

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

House of Assembly

For the period:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m. -

February 17, 1977

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members of the House the presence in the Speaker's gallery of Miss Sharon Ann Hogan. Miss Hogan is a ten year old Newfoundlander from Branch in St. Mary's Bay and she is the Champ, the child amputee, selected by the War Amputees of Canada for Newfoundland. In that capacity, she was a recent participant in the Grey Cup Parade in Toronto. I know all hon. members will join me in welcoming her to the House of Assembly this afternoon and wishing her well in the years ahead.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bay Of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I arise to ask leave of the House to bring before the members a matter of historic importance that happened on the West Coast of the Province yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have leave? Agreed.

The hon. member for Bay Of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to congratulate the ten people who travelled a distance of 120 miles on snowmobiles from Burgeo to St. George's. The ten people arrived safely in St. George's yesterday, and are scheduled to start their return trip tomorrow. This, Mr. Speaker, I think is something that is worthy of note and in some small way it compares with McCormack's journey through Newfoundland about 100 years ago. According to the travellers the journey was good in some places and was rugged in other places. However, Mr. Speaker, I wish to convey to them my sincere congratulations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, we rise to welcome the news from the hon. member. I believe that all hon. members on both sides expected an announcement of great urgency, and I think it is an indication of the willingness of all members on both sides of the House to give way to the hon. member. I do not have the latest information on historic events in snowmobiling. Maybe our friend, the Minister of Tourism, may

MR. NOLAN:

have it available. But anyway we would like to congratulate the people on their trip from Burgeo to St. George's, 110 miles, I believe the gentleman said?

MR. WOODROW: One hundred and twenty miles.

MR. NOLAN: One hundred and twenty miles.

AN HON. MEMBER: We travel that much every weekend.

MR. NOLAN: I am told by my hon. friend opposite that they do it every weekend out in St. George's but I mean I am in no position -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: - I am in no position to argue that point. Anyway we wish them well. I hope they are following all the snowmobile regulations in their long trek, and that if they did not have a St. Bernard around that they had a barrel of something to keep them warm.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege arising out of yesterday's debate on the resolution as put forward by my friend the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). In the Daily News of today under the heading, "Labrador Beat", it is suggested very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that I have taken a position with regard to the Labrador people in connection with special status and hunting rights.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I will have to ask hon. gentlemen to please be quiet so that I can hear the hon. member, and perhaps he would speak a little more loudly, please.

Mr. Hickey.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the position as indicated in an account under the heading "Labrador Beat", and I take it that this paper goes throughout Labrador, and this is my concern, not so much that I have been misquoted or misinterpreted, but indeed that the wrong message was conveyed to those people. To indicate that I enunciated yesterday a position which is brand new, a position which this government cannot support or maintain, etc. etc., in misinterpreting or twisting what I said yesterday, Mr. Speaker - and I have a copy of Hansard, and I have checked it to refresh my memory - the person, whoever it is writing this, uses the issue of the snowmobile, wherein again that person, apparently either out of ignorance or whatever else, indicates that just last year I issued regulations and perpetrated regulations on the people of Labrador only to find out that I had to back down and now they have none.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in the first instance that the gentleman, or whoever it is who writes this article, is well aware as to what a White Paper is, a White Paper was issued last year. There were no regulations issued by this government. There were no regulations suggested as regulations per se. A White Paper was issued as a working paper, as a point from which to start debate and discussion, and from that came regulations. The fact that there are no regulations on the Coast of Labrador is indicative of this government's recognition of special problems and the special area, not necessarily special status for the people there, but special geographic and climatic conditions warrant that kind of consideration.

The whole issue, Mr. Speaker, is twisted so as to portray an image to the people of Labrador that I, as one minister,

Mr. Hickey:

enunicates a policy which is so new, never heard of before.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that I enunicated a policy yesterday which is the policy of this administration. I enunicated a policy yesterday which was the policy of the former administration for I do not know how many years. It is important to me, Mr. Speaker, that if I am going to be quoted on an issue which is as vital and as critical and as important as the one that we were debating yesterday, let us report me correctly. As I said, it does not bother me in the least if I am misquoted, if I suffer personally through a misquote or anything of that nature. I am not concerned about myself here, but I am concerned about a message that gets to the people of Labrador which can only spur on and fan the fires of the very issue that we were talking about yesterday. And it is this kind of erroneous, twisted reporting that can add to this issue, and I say that it is a shame that I have to stand in my place today to even to bring it to the attention of the House.

