in trucking every consideration as far as the employment and revenue was concerned. I assume that he has done that. Other than that, of course, as I say, government is in no position to dictate the policies of a private company.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Labrador North.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industrial Development, in light of the fact that a number of ships that are owned by small ship owners in the province have been tied up all year, and there is no light in sight for any revenue, I mean what part is the government playing with regard to trying to get those ships back to **work**?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, the officials of the department met some time ago with the Ship Owners' Association, who are a group of local ship owners and they expressed their concern to us at that time. We have undertaken to contact the Federal Department of Transport, the CN and other people whom we knew who might be interested in charters and long term charters. I think the major problem is the spot charter problem that they have. They do not have any length of contracts. We have made representation on their behalf and we are working with them as vigorously as we can. Of course if the Government of Newfoundland

had any occasion to charter these ships or to put them to work we would do so immediately, but we are working with them as closely as we can to try to solve the problem. I admit the honourable member is quite correct, it is a serious problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt the Minister of Education again in signing his correspondence, but would -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Since he has recovered I will recover; would the minister indicate to the House, Sir, when he is prepared to table the Harris Report on human resources in education in the province, which the minister promised to table during the last session of the House of Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I believe at the time that I indicated I would table this as soon as I could. It is an internal document. There are still a number of matters in it on which the Department of Education and the government wish to make a decision and of which to have their own assessment and until that is done, then I would prefer not to table it. But I can certainly tell the honourable gentleman that before this session closes I shall certainly table it.

MR. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Well, why then did the minister promise that he would table it within one week during the last session of the House of Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: Now he is promising that statement before the end of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! That question is out of order. It is more of a statement of fact than a question.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, before you call Orders of the Day may I direct a question to the honourable Minister of Fisheries? According to a news report the honourable minister and the Premier and I think the Minister of Labour were meeting with the union and the Fisheries Association. Could the minister say has any progress been made towards a settling of the trawlermen's strike?

HON. J.C. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): I never heard the news report, Mr. Speaker, nor were the three gentlemen the honourable gentleman just mentioned meeting with the Fisheries Association and the union. The position is, as I understand it, that negotiations are expected to continue next week. The Premier, the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations and myself just had a meeting with certain principals of the fish companies in the province and that is probably what the report refers to, but not with the union.

CAPT. WINSOR: It was not a union meeting?

MR. CROSBIE: No. It was a meeting with the representatives of the company only.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Address-in-Reply. I think the honourable member for Hermitage adjourned the debate yesterday.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to be able to participate in this Address-in-Reply to the Speech From the Throne. I would, first of all, like to add my voice of congratulation to those members who have already done so in congratulating the Lieutenant-Governor, His Honour, Mr. Winter, on his first speech on the occasion of the opening of a session, and to extend to him on my own behalf and on behalf of my colleagues, the warmest wishes for a very successful and pleasant stay during his term of office.

I would like also to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion, the member for Bay de Verde and the member for Port au Port. Mr. Speaker, I would like to do as the member for Trinity North the last night, I think, said he was doing. I would like to divide my comments into two parts, if you like, and first of all talk somewhat about

some of the needs of my immediate district and then to dwell on the Throne Speech and some of its implications as far as the province is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, before getting into the matter of the needs of my district, I think I would be remiss, I would be less than honest, if I did not get into the record on another matter in relation to an incident of yesterday afternoon. It is not my purpose at this time to debate the merits of what went on in reference to the suspension of a member. There is a time and place to do that, and as I have said before in this chamber, I hope the time arrives fairly soon because it is a matter that we ought to have settled.

Mr. Speaker, without getting into that subject, I have, in the short time I have been in this House, just over a year now, and in the longer time I have been following the activities of the House of Assembly, I have never, Mr. Speaker, never in all my life, either in terms of a speech within this House or in terms of speeches I have heard elsewhere or read about, have never in my short memory ever witnessed or heard talk of or read about a speech as low down and as below the belt as I heard from the Minister of Social Services yesterday. The minister really struck a new low yesterday with the kind of shocking tirade, completely unwarranted -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker, the minister knows the difference. The minister was not trying to get down to anybody's level. The minister was in every sense of the term, Mr. Speaker, getting below everybody's level in this particular House, in my short memory. And it is the kind of thing that I wish you could strike from the record. And I wish the minister were allowed to be given a second chance. And, Mr. Speaker, I would be one in this House to allow him leave to do it all over again with the understanding, Mr. Speaker, that this time he would be the kind of gentleman that we had hoped him to be, and expect him to be, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY: Name it.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, to name the low stuff, Mr. Speaker, as the minister invites me to do, would be to repeat his entire speech. It was all low, the whole forty-five minutes. There was not a syllable that was not low, below the belt, shocking -

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: No, the rules for "Ank" are in vogue right now. He was all upset yesterday, Mr. Speaker, because he was being interrupted once in a while. Now let him be as silent as he wanted me to be yesterday. I had difficulty, Mr. Speaker, being silent - for that I will apologize to the Chair. But it was hard to sit here, Mr. Speaker, in silence yesterday and listen to the kind of low down tripe - not tripe, that dismisses it too easy, Mr. Speaker. It was more serious than that. It was character assassination of the first order that that gentleman got on with yesterday, and should not be allowed in this chamber. I agree with the Minister of Transportation that the kind of thing that the Minister of Social Services read in the record yesterday should not be protected by the immunity of this House. It should not be protected. There should not be anything to protect the Minister of Social Services against the kind of

thing he got away with here yesterday, Mr. Speaker. Nothing whatsoever. There was be a law against it somehow. Shocking! And I hope I will never see the likes again as long as I am here. Never again!

He preaches, Mr. Speaker, he preaches all kinds of virtues of what you should be like, and he clues up with that poetic line, which I meant to remember but did not, that very poetic line about -

MR. MURPHY: Who stealth my purse steals trash,
Who stealth my good name steals all.

MR. SIMMONS: Exactly.
Who stealth my purse steals trash,
Who stealth my good name steals all.

The essence, Mr. Speaker, after listening to the forty-five minutes of what the minister had to say, and then to have that poetic bit tacked on the end - the essence, Mr. Speaker, for those who did not hear it yesterday, the only conclusion you could draw from what the minister was saying "Do not do as I do, do as I say." Because, Mr. Speaker, if we take what he did yesterday afternoon if that forty-five minutes is an example, I shudder, Mr. Speaker, I shudder to think what a low level we would get down to in this particular House in debate.

MR. F. ROWE: You would need a bottle of Graval to hold it back.

MR. SIMMONS: Let him, Mr. Speaker, let that minister practice what he preaches. Let him be governed by the little couplet at the end of his speech, instead of engaging in the kind of character assassination that he obviously relished yesterday - he enjoyed doing it, Mr. Speaker. And the message I got was that it depended on what side of the House you sat, depending on whether you were a perfect being or a scoundrel, and scoundrel is one of the kinder implications that I could read into what he had to say yesterday, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that Minister of Social Services if he were dressed only in the cloak of discretion which he practices he would be a completely naked man.

MR. F. ROWE: The Naked Ape.

MR. SIMMONS: I referred also, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Tourism, and to his comments. I certainly listened with care last night to his concerns about this institution, and about the importance of not having it degraded.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: And what he said, Mr. Speaker, made a lot of sense. What the Minister of Transportation said made a lot of sense. I could not hope but have two wishes as he talked. Wish number one, I hoped that I as a member of this House can live up to the kind of -

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Tourism.

MR. SIMMONS: The Minister of Tourism. I am sorry, I probably said the Minister of Transportation, I was thinking of him in his former role because I have had a number of relations with him there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you for that biggest contribution of the session on the part of the Minister of Industrial Development, Mr. Speaker. He is getting there, Mr. Speaker. One of those days that minister might even make a speech. Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the Minister of Tourism. I found myself having two wishes. One, that I hope I can live up to the kind of image and performance that one should expect from this House, the kind of level of debate that he talked about. I also wish, number two, the the Minister of Social Services heard every word that the Minister of Tourism said. Because if there is any person, Mr. Speaker, who should learn a lesson - now, whether he is capable of learning the lesson, Mr. Speaker, is another question - if there is any man who should learn a lesson on this subject, it is the Minister of Social Services. I can suggest to the Minister of Education if he is looking for places to put community colleges, that I can suggest one faculty and one student body to him when he finds a location, down off Cape St. Francis somewhere. I would suggest the faculty be the Minister of Tourism and I suggest the entire student body be the Minister of Social Services. The Minister of Tourism will even then have a full-time job, Mr. Speaker, in getting his points across insofar as the dignity of this House is concerned.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have lots of time and I can listen to the babblings of the Minister of Social Services. I had to do it yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and I can do it again today.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, no, but I had to in the sense that I felt I owed it to him, Mr. Speaker, to hear what he had to say rather than go outside and not hear it and then come in and make comments without having had the benefit of his oration. So, instead, I sat here, grim though it was, and just stuck it out, Mr. Speaker. I am glad I did in one sense only. At least I can say it was one of the less pleasant experiences of my life. In that the minister's speech was unique, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Tourism - he talked last night.

He was fairly critical of the Opposition for never making any effort to get to the bottom of things. He talked long and hard last night, the Minister of Tourism did, who unfortunately is not in his seat today, and I wish he were here because I would prefer to be saying this kind of thing to a fellow's face rather than in his absence. I would presume he has some pressing business which keeps him from being present.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Tourism last night made this point again and again. He charged again and again that they, the Opposition, the crowd on this side of the House, never made any effort to get to the bottom of things. He accused us of going off to the press and making statements without having recourse to the facts first. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will be the first to admit that on occasion I have been obliged to make statements either publicly or in conversation with people across the province or in correspondence, I have been obliged to make statements without as full a command of the facts as I would like to have.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that we do not have as nearly a full command of the facts that relate to our job here is the kind of thing, the kind of circus we witnessed this afternoon when my colleague, the member for St. Barbe North tried to get some legitimate answers to questions. All we saw was a circus. All we saw was a minister who was caught with the fact that he had a majority who could thump for him every time he made a silly asinine statement of which he made several this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, several. Not as asinine as last night, but, Mr. Speaker, there are explanations for everything.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The questions were based on the Throne Speech.

MR. SIMMONS: The questions were clear, Mr. Speaker. One question was, do you intend to establish community colleges and where? And what do we get? We get the most protracted and off course answer. How he got away with it, Mr. Speaker, I will never know. I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that I can depend on the same kind of latitude in putting my questions as that member was allowed to have in giving his answers. I hope that is a precedent because I intend to draw on it, Mr. Speaker, in putting my questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair certainly interprets the remarks made by the honourable member for Hermitage as that he is challenging the rulings made by the Chair during the question period to the honourable minister. The Chair certainly has no intention of allowing that to continue. The Chair made several rulings during the question period with regard to questions put by the member for St. Barbe North and the answers given by the honourable Minister of Education.

I would caution the honourable member for Hermitage to be rather careful in his challenges of decisions made by this Chair.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, first of all I did not challenge. I know the proper way to do it and intend to do so when I feel the need is there, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was actually engaging -

MR. ROWE: When the need is there.

MR. SIMMONS: I was engaging in an exercise which springs from a basic characteristic I have which is stated best as home springs eternal, and I was just hoping, Mr. Speaker, and that is enough, hoping.

Mr. Speaker, I was saying that we would not have the problem that the Minister of Tourism talked about last night.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: It is all very kind I say to the minister what I am saying, I have already said in his absence that I rather enjoyed his dissertation as it affected the dignity of the House last night and took the public pledge that I would try to live up to the kind of level the minister talked about last night.