I would ask the newspaper, and the person who wrote this, to afford me, and through me, the people of Labrador, the benefit of an accurate account of what I said yesterday so that the people in Labrador can indeed read and understand what I said. And if that gentleman, or those people, whoever it might be, do not have this information, then let them take this and read it, and they will get it there, it is abundantly clear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Exploits.

DR. TWOMEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 243 residents of Leading Tickle, a community in the district of Exploits. The prayer of the petition reads as follows: "We the undersigned voters petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to upgrade approximately sixteen miles of road for pavement. This is an ancient community as it relates to the history of Newfoundland. It is populated by vigorous and hard working people

DR. TWOMEY: who earn in general, their living by fishing and lumbering .They are progressive, outgoing and ambitious. Recently they built a community center, a recreation center, with the aid of a provincial grants and LIP grants. They are like all people in coastal communities in Newfoundland, they have a deep and abiding love for their settlement. This road winds uphill, down dale; at certain times of the year when the weather is inclement travel can be hazardous, especially for the school bus which takes the children from grades nine to eleven to Point Leamington. I respectfully ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications to give serious consideration to this petition. In the past he has driven over that road with me, and he knows its present condition. I am aware that money is not generally available, or freely available at this time; however I would ask for his consideration.

I ask that this petition be referred to the department to which it relates. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: I would like to support the petition delivered by the member for Exploits. I spent some time in Leading Tickle, Last summer I was there for a certain reason, and I know the area very, very well. I think I have walked through most of the town and I do agree with the member that certainly that the road needs to be improved, It is hazardous in places, it is very steep, it winds, and I do hope that the Minister of Transportation and Communication will listen to the pleas of the people of Leading Tickle.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. CROSS: It gives me great pleasure at this time to stand and support the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the member for Exploits, on behalf of the people of Leading Tickle. I think perhaps I would be somewhat remiss in my duties if I did not support the people of Leading Tickle with their petition. I did have the opportunity of living and working among these people for five

MR. CROSS: years as a teacher, I do know certainly that they are a people of stamina and patience. The road spoken of was built some fourteen years ago, and the people have been driving over the dusty trails ever since, the narrow, winding road, and certainly I can sympathize with them, because for twenty years the people of Bonavista North and I myself have been driving over the unpaved dusty roads of Bonavista North.

So, without saying more, I would say that I do not hesitate one moment in supporting this petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition also, because I think it is terribly important for us who have been here at least I have been here a year now or a year and a half, and our hon. friend and colleague from Exploits is, as the saying goes, breaking grounds for the first time. He is extremely sincere and enthusiast and in asking for the sixteen miles of road for the people in Leading Tickles, I notice he mentioned the fact that there is a community center there, and of course there is a school bus and it seems to me that the people in the community must be interested. So I want to give my whole-hearted support to my friend from Exploits.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: If I could say just a word or two in support of the prayer of this petition, I think it is an admirable request which should be granted. I am surprised that there is anything left in Exploits district that is not paved, because I recall vividly being in the community of Leading Tickles last year - I guess it was a day or two before a public event took place and the pavement was being laid there, and I can only regret that the by-election was

MR. ROBERTS: not held a week or so later, because doubtless the road would have been paved. But now , Sir, that we have the hon. gentleman representing, I am sorry -

MR. MORGAN: The contract was a year old.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Bonavista South has a hair out of place, Sir, and he tells us that the contract is a year old. Of course it was , Sir, because it was called prior to the 1975 general election , was renewed in the 1976

MR. ROBERTS: general election, and perhaps the best thing to do to get an immediate paving would be to have another by-election, given the record of this government, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. gentleman from Exploits is not part or party to any such electoral bribery as his colleagues, or the government of which he supports indulged in last year as revealed so openly by the Minister of Transportation -

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

MR. FLIGHT: Hear! Hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please to my left as well. I would remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition of the rule of which we are all aware with respect to material allegation.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I am grateful to Your Honour for bringing me back on the straight and narrow, having been led astray by such people as the gentlemen, Mr. Ski-doo from Grand Falls.

Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition wholeheartedly and genuinely, and I hope the work is done this year. I think that the gentleman from Exploits (Dr. Twomey), Sir, stands pledged to do what he can for the people of his constituency and, Sir, one of the tests in this non-election year will be whether the government supports him in his efforts to help the people of his district by paving these sixteen miles of roads, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Any there any further petitions?

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of thirty-four residents of the community of Little Heart's Ease in Trinity Bay. There is some preamble here before the

MR. CALLAN: actual prayer of the petition it got around to.

We are told that a committee of concerned citizens of Little Heart's Ease was duly organized on June 7th., 1976 for the purpose of soliciting support for an artesian well in the Stringers Road area of Little Heart's Ease, and there were half a dozen people present at that meeting and of course they formed a committee with the chairman and what have you, as is required by Water Services Division of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

The thirty-four signatures on the petition say, "We the undersigned heartily support this endeavour, an artesian well for that area. The need for an artesian well is a crucial one in the light of the fact that during certain periods of the year some individuals have to travel as far as six miles to procure drinking water.

"Furthermore," it says, "should a fire ever occur in that area the hazard would be extreme. This is a matter which is of great concern to us," they say, "and we humbly beseech the House of Assembly to initiate some action immediately for our health and safety." I am reading directly from the prayer of the petition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition it has to be noted that the petition-or the meeting that formed the committee was called together on June 7th., 1976. Now I received this petition I think it was two days after the House of Assembly closed the middle of June, last Summer, and of course I have not had an opportunity until now, because the House did not sit of course from the middle of June until it met a couple of weeks ago. So I have chosen today to present this petition.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many hon. members in this House are familiar with the problems experienced by people who have shortage of water. I can tell you for my own part that I am quite familiar with it. As a matter of fact, before I left Norman's Cove this morning the last thing I did was travel to a nearby

MR. CALLAN: brook to get twenty gallons of water in five gallon tubs, you know, so that my wife would have water for the House while I was gone in here today.

I have lived in that area of Norman's Cove myself for the past ten years, and over that ten year period I have dug six what you might call shallow wells, I suppose, with no water. I have been on the Norman's Cove Council years past when we fought for water and sewer for five years and we still have not got it. When I presented a petition a few days ago on behalf of Come By Chance for water and sewer

Mr. Callan.

down there, I mentioned, of course, the fact that five water and sewer projects were carried on in the district of Bonavista North last year during that by-election. I do not know how many artesian wells were dug in these three districts where the by-elections were held, Mr. Speaker, but I can say with all honesty and all sincerity that it is very frustrating to me to see the way that government handles their priorities. I am sure that if the administration spent more time in governing this Province and doing the things, on along with priorities -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must call to the hon. gentleman's attention the rule with respect to petitions which requires the avoidance of debate.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I might say that I whole-heartedly support the prayer of this petition and I ask that this petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates. And I hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs will see that it gets what it deserves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further petitions?

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the financial statements for the Rural Electricity Authority for the year ending March, 1976 as is necessary under the relevant legislation, and I hereby table it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Section 4 of the Public Tender Act, No. 68 of 1974, any Crown agency or department issuing anything but the lowest tender must report to the House through the Minister of Public Works. I table now the information that I have received thus far providing information on work awarded to other than a low tender during the period April, 1974 to December 30, 1976.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. Could he tell us, please, what steps, if any - although I assume that there are some - that the government are taking in an effort to try to resolve the situation which exists at the Iron Ore Company of Canada's operations in Western Labrador, in other words the strike which admittedly is an illegal one?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I have been on the problem since one-half hour after the picket lines went up. I received a telephone call from the union president informing me that the picket lines were formed. I maintained contact continuously by telephone with the company and with the union. The union were down during the last few days, and we met continuously almost until five o'clock yesterday morning with the union here in St. John's, and we were at it again all yesterday afternoon. If hon. members recall, I was out of the House. Last night final contact was made at 2:30 this morning. There were some suggestions, after consultation with the Iron Ore Company of Canada's officials, that they were prepared to accept. They were presented to the union. These points in the union's opinion were not sufficient to warrant the resumption of work. Last night at about six o'clock there was a small ray of hope, a bit of cautious optimism, but unfortunately yesterday's events, leading to the injunction hearings and so on, have complicated the labour relations problems to some extent at this point in time. So the union membership this morning were required to return to Labrador City as a result of the Supreme Court's judgement yesterday, and the situation now is in abeyance through this day until certain responsibilities that were charged by the Supreme Court to the union are discharged. I have been in

contact with the company today, and as soon as the union are in a position to get back, we will get back, and we will try and find some common ground on which, hopefully, the resumption of work can take place. It is a very difficult, and a very complex situation. I am satisfied