I was also about to respond to his statement that they, on this side of the House, never make any effort to get to the bottom of things. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that on occasion I have had to make statements, whether in the press or in letter form or in private conversations with constituents and others across the province, make statements without as full a command of the facts as I would have liked to have. I was saying one of the reasons that is the case, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of thing we saw here this afternoon, where the Minister of Education knew very well what my colleague, the Member for St. Barbe North, wanted. One of the questions in particular was, does the government intend to establish community colleges and where?

Now the answer to the first part of that question is either yes or no. And the answer to the second part of the question, if the answer to the first part is yes, the answer to the second part is to list the places. It is that simple.

There is no need for the minister to get on in a childish and far ranging dissertation to the amusement of his colleagues because he happens to have more than my colleague has on his particular side. We all know the game, Mr. Speaker, that is being played. We all know the game that the minister was playing, Mr. Speaker. If we cannot get as nearly to the bottom of the facts as we would like it is for the kind of reason my colleague experienced this afternoon. It is for the kind of reason that we saw in the question period when we asked for information about "The Daily News". We still, Mr. Speaker, do not know the full facts about "The Daily News" and had the Minister of Public Services been here this afternoon I had a question for him, Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Public Services which I would dearly like him to answer and I will put the question just for the record right now, Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask the minister on the subject of "The Daily News", would he confirm or deny that directives, I will qualify it, directive or directives, one or more, would the minister confirm or deny that one or more directives have been issued to contractors doing business with the government, discouraging them or perhaps even instructing them from placing advertising in "The Daily News". That is a question, Mr. Speaker, I had for the minister except he was not here today.

MR. HICKEY: That is not so.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Tourism says it is not so. I heard, Mr. Speaker, his attitude on the subject last night. He said he would not place a single line of advertising in "The Daily News."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: I take exception to that remark. It is a complete untruth. I never uttered any such words. I simply said last night that I have my own opinion of "The Daily News" issue and if anybody in this House wishes to debate it with me I would be glad to do so. I ask the honourable gentleman to retract that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair seems to be perhaps, in this point of view at least, a difference of opinion between two honourable members at this point.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKEY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, the statement made by the honourable member, as far as I am concerned, reflects on my own integrity making such a statement. I did not make it. I am the one who has been aggrieved. I am the aggrieved party. I have the right in this House to ask for a withdrawal. I ask for one and I ask for an unqualified withdrawal.

MR. SIMMONS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I sat here last night and I listened intently, very attentively to what the minister had to say. My recall of what he said is as I said it a moment ago.

MR. HICKEY: I know what I said.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is my honest recall of what he said. I may be wrong.

MR. HICKEY: You are wrong.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, may I finish speaking to the point of order? I may be wrong on that as I may be wrong on many other things. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that if there is some doubt on this matter, or if the minister feels that I have misrepresented what he said, let us recess the House, let us get the transcript of what the minister said last night, and if I am wrong in reproducing what he said a moment ago, I shall apologize without any qualification.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair,

from the Chair's viewpoint, it looks upon the matter as a difference of opinion between two honourable members. At the same time, I would like to say that honourable members, when speaking, making statements and stating facts, certainly have the responsibility to bear out these facts, whether they are correct or incorrect. As I said, the Chair feels that it is a difference of opinion between two honourable members as to what was said in a previous debate.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKEY: A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: There is no point of order.

MR. HICKEY: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if I may continue my speech.

MR. HICKEY: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, as I saying -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I was trying to hear what the Hon. Minister of Tourism -

MR. HICKEY: It is customary, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: He was rising on a point of order, and I could not hear because other members were speaking. I ask the Hon. Minister of Tourism, is he rising on a point of order?

MR. HICKEY: Yes, I am Your Honour. It is customary for an honourable member to have the privilege to rise on a point of order, and another point of order, and another point of order, if he wishes. Now I rise on another point of order, Mr. Speaker, and that is very simply this, that the very thing I talked about last night is being carried on here today, and that is honourable members making a statement when they are not in possession of the facts, or not sure of the facts. They do not bother to look or check. They very simply make statements which are inflammatory against someone's character or reputation or against someone's behaviour,

responsible behaviour in this Chamber. I suggest, Your Honour, I am quite prepared to go along with a recess. Let us recess for five minutes. Let us get the tapes, and we will find out which member is right, and which member is wrong. I stand on what I said.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

For the third time, the Chair is to make a ruling on the same point of order raised by the Hon. Minister of Tourism. The Chair feels that it is a difference of opinion between two honourable members, and if the Hon. Minister of Tourism and others feel that the Chair's ruling is wrong, then, of course, I am sure they are aware of what recourse they have.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the minister interjects, be a man, take it back. Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of taking back anything. I reproduced a moment ago, verbally, what I thought the minister said. Now I have already said that it is quite possible I am wrong. I have been wrong before.

MR. HICKEY: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: The minister knows, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKEY: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, insofar as I am concerned now, I have stated correctly what the minister said last night. Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister has a recourse. If he feels I have misrepresented him, he can go out, Mr. Speaker, get the tapes, or get the transcript, and then take the proper recourse under the procedures of this House. I will stand by the judgement of the House in that matter. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take back something, so far as I am concerned, now I have no reason to take back because I believe it to be the truth, Mr. Speaker. I believe it to be the truth and that is why I said it. If I did not think it was the truth, I would not have said it a few minutes ago. Now if the minister can convince me that I misrepresented him, well I will be a man about it and apologize without qualification. But in the absence of that proof, I happen to believe, Mr. Speaker, right now that I spoke the truth just now in reporting to

the House what the minister said last night in this Chamber, and until there is something to the contrary, I stand by the statement that I told what I think is the truth.

MR. HICKEY: McCarthyism.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, McCarthyism. McCarthyism, the minister says. Always anxious, Mr. Speaker -

MR. HICKEY: Why do you not - .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Why do you not repeat everything?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if the minister would suggest to me how I make my speeches, I suggest to him that I shall continue to pick out those parts of his speeches which I want to respond to, and I shall continue to say nothing about the other parts that I do not want to respond to. That is my privilege as a member of this House, when I address the Chair. I am not going to be regurgitating all the stuff he said last night. I agree with some of it, Mr. Speaker. Some of it I disagree with, and I am going to take exception to it in the next few moments, and others I will just ignore for a number of reasons.

Mr. Speaker, the minister last night said that they, the Opposition, never make any effort to get to the bottom. I have said already that the example this afternoon involving my colleague, the Member for St. Barbe North and the Minister of Education, is an example of why we cannot get to the bottom of a lot of things in this House, because of the arrogance of people like the Minister of Education who feels somehow that he is not first and foremost an answerable minister of the Crown but rather some clown in a circus.

Mr. Speaker, I said also that another example of how we have difficulty getting to the bottom of things -

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

The honourable member made his statement just as I was sitting in the Chair, referring to an honourable minister as a clown

March 14, 1975

Tape no. 411

Page 4 - mw

in a circus. The inference was there, and I think the accusation was direct. The honourable member is not going to be permitted to make statements of this type. They are abusive and insulting and they are completely unparliamentary.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not call the minister a clown but if it was anything by way of imputation, I certainly withdraw. The terminology I used, or certainly meant to have used, was like a clown, the actions were like.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): That is correct. I understood the honourable member correctly. Like a clown - there is no difference in the interpretation of it so far as the Chair is concerned.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, instead of the kind of performance we got from the Minister of Education this afternoon, if we could get direct, precise, responsible answers to the questions we ask during question period we would be a lot nearer to the bottom of the facts, as the Minister of Tourism would like us to be. We would be a lot nearer if we got the answers to the questions we put about "The Daily News" than we are at the present. But for some reason, Mr. Speaker, ministers responsible are choosing not to give us the facts on those issues.

Mr. Speaker, we would be a lot nearer to the bottom of the situation if we were given complete, responsible instead of evasive answers to questions about the Dobbin deal, we would be a lot nearer to the bottom of the facts. We would have been a lot nearer last year to the bottom of another situation, the facts of another case, if the Premier and his colleagues had not evaded the issue of the called for investigation into the Bill Saunders resignation two or three years ago. There are a lot of issues, Mr. Speaker, a lot of examples I could give, Mr. Speaker, like those I have given - the Saunders issue, the Dobbin issue, "The Daily News" issue and the example which runs through every question period, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, a lot of examples, Mr. Speaker of why we cannot in Opposition get as near to the bottom of the situation as we would like to, cannot get as near

to the total facts of the case as we would like to be at times, and so, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Tourism stands in his place as he did last night and makes a statement that we make no effort, I correct that. I say it differently. I say we make an effort, a sincere effort, as is evidenced by anybody who watches this Chamber in session. We make a sincere effort. Our effort is very often frustrated by ministers of the Crown who chose not to give us the information we are looking for.

So, Mr. Speaker, in part, I agree with the Minister of Tourism. We do not always get to the bottom, but I disagree with his reason. His reason is that we do not make an effort. We make the effort okay, Mr. Speaker, but we are confronted very often by at least as able an effort from ministers of the Crown to keep the information from us for whatever reason.

Before getting off the subject, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Tourism, I think it is worth noting that he hit another note last night which has run through just about every speech I have heard from the government side of the House in this Address in Reply. He thanked the Premier, thanked the Premier. Mr. Speaker, all spring I have been looking for signs of an election. I could not see much in the Throne Speech - I could not see much in the Throne Speech that would make us think there was going to be an election. Now, I will comment on that later. I could not see an awful lot in the Budget Speech. I could see how the Minister of Finance and the Premier would like to think that there are some things in the Budget Speech which would make a good election issue but I will come to that too, Mr. Speaker. But the first real concrete indication I have gotten that an election is not far off is the way everybody stands up on that side of the House and gets on his knees to the Premier and thanks the Premier, thanks the Premier and tells him what a great fellow he is because they are all hoping, Mr. Speaker, all hoping -

MR. EVANS: The only difference is before -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! All honourable members

know the rule that any person who has the floor has the right to be heard in silence. If honourable members disagree with what the member is saying they can rise on a point of order or wait their turn to speak or they can swallow their smoke. Since the honourable member has the right to be heard in silence, then rules of order will be enforced by the Chair.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. They all thank the Premier in their speeches. They all are hoping against hope that in the unlikely event that when the election is all over, the Premier is still in the Premier's Chair,

MR. EVANS: Who is going to replace him?

MR. SIMMONS: It will not be the Member for Burgeo although it would be an improvement, Mr. Speaker. It would be a distinct improvement, distinct improvement. A gentleman -

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker. I just paid a compliment to the Member for Burgeo and he misunderstood me and that should not go uncorrected. I say that the Member for Burgeo, Mr. Speaker, would make an eminently better Premier than the present one. At least he knows about the fishery which we cannot say for the present Premier.

Mr. Speaker, in the extremely unlikely event that the present Premier continues to occupy the chair when the election is over, they are all getting ready, they are all lining up, they are all saying not I Lord, not I Lord. They are all saying, look at me, look how faithful I am, look all the nice things I do for you; every time I get up I pat you on the back. You watch it, Mr. Speaker, I predict that every last speaker who gets up on the government side in one form or another will say something that he did not say last year, if you check the record, Mr. Speaker, on the Address in Reply. They will be very profuse in their thanks to the Premier, very profuse and for a very good reason, Mr. Speaker,

because they are hoping against hope that when the election is all over there is still a place in the Premier's kingdom for them:

Not I Lord, not I.

So, the Minister of Tourism last night, Mr. Speaker, waxed eloquent in his thanks to the Premier, again getting in that little bit of insurance that when it is all over in the unlikely event that the Premier continues to be Premier, getting a bit of insurance, that he will not get the flick from the Premier after the election is all over.

Well, as it happens, Mr. Speaker, he is wasting his time, he is wasting his breath and he is buying insurance on something that is not very insurable these days, Mr. Speaker. If I had to place my bets on the chances of the present Premier being Premier after the next general election, I would not be betting very much in favour of the proposition, Mr. Speaker, not very much at all.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker,

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

We have heard in the last couple of days about disruptions in the House and mockery of the House. We see a prime example of it right now from the government side benches. Could we not have order in the House, the same on both sides, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): I think the honourable member's point is well taken. Certain honourable members to my left, maybe the events of the week have weakened their ability to withstand another honourable member's differing views or whatever. However, an honourable member has the right to be heard in silence and if he is out of order, honourable members may rise on a point of order, and otherwise, rules will be enforced by the Chair. This is the second or third time I have brought this to honourable members' attention and disciplinary action from the Chair is not unheard of, so I suggest to all honourable members that they might keep that in mind.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, could I have an indication of how much time remains of my forty -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I am game.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): The honourable member has eleven minutes remaining.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well I should want, Mr. Speaker, to come to the subject of my district in a few moments. But before doing that, Mr. Speaker, I did make a promise, or a threat, as the case may be that I would make some reference to the Throne Speech in particular. Mr. Speaker, I have read the Throne Speech with a considerable degree of interest. And, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing particularly surprising about it. It is a very consistent culmination to three or four years of this government's rule. There is no question about that. It cannot be accused, Mr. Speaker, of being inconsistent, this Throne Speech. It is a very consistent document.

It is, first of all, Mr. Speaker, consistent with the record of this particular administration. And it is also consistent, Mr. Speaker, in another respect, and this is the biggest indictment of this Throne Speech. It is consistent in that it contains just about every item we have seen in every other Throne Speech so far that this administration has been a party to.

Mr. Speaker, my friend the Member for St. Barbe North made reference to the - well what do they call it this year? The young Newfoundland -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: No, no. This year they call it The Youth Commission. Oh, yes, they are going to go to youth now, Mr. Speaker, and they are going to get all kinds of views. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a brilliant, new idea dreamed up for the first time the morning someone wrote that speech, it had to be the idea of going to youth. We never heard of it before, Mr. Speaker. A completely new idea or brain child if there ever was one. They are going to have a Youth Commission now, Mr. Speaker, in 1975. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what they would call it in 1977 if they were around? If they were around, Mr. Speaker, what would they call it, I wonder, in 1977? I ask that, Mr. Speaker, because I happen to know as much as I have suggested that the thought is a very, very, very original one. When I read it somehow I got the feeling, certainly goodness this is such a great idea that it did not go unnoticed in all of human history until 1975. So I began looking around to see

if somewhere back in time I could find an example of where it occurred before - somewhere back in ancient or middle times, or the modern ages. I look for some other place where this great idea had occurred before. And, lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, I actually found another place where this had been mentioned before - 1971, a fellow whose only title was Leader of the P.C. Party at the time in Newfoundland. He said in October 1971, that he will, not would, or maybe, or would look into, but he will establish a - listen to it - a Young Newfoundland Service Corps. That was in 1971. A Young Newfoundland Service Corps. But then, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: A Young Newfoundland Service Corps. Now that was 1971, - and you can excuse it, Mr. Speaker, if the language is a little clumsy. It was a long term, and not too workable. He was not used to coming up with good clichés at that time. Young Newfoundland Service Corps - that was 1971 he was going to do it. In 1973 we read the Throne Speech. Ah ha! somewhere they heard the word "advisory" and so no longer is it a Young Newfoundland Service Corps it is now a Youth Advisory Council. They are making progress, Mr. Speaker. In two years they have reduced the number of words from four to three, and they have replaced service with advice. So in 1975, real progress, they got it down to two words now, Mr. Speaker. Now in 1975 it is going to be a Youth Commission. Mr. Speaker, what a mockery! What a mockery! This government has no more intention, Mr. Speaker, of involving youth any more than they have of involving their caucus in decisions. They do not even involve the thirty-two people on that side of the House in the decisions. We saw that a week or so ago, when three people had to come into the House and plead with the government to let them have a say. And then they talk about involving youth. They will involve nobody, Mr. Speaker, only the terrible trio, only the trio in the cabinet. I did not say the Tory trio. That is another bunch of fellows that I have a lot of admiration for. I am talking about the terrible trio. The three

guys in cabinet who really make the decisions, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think it must be fairly obvious from my comments that I do not have any great admiration for the kind of effort being undertaken by this particular government. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no confidence

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: No confidence at all in the ability of this administration to come to grips with the problems of the country or to help solve them affectively.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. My amendment to the Address in Reply, I am pleased to say, will be seconded by the Member for Labrador North. I would like to repeat that it is an amendment to the Address in Reply, and that it is seconded by the Member for Labrador North.

Be it resolved, Mr. Speaker, that all the words after "that" be deleted and that the following words be substituted "there fore:" This House regrets the failure of the present administration to introduce programmes to lessen the severe impact on our people of the rapidly rising cost of living, and regrets the failure of the administration to introduce programmes designed to reduce the constantly increasing number of persons who are unemployed, and further regrets the inadequacy of measures to deal with dramatic increases in work stoppages as a result of strikes and lockouts both legal and illegal, and regrets further the lack of concern and of measures to research and deal with the rising tide of vandalism and criminal activity which is on the upsurge daily in urban areas throughout Newfoundland and Labrador."

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: I so move, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: If I may speak to the amendment, Mr. Speaker, or -

MR. CROSBIE: Are there copies, Mr. Speaker, for this side of the House so we could have a look at it. We certainly do not mind debating it, but we want to make sure it is in order, you know.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): I believe that amendment is in order, properly proposed. And the honourable member has the right to continue his speech.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the best way, or certainly the first way I would like to illustrate the truth of what is contained in this amendment is to go back a minute, once again, to the Throne Speech of 1975. I said a moment ago that it had remarkable consistency, remarkable in two respects; remarkable in that it was consistent with the kind of thing this government have been up to for over three years - making a lot of noise, making a lot of words, and then coming in, if a promise was not kept and saying, well, so what? So what, we cannot keep them all. No, Mr. Speaker, that is true. Nobody would expect a group of ordinary human beings however competent to cross every "t" to dot every "i", to keep every last commitment. That is one thing, Mr. Speaker, but when you have an attitude among people in government that you can make promises willy-nilly - I will give you an example, Mr. Speaker, during that famous Hermitage by-election which the government had heard far too much about -

MR. EVANS: Infamous.

MR. SIMMONS: Infamous in many respects, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the Member for Burgeo-LaPoile. Infamous in many respects.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Infamous in the attempts that were made in that district to buy votes - infamous in that respect, Mr. Speaker. Famous in some other respects, Mr. Speaker. Famous in terms of the contribution that my colleague and friend the Minister of Justice, famous in terms of the contribution he made to my campaign in Seal Cove, Fortune Bay.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: It is a well known story, Mr. Speaker, but there may be one member in this House who was dozing the day it was mentioned first, or the second time, or the third time. And so for the fourth time, Mr. Speaker, let the record show that I have paid my debt to the Minister

March 14, 1975

Tape 413 (Afternoon)

PK - 5

of Justice. I have paid my debt to him, and he has paid his debt to me for that great undertaking of ours back in 1969

when he was the candidate and I was the manager, Mr. Speaker, if there is to be blame for 1969, blame to be attributed, to be portioned out, blame for the minister who was then the candidate not having won the leadership, Mr. Speaker, I want to take all the blame. I want to take every last ounce of the blame because, Mr. Speaker, could you imagine what a shocking miscarriage of justice it would have been had we succeeded. Indeed, to play with words, Mr. Speaker, to have succeeded in that venture would have been to have failed miserably.

So, Mr. Speaker, for the great contribution I made to his campaign back in 1969, he owed me a favour. Lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, right in the midst of the Hermitage by-election, here he comes, Mr. Speaker -

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We now have before the House, Mr. Speaker, a non-confidence motion. I submit that all that is relevant to be debated are the matters referred to in this non-confidence motion. That is the cost of living, unemployment, strikes legal and illegal, vandalism and criminal activity which is on a daily upsurge, so the motion says, throughout the province. This is not the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, itself in which you can talk about what you like.

Now, the honourable gentleman is therefore quite out of order in pursuing this bit of history about what he did in 1969 and the Minister of Justice did, etc. I ask Your Honour to impose the rule of relevancy.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Now, the rule on debate on an amendment is quite different from the rule on the Address in Reply on which debate can be far ranging. I do not think that the same flexibility extends to debate on the amendment. I do observe, however, that the points raised in the proposed amendment are quite wide-ranging themselves and give any honourable member considerable scope for the motion of non-confidence which it basically is.

At this time I do think that the honourable member may have been straying from that which is relevant, and I should have interrupted him at that time. However, I was engaged in trying to ascertain another

point at the time, but I believe the honourable minister was quite correct.

MR. CROSBIE: A point also, Mr. Speaker. Just in case any authority is needed, it is quite clear on page 142 of Beauchesne, section (170), "Amendments to the Address are moved by way of additions thereto. A general debate may take place on the Address, but when an amendment is proposed the discussion should be strictly confined to the subject matter of the amendment."

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly apologize to the Chair if I was straying somewhat. I was, perhaps in somewhat verbose fashion, about to make a point, perhaps a point that would relate very accurately to the motion, indeed that the motion in recalling my activities in 1969, perhaps it could almost come under the criminal activity clause in the motion. Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, I quite agree we should get on with it. Certainly I apologize if I have digressed to widely.

Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the Hermitage by-election when I got off on that pleasant little tangent. I was talking about consistency, Mr. Speaker, the consistency of this particular government. Let nobody ever accuse this government of being inconsistent. They are, Mr. Speaker, the most consistent bunch who ever occupied any office, most consistent. My speech writer, the junior member for Harbour Main, Mr. Speaker, reminds me that I should have said and I now say, the honourable consistent bunch or the consistent honourable bunch. The honourable consistent bunch. He suggests the consistently honourable.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

The word bunch is not dissimilar to the word crowd which was sneaked into the debate a year or so ago and became rather notorious. I suggest to the honourable member that when referring to other honourable members he might choose words which are at least neutral but certainly not uncomplimentary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, again I apologize if there was any unkind

connotation. When I think of bunches, I think of flowers. I will call them honourable consistent crowd, Mr. Speaker. They are consistent. There is no question about that, no question about their consistency.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I have all the time in the world.

Mr. Speaker, consistent in two ways. First of all, consistent in that they run out at the appropriate times and make the promises, whether in Throne Speeches or in election campaign speeches such as the Minister of Justice was doing down in Fortune Bay on that occasion in Seal Cove, or in Budget Speeches or wherever. Their promises are there, but there is this attitude, Mr. Speaker - I have got it pretty publicly from the ministers of the crown - this attitude that what is the big crime about making promises that you do not intend to keep. I have one instance, Mr. Speaker, relating to the Hermitage by-election where after the by-election was over and I had taken my place in this chamber, I went to a particular member of the government and I said, well, what about the ferry service -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

The honourable member is speaking on the same matter which was brought to his attention by the honourable the House Leader. I fail to see where this is relevant to the five or six points raised in the proposed amendment. If the honourable member can show how it is relevant, then of course he may continue. But at the present time the Chair fails to see the connection.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I certainly am willing to abide by your decision. However, I submit I perhaps have not been given an opportunity to make the point. I have had some interruptions from the member for Bonavista South and I have had a number of points of order. I shall try as quickly as possible to get to the point.