MR. ROUSSEAU: that the people I am dealing with on both sides feel, and have told me so, and I would hope they would say publicly if they were so asked, that I have done everything that is humanly possible. I will continue to do everything humanly possible, to do what I can to bring about an end to this dispute supposing I have to go to the far sides of the earth. They are also - not only as Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, but they are also my constituents, and I have a very strong feeling when people are on picket lines when it is twenty, thirty, forty or fifty below in the night-time. It is not the easiest thing.

MR. NEARY: Are they on the picket line now?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Not now, but they have been for the past few days. This is difficult, and so I would hope that both sides would, if necessary, suggest what government has done.

Of course, on top of that we must also look at the fact that we had appointed the newly appointed Judge McCarthy to look into what began really a little while after the last tragic fatality on Saturday, As magisterial inquiry on Saturday which became on Monday in the announcement an inquiry under the Mines and Energy Act and which was enlarged later on to include Judge McCarthy as the commissioner under the Public Inquiries Act to allow him the broadest terms of reference, to look at all aspects of health and safety at the mine as well as the incidents of three deaths that in itself, as I suggested publicly when the announcement was made, was not sufficient to bring about a resumption in operations.

So we will continue to discuss between the company and the union, through me, and certainly I will make every effort to try and get both sides together. I certainly would like to have a face to face meeting. I think that certain things could be resolved at a face to face meeting that would certainly facilitate resumption of work. So my efforts will continue to the best of my ability and if I see a light, see a crack, I will certainly jump in through it.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, has the minister been invited by any of the groups involved to go to Western Labrador to take part in either discussions or negotiations - I do not want to put a value on a word - discussions in Western Labrador with respect to the situation, Sir?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, I have not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Is the minister prepared to go to Labrador, Sir, for this purpose?

MR. ROUSSEAU: The minister is prepared to go anywhere on the face of this earth where I can get both parties together.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile followed by the hon. gentleman from Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Health. I would like to ask the Minister of Health, Sir, in view of the fact that there has been a couple of cases of meningitis reported on the mainland, would the minister indicate to the House if there are any known cases of meningitis in this Province at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: I would prefer to take that as notice and see if I can get an answer to it. I would not want to give a wrong reply. I will get the answer for the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have a supplementary?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir.

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

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Sir. Is the minister giving any consideration, or his department giving

MR. ROWE: any consideration, or is it their intention to move the Highways depot out of Old Perlican?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, yes, we are giving active consideration to relocating the depot from its present location in the Old Perlican area.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate where they are planning to move the depot to, Sir?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will be only too pleased to discuss the matter with the hon. gentleman, who is the MHA for the area, in my office anytime in the next couple of days.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROWE: Could the minister indicate, Sir, to the House what the rationale is for moving the Highways depot from Old Perlican to some other area of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, over the past year, since I became minister of the department, I have been making every effort to improve the operations, the maintenance operations of the Department of Transportation and Communications. And any move we make with regards to relocation of depots or relocation of headquarters or relocation or reassignment of our equipment and men is always done with the intention of improving our services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: A further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware of the fact that the nearest major Highways depot to that tip of the Peninsula on the Trinity Bay side is in Whitbourne, major depot, and that the next nearest major depot, as far as I am aware of on the Conception Bay side, is in the Birch Hills area, and that depot in Old Perlican therefore

MR. ROWE:

is strategically located in that it is at the tip of the peninsula and serves well both sides of the peninsula, on the Trinity Bay side and the Conception Bay side?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of all these factors as put forward by the hon. gentleman. But the decision made to relocate the depot presently located at Old Perlican was based on the advice and the opinions of the engineers and the employees in the department who have worked in the operations, the maintenance operations, for many, many years. If the hon. gentleman has any objections I will be only too pleased to discuss them with him.