The reference in the motion to the failure of the administration to introduce programmes and so on was the point I was coming to. I was doing it by way of an example involving the announced and promised and committed ferry service for the people of Gaultois. I was really talking in terms of consistency in that they are consistent in the promises they make and they are then consistent in their batting average.

consistent in the way they fail to carry out these promises. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be more germane, nothing could be more pertinent to the motion, the amendment that I have moved just a few minutes ago.

On that occasion, Mr. Speaker, when I made some representation on behalf of my constituents at Gaultois in respect to the ferry service which had been promised during the by-election, the answer I got from the member of the government at that time was, you know blankety-blank well that we have not even thought about that since.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I quote that because I think it sums up an attitude, an attitude which explains the kind of failure that I have been talking about in this amendment. It is not that the men are incapable or such, Mr. Speaker. De facto, in effect, as a result, that is what the problem is, but it is not that in reality these are incapable people. They represent a very cross section of the men who find themselves in full-time political life. It is not that they are, as a crowd, Mr. Speaker, as a group of people, all incompetents. That is not the problem. The problem very largely is this matter of attitude, the attitude that says, we are in and the name of the game is to stay in. If we break a few promises along the way or if we make a few promises we cannot keep, well, you know, that is par for the course. It is that kind of attitude, Mr. Speaker, which renders this crowd, this honourable crowd, incapable of coming to grips with the cost of living.

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

Sometime last sitting, I do not know if it was last Fall or the sitting previously, I ruled on the phrase "honourable crowd". I believe we were in committee at the time, and again I will continue to rule on that phrase "honourable crowd" because it does not describe honourable members of the House in the manner in which they should be described. Honourable members can be described as honourable members and very little else.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, again my apologies, it seems that I am doing a fair amount of that this afternoon but I distinctly heard Mr. Speaker say a few minutes ago that crowd was permissible and it was in that vein I was using it, in reference to the bunch versus crowd but I now strike crowd from my vocabulary for the time being, at least for the duration of this address or I shall try to, Mr. Speaker.

The words, Mr. Speaker, may fail me in terms of finding appropriate tags to put on the members of Cabinet, the words may fail me, Mr. Speaker, but the thought is there and I have all the time in the world, today, Monday and whatever other day they call the Throne Speech and I shall, whatever it takes, the next twenty minutes or the next seven hours, Mr. Speaker, if I have difficulty finding the words I shall just take my dead time until I find a word that is at once accurate and two, parliamentary, to make the -

MR. MORGAN: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for Bonavista South -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! While the honourable member has unlimited time, and that is a fact, I have checked that the honourable member does not have unlimited time to be irrelevant and certainly his talking about what he is going to do and how he is going to do it is irrelevant. The honourable member has put a motion before the House and he has the duty, he has the right but he also has the duty, to speak to that amendment. He has not been doing so.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am trying very hard and I shall continue to do so. I would get much more quickly to the point if I did not have to put up with interruptions with the opposite side of the House, but I shall push on.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking at this point about the failure of this government to introduce programmes, not the failure to make promises. Now on that they are consistent. On their failure to introduce programmes to lessen the severe impact on our people of the rapidly rising cost of living, on that failure, Mr. Speaker, they are consistent.

I have before me, Mr. Speaker, a list, a documentation of the promises that members of this present administration have made since they came into office, which will illustrate, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the first part of this amendment, that this House regrets the failure of the administration to introduce programmes to lessen the severe impact on our people of the rapidly rising cost of living, or that it regrets the failure of the administration to introduce programmes to reduce the constantly increasing numbers of people who are unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, just to take two or three or more of these to, by way of example, talking about the struggle people are having, particularly in rural Newfoundland, in coming to grips with the cost of living.

The present Premier, before he became Premier in October 1971, stated publicly that the government he would lead would pay special incentives to teachers and other professional people who serve in smaller communities. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a promise that was made like many others we will see were made. It is another promise, Mr. Speaker, that was not kept. It is another promise which demonstrates the failure of this government. They know, Mr. Speaker, they have their finger partly on the pulse of things. They have an idea of what is needed but, Mr. Speaker, they are so busy, so busy, Mr. Speaker, keeping

themselves in office, that they have not time to worry about the people of Newfoundland.

In 1973, Mr. Speaker, the Premier said that his government has, not will have or might have, but has a four year financial plan before the Cabinet. A plan I hope - the point is making financial plans, as the Minister of Finance could well tell us, I cannot think of anybody else more expert on this particular subject, he being the Minister of Finance and in view of his speech the other day and in view of his subsequent performances on television, he certainly appears to be the expert -

AN HON. MEMBER: He is.

MR. EVANS: Give you a pretty good idea what you know about Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, at any time I would match what I know about finances with either the Member for Burgeo or the Minister of Finance.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no pride in your family at all.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Sir, not a bit of pride left in my family, not a bit.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! Order, please! On several occasions I have interrupted the member speaking to draw to the attention of honourable members to my left that he has the right to be heard in silence. Now I made a vague reference to the powers of the Chair when it is being ignored by any honourable member. So I suggest to honourable members that if this is going to continue they may be in for a rather rude and abrupt surprise.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the Premier's four year financial plan. I was appealing to the Minister of Finance because of his expertise to support me in this matter and to confirm what I was about to say, that if you are going to have a financial plan it is useless to have it in isolation unless it relates to the needs of the province, the unemployment or to the employment needs of the province, unless it relates to the need to lessen the impact on the cost of living. Unless you have that kind

of a financial plan for the province, well there is only one other thing to have, the kind of financial plan which would be designed towards industrial expansion for its own sake, or designed towards lining somebody's pockets for their own sake, or that kind of thing. So there are only two choices.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: In government, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope, I would hope that the reason the Premier mentioned this four year plan, which he did not say they were going to have, he said they had it, I would hope that the reason for it was to come to grips with the kinds of things that they have not yet come to grips with. That is what I find lamentable about that promise that was made in January, 1973. The Premier said in January 1973, it was before the Cabinet, less than two weeks later the Throne Speech said the government is now completing a five year plan.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the five year plan. Nobody in this House has seen the five year plan, but perhaps with the new Minister of Finance they do not need a five year plan. Perhaps the minister is the five year plan or perhaps he has got it in his head. I do not know. But if the Premier makes that kind of statement, it does give people like me some hope that perhaps these people do have a long term plan of action which will come to grips.

But, Mr. Speaker. I can only go on so long wishing and unless they give me some proof positive, unless they show me in black and white that they have the five year plan and that it is the kind of plan which will address itself to the needs that are raised in this amendment, then eventually, Mr. Speaker, I get skeptical. Eventually I begin to wonder if that was ever the case, what the Premier said two years ago, or I begin to wonder if they changed their minds, or I begin to wonder if the new Minister of Finance has solved all their problems. If so, Mr.

Speaker, he is a very different person than he was the last time he was Minister of Finance, when he could not even write his own Budget Speech. At least we must give the man credit where it is due if we are to believe what he said, and I certainly believe him. He said he wrote his own speech this time, Mr. Speaker, and you have got to admit, Mr. Speaker, that is an achievement for a Minister of Finance to write his own Budget Speech, particularly if you keep in mind that he did not do it the last time. He said he did not write three, four words of it the last time.

MR. EARLE: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Sixteen.

MR. SIMMONS: He did not write sixteen words. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I abjectly apologize to the minister. Let the record show that he did not write sixteen words. He might have written fifteen, fourteen words. Well that could be a short paragraph. So he wrote perhaps one paragraph, certainly a sentence, or part of a long sentence the last time, this time he writes the whole speech, Mr. Speaker. I am glad he is willing to take the credit for it. I am glad he is willing, Mr. Speaker. I certainly would not be willing. I will tell you that, Mr. Speaker. I am glad somebody is willing, man enough to stand up and say, look I am responsible for this mess. That takes real guts, Mr. Speaker, to get on television, to get in this House before all the people of Newfoundland and say, look, I am responsible. I am responsible for this particular mess. I am responsible for failing to come to grips with the education needs of this province. I am responsible

for perpetrating the deception, Mr. Speaker. I am responsible, the minister is saying, for perpetrating a deception that Boards are \$25 million better off this year. What utter nonsense, Mr. Speaker. The Boards will get that extra money if somebody keeps the promise of the present minister ten, twelve years from now. They will get that money in 1985-1986, and 1986-1987. Now I ask, Mr. Speaker, why did not the minister tell that when he read his budget speech? Why did he give the impression that they were getting \$25 million extra this year?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

As I understand the amendment proposed by the honourable Member for Hermitage it appears now that he is being somewhat irrelevant in talking about the budget speech which is another point in time on the Order Paper for that particular item.

MR. SIMMONS: I am prepared to do this, Mr. Speaker. Whichever way it conforms to the rules of the House, I shall connect up every sentence each time if that is what is required. I was about to tie in the employment situation, Mr. Speaker, the additional school construction that that \$25 million would have allowed us, the additional teachers, and that kind of thing. I submit, Mr. Speaker, without questioning your ruling, and this I am not wanting to do, I would submit that what I was saying and perhaps I did not, perhaps the onus, perhaps the failure was on my part in not showing the relevance of it, but I was talking about the second part of my amendment which says that the House regrets the failure of the administration to introduce programmes to reduce the shockingly high unemployment rate.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that one of the clear ways this could be done, and at the same time alleviate the very serious problems which exist in terms of school facilities around this province, one sure way to kill two birds with one stone, the unemployment problem and the desperate shortage of adequate school facilities, would be to make these kinds of millions available now as the minister gave the clear impression he was doing. And the CBC National News that night reported that education for capital reasons was going to get an extra

\$25 million. Mr. Speaker, that is a fraud. That is a deception.

In 1985 they will get the first dollar of that if the -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: present government's promise is kept by its successors.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair certainly has no intention of allowing any honourable member to refer to another member or something said by another member, a minister of the Crown, or a member of the Opposition as being a fraud, and deceitful. I certainly think that is very unparliamentary. And I would ask the honourable Member for Hermitage to withdraw those comments.

MR. SIMMONS: As I stated before this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to withdraw anything that is unparliamentary, and I shall continue, Mr. Speaker, to struggle for accurate words which are parliamentary. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that it is my impression that the minister in giving the impression that the \$25 million was immediately available rather than available ten years from now, Mr. Speaker - 1985 they will get the first cent of that, ten years from now - and I say in alleviating that impression, Mr. Speaker, he was less than candid -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Less than candid, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman I assume is speaking on his amendment. I am failing to see the relation of his present debate to his amendment. I would ask that he be ruled out of order, and if he is going to speak, to speak to the amendment only.

MR. F. ROWE: To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, my colleague here is leading up as he stated before what affect that amount of money would have on the employment. And this is exactly what is stated here, the failure of the government to increase or decrease the number of unemployed. Now he must, you know, have a preamble if you

want to call it such, to lead up to substantiate his argument. I think that is exactly what the honourable member is doing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to that point of order.

There will be ample time in this House for the budget address, and would welcome if the honourable the member who is now speaking, apparently on the budget address, would continue in the way he is because he is making such a fool of it, it is really showing the credibility of the budget.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker, that -

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: That is not a point of order raised by the Hon. Minister of Finance. But, Sir, the motion specifically states that the - you know, the first part - and regrets the failure of the administration to introduce programmes designed to reduce the constantly increasing number of persons who are unemployed. Sir, the Member for Hermitage is talking about the expenditure, the possible expenditure of \$25 million to school construction, and if that does not involve the employment or the non-employment of the people I would like to know what does? And, Sir, the Member for Hermitage is constantly being harassed on points of order from the other side, and other quips from the other side in order to interrupt him and stop him and halt him from making a very good point.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, again to this point of order. The honourable gentleman is really debating a budget debate, and we are not in a budget debate, we are debating the Throne Speech.

MR. MARSHALL: The amendment to the Throne Speech.

MR. MORGAN: We are now debating - the honourable gentleman for Hermitage his amendment. And his amendment does not deal with the budget speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: It does.

MR. MORGAN: It does not. It cannot. Mr. Speaker, it has to deal with the Throne Speech, you cannot amend the Budget Speech at this time, you have only to amend the Throne Speech. And we are now debating an amendment to the Throne Speech. And the honourable must be relevant from here on in.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! We are attempting to debate an amendment to the Address in Reply to the Throne Speech. The rule of relevancy is rather difficult to rule on. Honourable members have been reminded of it earlier today. A very few moments ago, in fact, I rose and reminded the honourable Member for Hermitage that I did feel that he was debating the budget and not being relevant to this particular amendment. Now I realize that some latitude has to be given, and an honourable member perhaps should be given the opportunity to show the relationship of what he is saying but I suppose - or you cannot set a time. Then it is a judgement decision of the Chair as to whether or not, how long an honourable member has to show the relationship to what he is trying to bring out. It is certainly the feeling of the Chair that the honourable Member for Hermitage has been a little irrelevant, and even though perhaps we are talking of a thin line between this particular amendment and the budget speech.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, talking about the budget speech, I read in the press, I think, yesterday, and the minister may have been incorrectly quoted on this point, but he was quoted by one of the newspapers, I believe "The Evening Telegram" but I would not be sure, but I did read it last evening - as saying that the emphasis in the budget was on resource development rather than on employment.

Mr. Speaker, one of the main indictments in this particular resolution, and I repeat, is that the House regrets the failure of the administration to introduce programmes designed to reduce the constantly increasing number of persons who are unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope in a few minutes to show the relevance of what I have been saying about capital costs for school construction to that part of my amendment. But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, let me address myself directly to the subject of unemployment in this

province. I think, Mr. Speaker, the figures are well known. We are told by the Member for Trinity North in speaking the other night that the Statistics Canada figures are not correct, that they are wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, they may be right or not. They have been authorities on so many things before that perhaps they are right on that too. But in the absence of some proof to the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I would take the figures from Statistics Canada any day at all before I would take the figures from the Member for Trinity North.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I will tell you of somebody who did take them, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding what the Member for Trinity North has said, I heard the Member for St. John's East on the radio yesterday calling on both governments, federal and provincial, to do something about this shocking situation. He quoted the figures. The figure he quoted, in fairness to him, Mr. Speaker, was not the unadjusted figure, but not the actual figure. But he did quote the adjusted figure in speaking yesterday in the public media, he quoted the figure of 17.6. Now I can only assume that unless, you know, that these are wrong, this 17.6 is wrong, and the Member for St. John's East Federal got his other figure, which coincidentally was the same 17.6, from another source - I can only assume that unless that is what happened that he was going by this same fact sheet I have got in front of me here this evening - and I will say again while we are on opposite sides of the fence I have respect for the ability of the Member for St. John's East. I have respect for the Member for St. John's East, the federal member, in terms of his research. He has shown on many occasions that he researches his subject fairly well. And I would say

this, is no exception. I say he knew exactly what he was talking about notwithstanding the words of wisdom, the inside information we get from the member for Trinity North. I will stick by those figures, Mr. Speaker, the figures released by Statistics Canada February 4, 1975, which show, Mr. Speaker, that in Newfoundland the actual unemployment rate in 1975, in February of 1975, is 23.4 per cent.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: It is 23.4 per cent. I hear, Mr. Speaker, some people get up and rationalize. The Minister of Fisheries he has got his excuse. He says, oh well, it is not really 43,000 who are unemployed. He says, the people do not want to work. That is what he said last week. Well, is he saying, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundlanders, as a group, are different than other groups across Canada, who are included in the figures? Is he saying that Newfoundlanders are less willing to work than Nova Scotians? Is that what he said?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The honourable gentleman from Hermitage is not quoting the Hon. Minister of Fisheries correctly. The Hon. Minister of Fisheries did not say that Newfoundlanders did not want to work. What he did say was, at this time of the year that many Newfoundlanders did not want to work because of the unemployment insurance benefits. He did not say there were Newfoundlanders who did not want to work. So if the honourable gentleman is going to quote an honourable minister, make sure he quotes him correctly.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair has had one example of dealing this afternoon with a difference of opinion between two honourable members as to exactly what was said, and the ruling now is the same as the ruling then. It is a matter of opinion between two honourable members.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in my urgency to cater to the member for Bonavista South, let me put it this way.-I still stand by what I said a minute ago in terms of what the minister said - but let me put it this way because my point is just as well made, let me

take the words that he used, that during the winter or something to this effect, and if I quote him incorrectly, let him stand and say so -

MR. HICKEY: I did.

MR. SIMMONS: No, I am talking about the member for Bonavista South now. I say if I quote the member incorrectly in terms of what he said a moment ago. I understood him to say that the apparent unwillingness to work is related to the winter months and unemployment and so on.

MR. MORGAN: People are not looking for work.

MR. SIMMONS: Sorry?

MR. MORGAN: People are not looking for work.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if the member for Bonavista South, of course, knows of people who are not looking for work, if he knows of people who are not looking for work -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if the member for -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if the member for Bonavista South knows of people who are not looking for work and who are on unemployment insurance, he should report them. Because every person who receives unemployment insurance must be available for work and actively looking for work. So I put it to him, Mr. Speaker, that if he knows of people who are breaking the law -

MR. MORGAN: I will give you a list from Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker, he cannot give me a list from Hermitage.

MR. MORGAN: Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: And if he can give a list from anywhere, he should go and report it or else he is being party to the offence, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: I suggest, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: I suggest, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair at three consecutive -

MR. SIMMONS: Name him!

MR. SPEAKER: - times called for order and particularly for interruptions being made by the member for Bonavista South. I certainly hope he does not intend to continue in this way.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was suggesting in response to the comments which were made a minute ago by the member for Bonavista South, which I think are very pertinent to the point I am trying to make about the unemployment rates here in this province, if there are people - let us concede for the purpose of the argument, let us concede that there are people in Newfoundland who are not particularly anxious to work -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: My question, Mr. Speaker, still stands. Are there proportionately more people in Newfoundland than in Nova Scotia, than in New Brunswick, than in other provinces? If it is true for Newfoundland, as the member for Bonavista South suggests, is it not equally true in relative terms for every other part of this country? And, therefore, if that is the case, can we not still take these figures at face value having in mind that the figure for Saskatchewan or the figure for British Columbia includes the kind of people that the member for Bonavista South is talking about? And, therefore, it can be assumed that they are included in the figures for Newfoundland,

the figures for Quebec and the figures for Ontario and all the other provinces of Canada and the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. So the figures still stand, they are still relatively comparable. You can still compare them, which is what I am going to do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forestry invites me to quote the figures for Detroit. Well actually since he wants us to do that, I shall do that in a moment for him because I have those figures here too, and he will get a real eye opener on this particular subject. First of all, let me stay on the Canadian figures, Mr. Speaker.

The Canadian figure nationally across the nation, 8.6 per cent of the people are unemployed. In Saskatchewan, the figure is 3.9, less than 4 per cent are unemployed.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the Liberal provinces?

MR. SIMMONS: I will tell him about the Liberal provinces if that is what he wants.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Well, let us talk about Quebec, for instance, there is 10.9 per cent unemployed in Quebec. I will tell you about some Tory provinces too, only 7.1 per cent -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: - only 7.1 per cent in Ontario, a good Tory province, Mr. Speaker. Let me see, Alberta 4.1 per cent.

MR. EVANS: A good P. C. province.

MR. SIMMONS: Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it does raise the question -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: - it does raise the question, it does raise the question, Mr. Speaker, of not only whether it should be a Tory government or another government in Newfoundland, but whether this particular Tory government is even less competent than the ones in the other provinces. Mr. Speaker, the highest unemployment rate in Canada is in Newfoundland, And here

is something else, Mr. Speaker, that is in the fact sheet, which I do not think has been mentioned in this debate. The figure in the case of Newfoundland - it is the only province where it is broken down this way - the figure in the case of Newfoundland is broken down in two ways; Avalon Peninsula and then the rest of the province, in other words, perhaps the less urban parts of the province. I am quite aware that there are important and large centres of population in other parts outside the Avalon, but for some reason the statisticians chose to break it down this way. Avalon Peninsula, there is a rate unemployed, and the rest of the province, there is another rate. If you exclude Avalon, the urban part, the rate -

AN HON. MEMBER: Where are your colleagues?

MR. SIMMONS: Where are my colleagues? Oh, my colleagues wrote the speech so they know every word I am going to say, you see. You have to listen, because you do not know what goodies there are.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate last month for the part of Newfoundland other than the Avalon is 28.4 per cent, almost one-third, or just about thirty per cent, well over one-quarter of the people, the work force in Newfoundland unemployed last month, well over one-quarter of the work force outside the Avalon. Because as we all know, because of government services, and the very large civil service here in the St. John's area and for a number of other reasons, the job opportunities on the Avalon are relatively greater than in most other parts of the province, but in all other parts 28.4 per cent are unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the Premier in replying to questions put from this side dismiss the unemployment figures, Mr. Speaker, dismiss them as he will, the fact is that we have 43,000 Newfoundlanders, and let us allow that some of them do not want jobs, and some of them are enjoying their unemployment insurance too much, as the Minister of Fisheries suggested, and all that kind of thing, but I still say, Mr. Speaker, that as soon as you take those factors

into account, you must take them into account equally for all parts of the nation, all parts. So the figures stand up, and they are shocking figures in whichever way you look at them.

Now I have heard the Minister of Fisheries' version. I heard the member for Trinity North tell us that the reason there were so many unemployed people in Newfoundland was that they were seasonal workers; they were fishermen, they were workers on the Great Lakes in Ontario. Is he suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the only people who work on the Great Lakes in Ontario come from Newfoundland? There are at least as many Great Lakes' workers in that area from Nova Scotia. I would submit that there are more from Ontario itself.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, and then again the Minister of Industrial Development says, how do you know that? Mr. Speaker, suppose that every last soul who works on the Great Lakes is from Newfoundland. Is the member for Trinity North and the Minister of Industrial Development suggesting that the only seasonal workers in this country live in Newfoundland? How about all the construction workers in Ontario, Mr. Speaker? How about the farm workers out on the Prairies? All over this country, because of the severity of the climate in the winter, any kind of job which depends heavily on outdoors' activities, is a seasonal proposition. And all over this nation, Mr. Speaker, we have thousands upon thousands of people who are involved in seasonal type occupations. And to suggest that somehow we have a unique claim on seasonal people, the only place where people work seasonally is in Newfoundland, is a lot of nonsense, and is begging

the sad truth of the figures here, the unemployment figures. Mr. Speaker, all the explanations in the world will not subtract from the fact that we have an unemployment rate in Newfoundland today which is three times the national average, an unemployment rate of twenty-three per cent, or twenty-eight if you take the area outside the Avalon, an unemployment rate which is even worse, Mr. Speaker, than the United States had a while back. Just a little while ago the United States had an unemployment rate of twenty per cent. I think right now it is eight or nine or something around there, but not too long ago the United States had an unemployment rate of twenty per cent. Twenty per cent of all the people in the United States were unemployed. That is not as bad as we have here in Newfoundland right now in 1975.