MR. ROWE: One further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: One further supplementary.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate the situation with respect to job security with the men presently working at that depot? Will there be people losing jobs? Or will they be moving to the place where the depot is going to be transferred to?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, there will be no reduction with regards to the number of employees employed in the Old Perlican area whether the depot is located in Old Perlican or the new location.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am dissatisfied with the answer and I wish to debate it during the Late Show.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: A question for the Minister of Transportation and Communication. Would the minister tell me why the contract with Affiliated Marine Metals and Salvage was contravened and the company paid in full before the work was completed? That was in connection with collecting scrapped vehicles across the Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communication.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, that question was put forward I think three or four days ago. I did tell the hon. gentleman at that time the question was taken under advisement, and I will say that the information that he requested will be put forward to the House of

MR. MORGAN:

Assembly in due time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: A supplementary. Could the minister tell me when he will then answer the question?

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

That question I would consider as debate and would not recognize it.

The hon. member for Bellevue followed by the hon. member for LaPoile and Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Tourism. Does the Department of Tourism have any plans, or has the idea been considered, of taking over a park which is named the Pipers Hole Park at Swift Current? Does the minister's department plan to take over that park as a provincial park?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I should take that question under advisement. I am aware of a park. Is there but one park in that area? The name does not ring a bell to me. I am aware of a park which has a great deal of potential and which was started, I believe, with a LIP grant. The policy of my department is naturally that we cannot take over all parks that are started by such funding for the simple reason there are some eighty-five, I believe, in the Province at the moment, and for us to take those over and complete them and bring them to a standard which our parks are to a level at least which we want in keeping with our park system, not to mention indeed the cost of operating, would cost millions of dollars that we just do not have.

Now the one in Swift Current, there are some special aspects to it. Part of the area in question was part of our plan to develop a park in the area, not necessarily at the time when it was commenced but certainly it was part of our overall policy. For this reason we agreed to assume responsibility for it. I hope it is the park that he refers to.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is necessary for me to give some preamble before I get to the supplementary. In view of the fact that the Department of Tourism has spent money on that park over the past two Summers - they have added camp sites and so on - to a park, as the minister says, was put there through a LIP grant by the Lions Club at Swift Current, in view of the fact that his department has taken some responsibility for the park in that they spent money there, and in view of the fact that a terrible, that a fatal car-snowmobile accident occurred in that park last Fall -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has come up which I must hear.

MR. PECKFORD:

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The hon. gentleman in asking the questions, I would refer him to Standing Order 31(a) in which it states that "In these questions on matters of urgency may be addressed orally to Ministers of the Crown, provided, however, that Mr. Speaker shall disallow any question which he does not consider urgent or of public importance." I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the preamble and the question that I can anticipate is not of the nature of public importance as defined in Standing Order 31 (a) and therefore it is out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, now we can get something a little better than the hon. gentleman from Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) has given us. First of all, Sir, the Standing Order to which the hon. gentleman referred requires Your Honour to take the initiative, as Your Honour would if and when Your Honour was satisfied or even concerned that the Standing Order was being breached. Secondly, I would submit that there could be nothing of greater or more urgent public importance than trying to remedy a situation which has already led to the death of one citizen of this Province, and I submit in the view of my colleague, which a number of us share, if not corrected could lead to others. And we are quite familiar, Mr. Speaker, with the tendency of members of this government to take part in negligent activities which led to the death. Some of us in this Province, Sir, have not forgotten the situation at Red Cliff where the negligence, as found by a magistrate or the Minister of Transportation -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - led to the death, Sir, of two people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that question is perfectly in order. The hon. gentleman is not making a speech, he is not being argumentative, he is not being repetitious, he is

Mr. Roberts:

merely trying, Sir, to frame a question in the hope, illusory as that may be, that he will get an intelligent answer from the Minister of Tourism. I submit that he should be allowed to go ahead with it, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: With reference to the substance of the question, as hon. members know Standing Order 31 refers to matters of urgency or of public importance. Certainly I would regard the subject matter of the question as one at least of public importance, and it is not necessary for the Chair to distinguish because it says, "of urgency or public importance." And I will regard the subject matter of the question as within that general group.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, In addition to the tragic accident, Mr. Speaker, at the present moment I would say that there are individuals in the area of Swift Current who are in that park cutting birch wood. I think most people are aware that there is lots of birch wood down in the Swift Current area, and it is a commodity as far as burning wood is concerned. In view of these facts I am wondering- and since the Lion's Club has more or less washed their hands clear of the park in the last couple of years since the Department of Tourism has spent some money there - I am wondering if it is possible for the Minister of Tourism to have somebody at least, in Forestry or somewhere else, take a look at the park, perhaps put a chain across, and post some signs, no cutting, as a stopgap temporary measure.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised to learn that there has been woodcutting going on in the park. I was not aware of that. I will certainly take it under advisement immediately and see that the matter is looked into. I want to also say that I am not aware of any great amount of money spent, as I said, by my department, that is. The park came into being through the funding