In a year, Mr. Speaker, when according to the Finance Minister and the budget, we are told, and I quote, "the outlook for the economy in 1975 is for continued growth." When I get an opportunity to speak directly on the budget, Mr. Speaker, I shall point out that that statement is false too, and that that statement is at variance with the statement by the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council in terms of economic outlook for 1975. The Atlantic Provinces Economic Council projects a negative increase. In other words, no increase in the Gross Provincial Product for 1975. Yet the minister tells us something which is completely to the contrary.

In a year, at a time this week when the minister makes a rosy statement about economic growth, we have a figure of twenty-three per cent unemployment, a figure which is greater than the twenty per cent which the United States had a few years ago. Now, I have not said what year, Mr. Speaker. What year was it? The figure of twenty per cent unemployment represents the percentage of the American people, the American work force unemployed in 1932 right at the very depths of the American depression which hit the entire world. The American work force, there was a twenty per cent unemployment rate then in the depression, less than we have in a year when the Minister of Finance tells us, do not worry, boys it is all peaches

and cream. It is all rosy. You have not got a worry in the world. There are only 43,000 people unemployed. So, what is everybody getting worked up about? Mr. Speaker, that is why I was constrained to make this kind of an amendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Is the honourable Minister of Tourism rising on a point of order or some such matter?

MR. HICKEY: I am rising on a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this being the first opportunity that I have had to rise on a point of personal privilege now that I have the transcript of what was said last night with regards to the statement made by the honourable member for Hermitage, I wish to correct the records of the House and to table the statement which will clearly indicate who is right and who is wrong and will certainly confirm the point that I made earlier in the debate.

I would like to quote, Mr. Speaker, actually what was said with regards to the "Daily News" issue. "Mr. Simmons" asked the "Daily News". My reply, "we can talk about the "Daily News". Mr. Speaker, all we wish. We will never sweep under the rug the issues that have gone before us with regards to the former administration by using the issue of the "Daily News". The "Daily News", Mr. Speaker, is an issue which can be defended by this administration absolutely. I for one, Mr. Speaker, want to say right now that I defend this administration in its actions with regards to the "Daily News". There is nothing unhealthy or unwholesome about the decisions that were taken." That is the end of the quotation, Mr. Speaker. That is all that was said with regards to the "Daily News" last night by me. I did not - I repeat - I did not say at any time that I would not place an advertisement in the "Daily News". The honourable member for Hermitage said that I did. That is an irresponsible statement. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, it is the kind of statement that we should correct immediately because this is what leads to charges which have no foundation laid against one honourable member or another. This is the kind of thing, Sir, I think that should stop.

With this thought in mind, I table this transcript to prove this point.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall take the matter of privilege raised by the honourable Minister of Tourism under advisement and give a ruling on it hopefully on our next sitting day.

MR. SIMMONS: Certainly Mr. Speaker is quite at liberty to do that and perhaps that is the best course of action. In the meantime, I made an undertaking in my exchange with the minister earlier this afternoon that if he would check the record - I stated what was my impression and what I thought he had said, but of course, the record proves that the impression I got was not the words he had uttered and so for that reason, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do you go on impressions?

MR. SIMMONS: No. Well, Mr. Speaker, all of us go on impressions but that is beside the point. I got the clear impression but obviously the words do not support my impression and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it sometimes happens in the heat of debate, such as now, I doubt whether the Member for Harbour Grace will recollect what I said because he is so busy talking, but Mr. Speaker, perhaps that was my problem last night. I was so busy interjecting and interrupting the minister that I did not hear. But anyway, for whatever reason, certainly the minister did not say it according to the evidence he has produced here and as I indicated earlier, I without any qualification, would apologize to the minister for misrepresenting what he said. I did not do it irresponsibly. I did it thinking it was - I did it with the feeling it was my impression of what had gone on, but I apologize without qualification to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The point raised by the honourable minister was a point of privilege. A point of privilege is usually accompanied by a motion to take some kind of action against the honourable member who made the allegation. I certainly would feel, at least, that the matter can be resolved between the two honourable members.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was talking a moment ago

about the shocking unemployment rate which exists in this Province and I would appeal, Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to the ministers who make up this administration, I would appeal to them to get away from the verbage which would try and defend or explain a way or make disappear those figures.

Now, one can say that Statistics Canada is not doing its work properly. One can say there are a lot of people who do not want to go to work and one can say a number of other things, but I say, Mr. Speaker, the onus is on this government because it reflects - this fact sheet, Mr. Speaker, goes all across Canada and people all over this nation see that figure and they must see it for two reasons: one, because it is physically at the top of the list, and secondly, because it is at the top of the list in terms of percentages. Everybody across this nation sees that figure and I say to the Member for Trinity North, who introduced this item a day or so ago, and I say to the Minister of Fisheries who miscounted the figures, and I say to the Premier, the onus is on this administration, if those figures are so wrong, to go after Statistics Canada and have they corrected because it is not helping our image across the nation, if this kind of false - in the words of the people who talked about it on the other side - if this kind of so called false information is being perpetrated throughout the country.

Until, of course, Mr. Speaker, these figures are proven wrong, we have to, Mr. Speaker, draw some conclusions from them and as a citizen of this Province, Mr. Speaker, I can only draw the conclusion, I can only draw the conclusion that I incorporated in my amendment, a conclusion, Mr. Speaker, which says that this government has failed to introduce programmes to reduce the increasing numbers of persons who are unemployed. The figures

March 14, 1975.

Tape 419

RH - 3

back me up on that particular point and the evidence in the Throne Speech, and the evidence in the Budget Speech backed me up on those particular points. I say to this administration, and I say to the Minister of Finance and to the Premier, I say, Mr. Speaker, that if the emphasis in the Throne Speech, the statement of the government's intention, intentions in this session, and I say if the emphasis in the Budget Speech, the statement of the government's fiscal intentions in this forthcoming fiscal year, I say that if the emphasis had been on job creation - I was going to say rather than on resource development, Well the two are very closely tied, but resource development for its own sake, Mr. Speaker, is not a goal either, not a worthwhile goal for a government, to have a lot of oil refineries and a lot of oil rigs and a lot of farms and a lot of trawlers and a lot of other symbols of resource development, is not of itself enough if

in the process, the people of the area being developed, the people of the province who own these resources, do not benefit by way of jobs and in other ways financially. So, the two are very closely tied, the matter of job creation and the matter of resource development. But, Mr. Speaker, if it ever comes to a choice as to which you put first, resource development or jobs, it has to be jobs, Mr. Speaker. I am not saying that you create jobs and say to heck with resource development, but I am saying that if you are doing both hand in hand but there comes a point where in the public pronouncement of your policy as a government, you have to say which is first, there is only one that can be first.

Resource development for its own sake is not an end, it is not a goal. Resource development is itself only a means to an end. God help us if we got to the point where we had forty oil refineries in Newfoundland, and 150 oil rigs off the Coast of Labrador, and another five or six paper mills all over the island and in Labrador, and another dozen mines, iron and copper and asbestos mines all over this province - if we got to that point and still the people of the province were not benefiting in proportion, in terms of full employment, the kind of full employment that the Premier talked about before he became the Premier, he does not talk much about it now. He puts his ministers up now to explain why we cannot have full employment. He promised, Mr. Speaker, back in 1971 during one of his many campaign speeches, he promised that full employment would be a goal of his administration.

I, Mr. Speaker, am talking about the Premier of this province, the present, temporary Premier of this province. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that if he had only stayed on track. He was on track, Mr. Speaker. If he meant what he said back in October, 1971 he was right dead on track, full employment as a goal.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, my speech writer from Harbour Main reminds me that - I should clarify that, Mr. Speaker. I guess my speech writer says it because it is understood that the other person for Harbour Main could not

be a speech writer anyway. Mr. Speaker, my speech writer, the junior member for Harbour Main reminds me that the Premier stated full employment as a goal. He really brings me back to the point I was making just a few moments ago, that we are as near to full employment as can be achieved must be the goal of the government, not resource development. Yet we have it in the words of the minister in his budget speech telling us that the priority was resource development.

I say that is sad, Mr. Speaker, and it once again points out the truth of the second part of this amendment, that this House regrets the failure of this administration to introduce programmes to reduce the shockingly high unemployment rate. If this administration, Mr. Speaker, would only get its priorities straight! I have a feeling Mr. Speaker, that as sure as I sit down someone on the other side will get up and, having been longer in the House than I, they will not commit the error that I committed a few minutes ago of using the wrong words. They will quote me exactly on this business of resource development versus employment. They will quote me exactly, but they will quote me out of context. I bet my bottom dollar, Mr. Speaker, that come this time next week somebody on the other side of the House will be implying that somehow I am against resource development. Well, that is par for the course, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if we have to choose between full employment, between financial benefit to all the people of Newfoundland and Labrador on the one hand and resource development on the other, the choice

is obvious and it is the first one. They are tied in very closely and certainly to get one we have got to have the other.

MR. MORGAN: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, my amendment also mentions, my amendment also mentions - Mr. Speaker, could the Member for Bonavista South be silenced or named or something so I could get on with my speech. He is very distracting, Mr. Speaker, for reasons I will not go into.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, my amendment also -

MR. CROSBIE: Steve's amendment.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries says Steve's amendment, We shall come to the point of whether or not the -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! Order, please! All honourable members have the right to participate in the debate at the proper time. A couple of honourable members have been particularly obsessed with the idea of interrupting the honourable member to my right. This is quite uncalled for and unnecessary.

MR. SIMMONS: The amendment I have introduced this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is an amendment which represents the concensus of opinion, of firm conviction of members in the official Opposition about the performance of this government and it is no particular person's amendment, not mine, not the Member for Bell Island's amendment; it is an amendment which obviously, because of the conventions of this House, one of us introduces. My colleague for Bell Island made an effort, We all know what happened to that and now I have introduced the amendment and I would predict that all of my colleagues who stand, my colleagues on this side of the House in the official Opposition will, in various terms, express the kind of sentiments I am expressing, sentiments of regret over the government's failure to introduce programmes to do something about the cost of living, to introduce programmes to do something about the shockingly high unemployment rate, the failure of the government to come to grips with

the strike situation, the strikes and walkouts, both legal and illegal in this province, and also will express their regret, my colleagues will, their regret over the government's complete lack of concern, complete lack of concern and lack of measures to come to grips with the rising tide of vandalism which we see in this province on a day to day increase, and a point which I want to come back to, Mr. Speaker, a little later in my address.

Mr. Speaker, before getting onto that, I cannot pass the subject of unemployment without responding to a comment made by my friend, the Member for Port de Grave. He reminded us that some other politician who used to be Premier of this province at one time, had talked about burning your boats and there would be three jobs for every man. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know. The Member for Port de Grave, of course, is in a much better position to testify to the accuracy of that statement as to whether the former Premier made it or who did make it. I do not know. I was not around. I was alive and young but not following politics that closely in those days.

Mr. Speaker, if I were the Member for Port de Grave and were associated with the present administration, that line about three jobs for every man would be the last line I would bring to mind. I would want everybody to forget that.

Because as soon as he mentions it, Mr. Speaker, you cannot help, if you are thinking at all, if you live in this province in this year, you cannot help but draw a comparison. You first have to say, well, certainly the person who first said this business about three jobs for every man was either a born optimist or he did not understand the situation or he had an idea which he could not carry out or -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: - or he did not for whatever reason, Mr. Speaker, measure up to the literal truth of this particular statement, this particular hope, three jobs for every man. You have to think about that on one hand. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, here is why I would suggest that a member of the administration should never utter the words because it immediately brings them on, the fact that we do not exactly have three jobs for every man in Newfoundland today. We do not exactly have three jobs for every man in Newfoundland today, every man and woman, every working person or person who would like to work. Indeed we do not, Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, have one job for every person in this province today. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the sad truth is that one person out of four who would like to work, who is available for work, who is physically able to work, who is mentally able to work, one person out of every four cannot work, not because he would not, not because he is finding the unemployment insurance too comfortable, but because there is no job for him. One person out of every four, Mr. Speaker.

If that is not discouraging enough in terms of its implications, let us, Mr. Speaker - to say it another way if I can find the right page in this document I have before me, Mr. Speaker. Sorry, I will not take the time of the House now to find the exact reference, but, Mr. Speaker, I believe I am fairly correct in saying it this way although I would like to confirm it with the document I have here. I can say it the way I did a moment ago, that one out of every four cannot find jobs. Another way of saying it which even more dramatically illustrates the problem is that of the new people, the 7,000 or 8,000 people - perhaps

my colleague the member for St. Barbe North can confirm this - of the new people coming into the labour force, 8,000 a year, only one

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: One out of eight.

MR. SIMMONS: Only one - that is the figure I am looking for. My thanks to the member for Bonavista North. Of the 8,000 people coming into the work force in a given year, only one of those eight can expect to find employment.

Now, Mr. Speaker -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Look all you want. Mr. Speaker, I now pause to give them a moment to look. The honourable member for Bonavista North is enjoying every minute. He recognizes the words. He wrote this part of the speech, Mr. Speaker.

MR. THOMS: I did?

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Relevancy.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, one out of every eight persons coming into the labour force cannot find employment. Why? There are two or three reasons, Mr. Speaker. One reason is that in some cases the jobs are not there. They would be there if the Minister of Education took his \$25 million that he promised ten years from now. I submit that he cannot make promises that far ahead, not the Minister of Education, well he too, but I meant, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance. If he took

that \$25 million and made it available now and the next year or so to the school boards and the denominational education committees, that would create some employment both in a short time in terms of construction and in the long term, in terms of teachers.

Now, I know what the Minister of Education is probably thinking on this subject, that the numbers of teachers are related to certain formula, but I do know, Mr. Speaker, of instances where boards are not employing. I know, Mr. Speaker, I know of instances, Mr. Speaker, where there are schools where the full complement of teachers have not been employed this year because there is not the physical space to accommodate them, not the classrooms to accommodate them.

So, I say, Mr. Speaker, both in terms of short term construction jobs and in terms of permanent teacher jobs an emphasis in the Budget on capital construction this year would help alleviate the unemployment situation. I say, Mr. Speaker, that in some respects the jobs are not there. Mr. Speaker, there is another problem as well. There are, Mr. Speaker, literally thousands upon thousands of jobs in this Province that are either going begging for a person to fill the job, or being filled by people from outside the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no objections to persons from outside the Province. Indeed, I regard them as Newfoundlanders the day they arrive. That is not the point I am making. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that if we had within our own work force - Mr. Speaker, how would the senior Member for Harbour Main know what I am saying anyway? How would he know, Mr. Speaker? How could he know? How could he know, Mr. Speaker?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order! Is the honourable gentleman going to permit anybody over on this side to reply before six o'clock or is he just going on in this painful fashion to occupy

the time until six o'clock?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, a question. I am asking the honourable member.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if the minister, if the minister had been -

MR. CROSBIE: - so that we cannot reply.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if the minister had stated the real reason he was rising and ask me could he ask a question, I would have had the choice of yielding the floor. He rose falsely on a point of order, which is no point, and if it is a question to me, Mr. Speaker, that will depend, Mr. Speaker, on the kind of co-operation I get from the other side of the House. I have certain things I want to say. I admit right now, Mr. Speaker, I am saying them a bit more slowly than I would. That is because I have also to contend with some of the intellectual giants on the other side, Mr. Speaker, from Bonavista South and the senior Member for Harbour Main, and I am having a lot of difficulty.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! I presume the honourable member is speaking to the point of order raised by the honourable Minister of Fisheries which I do not think was a point of order. However, any honourable member may rise on what he considers to be a point of order and then, of course, the Chair has to rule upon it. I would think that the Minister of Fisheries probably knew his point of order was on shaky ground, however.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about some other areas represented in my amendment. Before doing so, it is so difficult to leave the item of unemployment, because it illustrates so dramatically the failure of this administration to come to grips with the realities, Mr. Speaker. And before them - and I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the answers in government these days are simple. I am not suggesting there is an easy solution to all the problems, but I say, Mr. Speaker, at some time and particularly after you have been

in office three years, at some time government has got to have the courage to try some solutions. You cannot just go on talking and planning and appointing royal commissions and special committees and select committees and everything else. There is a place for all these, Mr. Speaker, but their place is not to take the place of needed action. Select committees and royal commissions might put money in some pockets but it does not put very much money in the pockets of the average Newfoundlander who cannot find a job.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one really outstanding dramatic symbol of this government's failure it is the unemployment figure for February, and I predict it will be about the same for March, and it will be somewhat better as we into the Summer, I would hope, as construction gets going, and that kind of thing. The hard fact is still there, Mr. Speaker, that there is not on the horizon, there is not in the foreseeable future anything which would significantly, substantially, noticeably reduce the figure we have here from Statistics Canada for this particular time of the year.

Mr. Speaker, this government was elected on a platform of fiscal management, a platform of planning and development, a platform of ending patronage. Ah there, Mr. Speaker, there is a subject we could talk about for a long time if it were in order, ending patronage. There is certainly an aspect of it which is quite relevant. If we could depend on this administration to be governed by the Public Tendering Legislation, we could then as a direct result see more jobs being made available, more money being put into the pockets of the average Newfoundlander if we followed through the tendering system, if we gave the opportunity for jobs to go out on contract instead of being done in the matter in which all too many of them are getting done. But that is another issue, Mr. Speaker, and I might run into trouble if I further attempt to connect it up, and it is an issue that I do want to voice my concern on at the appropriate time.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, this government was elected on a platform of fiscal responsibility, fiscal management, a platform of planning and development, of ending patronage, a platform of overhauling the fishery. Ah, Mr. Speaker, here is something I bet the Minister of Fisheries would wish I did not talk about, the fishery. The jobs that we have lost in the fishery, Mr. Speaker, directly because of this government's failure over the past three years to come to grips, to even keep its own promises, its promises about a trawler fleet, a promise about expanding the Department of Fisheries. Oh it has expanded all right, Mr. Speaker, it has expanded. The only

expansion - there are two expansions I suppose, Mr. Speaker, in the Department of Fisheries, the size of the staff in numbers has expanded, and the size of the minister, physically speaking, is somewhat more expansive than his predecessor.

Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, where is the expansion we were promised in the Throne Speech of two or three years ago? Where is the expansion? Is it in the budget? I cannot find it, Mr. Speaker. I cannot find it, I can see a substantial cutback in provincial government expenditures in the fishery this year. Is that the government's way of creating jobs in the fishery? Is that the government's way of overhauling the fishery? When the government says overhaul, does it mean abolish? Does it mean run into the ground? Is that what the government means when it is going to do great things for the fishery? The fishery, Mr. Speaker, has a potential. It has a potential which is not being realized in most parts of this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I shall leave it to my colleagues. I shall leave it to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House to talk about the inshore fishery as it relates to their own areas. But I just want for a minute to illustrate how the government neglect of the fishery on the South Coast of this province, or as it affects the South Coast of this province, has meant a substantial reduction in the numbers of people effectively employed. The government's failure in this matter has meant a dramatic up-shooting of these figures I have here today. A significant part, Mr. Speaker, of the unemployment figure for February 1975 relates to the numbers of people in Harbour Breton, and in other communities along the South Coast who are either not employed because the

fish plants are not operating to capacity. Again, Mr. Speaker, as I did a few days ago I qualify lest anybody get the impression or misconstrue that I am alluding in any way to the present trawlermen's dispute. I am not talking about that at all. I am talking about the period prior to the trawlermen's dispute last Fall where we had plants at Harbour Breton and Gaultois, in my own district, and at Fortune and Grand Bank and all along the South Coast and the Southern Shore and parts of the North East Coast, plants which depend on the offshore fishery, plants which were operating at only part capacity.

In the case, Mr. Speaker, of Harbour Breton, when the plant was at full tilt some years ago there were about 350 people employed on a full-time basis. That figure today, Mr. Speaker, is down to 225 people compared to 350. Keep in mind also that those 350 were full-time people. Today the 225 include a number of people who are getting twenty or thirty hours a week instead of forty or so hours which would make up a full pay check for that particular week.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the former Minister of Fisheries, the present Minister of Forestry interjected a moment ago, how much fish are they getting. He is right. They are getting a lot fewer fish, a lot less fish, Mr. Speaker, at the B.C. Packers Plant in Harbour Breton this past year than they got two or three or four or five years ago. One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that they are getting fewer fish is the reason I am sure that the former Minister of Fisheries had in mind when he asked the question. One of the reasons is the declining stocks. There is no doubt about that, Mr. Speaker. I recognize, as anybody does who has been following the fishery situation, that has had a drastic effect. There is no question about that.

Markets have had a drastic effect too, but, Mr. Speaker, There is only one answer for the - only one explanation I ought to say - only one explanation for the fact that on the one hand all the foreign fleets, while they are catching fewer fish than they did in past years, are still catching a lot of fish, on the one hand. On the other hand, our own trawler fleets cannot get enough fish to keep the plants going. Mr. Speaker, what are the government members suggesting? Are they saying they only go for certain nets or they only bite certain

hooks or they like the Russians better than they like us, those fish?

Is that what they are saying?

Mr. Speaker, the explanation is one and only one. The explanation as to why we are catching a lot fewer fish than the Russians or the other people out there are catching is because we have got fewer trawlers out there. We have got far less catch capability out there, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, one more time I appeal to the Chair to ask the member for Bonavista South to be silent or else to name him. Mr. Speaker, I would submit on a point of order that the member for Bonavista South has dared the rule of the Chair on several occasions this afternoon. I suggest he be named.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would remind honourable members again that when a member is speaking he does have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The honourable gentleman is conducting a filibuster in the worst style of the American Senate, and it is the most boring filibuster. The whole object of it is to keep us from speaking until six o'clock so the press will not be able to publish our replies to these jejune and fallacious arguments and they have driven the press out of the House.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Is this a free House of Assembly? Is the press driven out by boredom, by utter and complete boredom?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The point raised by the honourable Minister of Fisheries is not a valid point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a good - I must compliment the minister on his performance and it did give me an opportunity to get a little sip of water. I am grateful, Mr. Speaker, to the members on the opposite side for providing those little commercial breaks. Those little commercial breaks are most welcome.

Mr. Speaker, just to clue up my point on the fishery, which I was interrupted on a moment ago, if we had had that trawler fleet which the Premier kept talking about, one of the former Ministers of Fisheries is no longer in Cabinet and no longer in this House kept talking about, and I believe he said it honestly and believing that his government would back him up, that former Minister of Fisheries. Indeed I would go so far as to say that one of the reasons he is no longer in Cabinet today is because that gentleman, who was my predecessor as the Member for Hermitage, that gentleman had all he could take.

I heard him on radio at one point talking about how, referring to Cabinet, how they were more interested in talking about super highways and overpasses than they were about rural Newfoundland. But that is another subject, Mr. Speaker, although it does put into the record the attitude of that former Fisheries Minister and perhaps explain some of this frustration in reference to his efforts to do his job as Minister of Fisheries.

He was one of the people, Mr. Speaker, who on many occasions talked about the trawler fleet.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Premier was another one of these people. There is all kinds of evidence, Mr. Speaker, in Tory election propoganda, in the PC Times, that modern day bible, all kinds of evidence, Mr. Speaker, where this administration was going to so revolutionize the fishing industry, going to so add to the fish catching

capability, going to add immeasurably to the number of jobs that would be created in the fishery, all kinds of things which if, Mr. Speaker, they had performed on, if they had just performed on that one set of promises alone, forget the promises they made, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the second refinery at Come By Chance, which was going to be started in June 1973, I believe, forget the promises they made in terms of the sawmilling industry. We all know what happened to that.

The other day I asked a question about how many jobs had been lost in the sawmilling industry and the Minister for Rural Development was protected by colleagues. They would not let him answer the question because they knew, Mr. Speaker, the answer was not a very complimentary one in terms of the government.

Oh yes, they were going to revolutionize, they were going to change the whole thing overnight, jobs like you could not shake a stick at in terms of the sawmilling industry, jobs like you could not shake a stick at in terms of rural Newfoundland, jobs more than you could count, Mr. Speaker, in terms of new oil refineries which the Premier announced so many times, so many times and the last date we heard was June 1973, although he has made a number of statements since saying it was going to start at various times.

Mr. Speaker, we could forget, I was saying we could forget all those promises which would have resulted in jobs had they been carried out. We could forget all the jobs that would have been created with a second oil refinery and a sawmilling industry if it had not bombed out, if it had not been mismanaged and bungled by the Department of Rural Development, giving out grants, Mr. Speaker, without co-ordinating it with forestry in terms of permits, and so that people got all kinds of grants to buy all kinds of tractors and could not find a stick of wood they were allowed to cut, Mr. Speaker, if it had not been bungled by this administration.

But anyway I was saying, Mr. Speaker, we can forget all the jobs that would have been created in the forest industry, the sawmilling industry in particular, the jobs that would have been created in another oil refinery, the jobs that would have been created in that great hardwoods plant that the Minister of Industrial Development talked about in one of his few mini speeches. We could forget all that, Mr. Speaker, if they would only -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: If they would only performed on their set of promises as they relate to the fishery. I would even narrow it down further, Mr. Speaker, if they had only performed in terms of their set of promises on the offshore fishery, then Mr. Speaker, we would have, one, a lot more jobs that we have right now in this province, particularly in the rural parts of this province; secondly, Mr. Speaker, we would have some proof that this government is prepared to put its money where its mouth is, that this government is prepared not only to be consistent in making promises, but also consistent in keeping promises.

What do we have instead, Mr. Speaker? We have an unemployment rate which is the highest, the highest, Mr. Speaker, in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment makes reference to the failure of the government to introduce programmes to lessen the severe impact on our people of the rapidly rising cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment has had for - I am sorry, the Senior Member for Harbour Main, the best reason we have for doing away with dual districts - Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment has had it in his hands for a long time the report of the Food Prices Review Board. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have heard that minister give all kinds of explanations, excuses, call them what you will, on why the federal government should do this and why the federal government should do that.

Mr. Speaker, on those points I happen to be in agreement with the minister. There are a lot of things in that report that the federal government, that first of all lies within the federal government's purview, area of authority and responsibility and that is therefore the proper responsibility of the federal government. He is right on that. Of course, like so often, Mr. Speaker, when a question is put to him either in this House or on the media, he has a habit of begging the real question. He has a habit of ducking his responsibilities as the minister of the department of which he finds himself the head. While I have heard him wax long and eloquently on about what the federal government should do, I have not heard him yet say a word about what the provincial government should do or would do. I have yet to hear him respond, Mr. Speaker, to any of the resolutions in that report which the provincial government could do something about.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the minister, perhaps in this debate or otherwise, to give us some indication of what he is advising his administration, this administration that it should do in terms of coming to grips with the cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, in this Budget Speech which we had on Wednesday, and in the publicity which followed, there was much prating, much boasting about the fact that the government have not brought in an increase in taxes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, yes, Mr. Speaker, as the Senior Member for Harbour main says, "Shame on the government!" "Shame on the Government!" Mr. Speaker, the Senior Member for Harbour Main suggests that we should have increased taxes. I say to him, Mr. Speaker, I say to him, that the one bit of inconsistency I have seen in this government so far is that it did not increase taxes this year as it did in 1972, 1973 and 1974. And lo and behold! It is even such a miracle to the Minister of Finance and to the Premier that they go out and publicly brag that they have not increased taxes as though it is the normal thing for this outfit to do. They go out and brag and say, look at us, we did not increase taxes this year. Probably do it next year, mind you, we did it last year, we did it the year before that and the year before that and we will probably do it again, but for this year look at us. What good boys we are, we did not increase taxes.

Increasing taxes, Mr. Speaker, is such a thing to do for this administration (I was looking for the word from my speech writer.

He fell down on the job, Mr. Speaker.)

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I am sorry, your earlier words have lulled you, shocking.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, increasing taxes have become the in thing to do, the thing to do for this particular government so much so that when they do not increase taxes they get all worked up themselves and say, look at us. Well we did not increase taxes. They have surprised themselves, Mr. Speaker. I put it to this administration,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I put it to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, that I would spend less time bragging about not increasing taxes, and find some ways -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forestry hit the nail right on the head. The budget, Mr. Speaker, really hurts me.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: He is right, Mr. Speaker, the budget really hurts me. Hurts me like you would not believe, Mr. Speaker, mainly in the pocketbook, Mr. Speaker, mainly in the pocket. But it hurts me also in other ways as a person who is concerned about the way our money is being spent in this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: He hurts me that way too.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, again. The honourable gentleman is now talking about the budget as if he were in the middle of a budget debate. We are not in a budget debate, we are speaking on an amendment to the Reply to the Throne Speech.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. Mr. Speaker, when will the Member for Bonavista South get it through his head that while I obviously must be relevant, and I am trying desperately to do so, that I can, Mr. Speaker, I would understand unless you instruct me otherwise, Mr. Speaker, I can make references which are appropriate and

relevant to the point I am making. I subject that is what I was doing.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Again with regards to the rule of relevancy, of course, it is rather difficult to rule on it. But the honourable Member for Hermitage was particularly talking about the budget per se, and it is the opinion of the Chair on that particular point that there really is no relationship to another point he was trying to make.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will certainly abide by your ruling, and I shall try again to be relevant.

Mr. Speaker, I would be the first to agree, the first to agree, I would be the first to agree, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as this resolution, this amendment is concerned - this resolution, this amendment which expresses regret at the government's failure to come to grips with the cost of living, to come to grips with unemployment, to come to grips with work stoppages, to come to grips with vandalism, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that in terms of what it contains the budget is the most irrelevant thing ever to this particular amendment, the most irrelevant thing because it does none of these, Mr. Speaker. None of these. It does nothing, Mr. Speaker, nothing, nothing, nothing to come to grips with the cost of living.

And as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, there are no increases in taxes this year, we are told. But neither are there any decreases. Neither, Mr. Speaker, are there any particular efforts to help the person who is not probably going to have a difficult time next year if the taxes go up, but who is having a difficult time this year with the present tax base, the present rate of taxes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the cost of living. And I am saying that one of the reasons that the people of this province are having so much difficulty coping with the cost of living is because there are not, there were not last year - well last year we had increases, as we know in the budget - there were not last year, and there were not this year any measures, Mr. Speaker,

which particularly help the fellow on a low income, nothing by way of tax relieve nothing by way of any special concessions for the low income earner, nothing, Mr. Speaker, whatsoever. And once again we have demonstrated the absolute failure, Mr. Speaker, of this government to come to grips with the cost of living.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: Howdy Doody!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the third part of my amendment regrets the inadequacy of measures to deal with —

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: — work stoppages, both in strikes and lockouts legal and illegal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not said anywhere in my address or in my comments this afternoon, or in this amendment, I have not said

anywhere that the government have not been doing anything. I have not said that, Mr. Speaker. They have been doing lots of things, but I fail, Mr. Speaker, to see the relevancy of these measures that have been taken to cost of living, unemployment or employment, or work stoppages or vandalism. I fail to see the relevancy. I see all kinds of actions which are not particularly relevant. I see situations, Mr. Speaker, such as the one that I was involved in a few moments ago, or an hour or so ago when I did, Mr. Speaker, misquote the member for St. John's East Extern, the Minister of Tourism, after which I subsequently apologized, Mr. Speaker, and repeat that apology because I was incorrect in doing it, Mr. Speaker.

What I should have said, Mr. Speaker, is that it was the Minister of Social Services who said that in essence and the words he said were, "I would not give five cents worth of advertising." So, I was wrong in quoting the Minister of Tourism, Mr. Speaker. It was the Minister of Social Services who I had in mind. I abjectly apologize once again to the Minister of Tourism. It was the Minister of Social Services who said that "I would not give them five cents worth of advertising."

Mr. Speaker, there is I believe ample evidence, all kinds of evidence, Mr. Speaker, to prove the third part of my amendment, that part which relates to the government's failure to come to grips with the work stoppages. Now, Mr. Speaker, again for the record I say that I do not want to be misunderstood insofar as my comments about the fishery are concerned. I want to get into an aspect of it again insofar as work stoppages are concerned. It is not my intention to discuss the merits of the present situation because there are labour negotiations going on. I think, Mr. Speaker, we can safely reflect to an earlier point in time and thereby not engage ourselves in comments which might have an adverse affect or could be interpreted as having an adverse affect on the present negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, we would not have this particular work stoppage now in the trawler fishery if the government, and in particular the Premier, had kept his word. If the Premier had not failed to keep his word insofar

as the trawlermen were concerned, we would not today have a trawlermen's strike. If, Mr. Speaker -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Would the minister repeat himself? The Minister of Justice -

MR. HICKMAN: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice has accused me of making an irresponsible statement before he hears what statement I am about to make. The first statement I made was this, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, would you call it six o'clock before we all go out of our minds.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if you are going to call it six o'clock, I would like to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been noted that the honourable member for Hermitage has adjourned the debate.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn until 1985.

I move, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, that this House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 18, at three o'clock in the afternoon and that this House do now adjourn.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, Monday is St. Patrick's Day and we wish everyone a happy St. Patrick's Day.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

CAPT. WINSOR: Could the honourable the House Leader tell us what days he is planning for Easter holidays because there are some gentlemen who want to take a holiday?

MR. CROSBIE: The hours, if you do not mind us taking a moment, Mr. Speaker - next week we plan to sit Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday - you know, our usual schedule - and including Friday morning at eleven to one. As far as Easter is concerned, we intend to suggest to the House that we adjourn from Easter Thursday - Good Friday of course we will have off and Easter Monday. We will adjourn from Thursday to

March 14, 1975

Tape 429

IB-3

Tuesday. We will continue on that schedule that we have informed you about before. We should start the estimates on Tuesday and I believe the Minister of Education says that he is extremely proud of his estimates and since they did not get on last year, he wants to ensure they get on this year. He will be presenting his estimates which he hopes will be approved in record time.

On motion that the House at its rising do now adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 18, at three of the clock.