Mr. Hickey:

from the Federal Government. And we made a special case of that particular project because it was part of our overall plan of park development in the Province. I will be glad and I appreciate, and I thank the hon. member for bringing it to my attention - I will be glad to look into the matter.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation. In view of the fact that Judge Morgan has resigned as a one-man commission of enquiry into private boarding homes that housed senior citizens, and mentally and physically handicapped people in this Province, would the minister indicate now who is going to do the inquiry or does the minister know at the moment? Is there a replacement for Judge Morgan?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I was only made aware of the fact that Judge Morgan, because of an illness, will not be able to do the inquiry. I was only made known of it yesterday by my colleague, the Minister of Justice, who naturally is responsible for setting up the inquiry and appointing the commissioner. But we both agreed that it was urgent that a replacement be found. I am afraid I am not in a position to say when it might be done, but hopefully today or tomorrow just as soon as we can find an appropriate person.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate to the House, in the terms of reference of the enquiry, if it will include institutions like Hoyles Home and apartments that house senior citizens in the private sector?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have not got a copy of the Terms of Reference with me here. I would not want to say something which might be misleading, or not the facts. I do know for sure - I think I am sure of what I am speaking - that all of the homes such as the Hoyles Home and other government institutions are included in the Terms of Reference with regard to the judge doing an inspection and an enquiry. I presume the hon. member makes reference to some of the economic units, private enterprise units, like Kenny's Court apartments. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, if it includes those or not, but I doubt if it does.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister also indicate if it is the intention of the minister's department to take immediate steps to have a smoke detector system installed at Hoyles Home, and a sprinkler system, and adequate ramps to take care of the possibility of an emergency in having to move 250 bedridden patients out of that institution in a hurry? Would the minister indicate if it is the intention of his department to install smoke sensors in the rooms at Hoyles Home?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Before recognizing the hon. minister, I should draw to the hon. gentleman's attention the stricture against asking a series of questions in one question. The system of supplementaries allows a series, and therefore series should not be asked in one recognition, so to speak.

MR. NEARY: Shall I take one at a time, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: It having been said, I think it would probably be just as well to hear the hon. minister's answers.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I was looking in my desk for a resume on the situation at the Hoyles Home as a result of some allegations made by the same hon. member a few days ago in a speech of his, and the report from the Provincial Fire Commissioner indicates to me that the situation at the Hoyles Home is probably - I am searching for the right words - but the fire fighting apparatus in place, all of the other measures which should be taken, shows that the Hoyles Home is possibly the best protected of all the institutions in the Province. I have not gotten -

MR. NEARY: The same gentleman told me that the Newfoundland Hotel was the safest building in Newfoundland, but the City Council has ordered them to put in a smoke detector.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have not got that information with me here, but I will give an undertaking to, not only the hon. member, but to the House, that I will get this information tomorrow, which is the fire inspector's report.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay, followed by the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans, and the hon. member for St. George's, and the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health, and I would refer him to the Auditor General's Report, page thirteen, paragraph fourteen, with respect to amounts recoverable from third parties for services provided under the Hospital Insurance Plan. The Auditor General notes that this has been entered in the ledger of the Department of Health but not recorded in the accounts of the Province. I wonder if the minister could tell the House where, in fact, this money ended up at?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have gone over this with the permanent officials in the Department of Health, and there has been considerable discussion with the Department of the Auditor General over the years. It appears that what happens here is that in the event of a motor accident

Mr. Collins.

where a third party liability is involved, the Department of Health always endeavours to obtain its share of any judgement which might be handed down in relation to the costs which might have been incurred in any given hospital. As I understand it, there are times when those monies are difficult to collect, and some collecting agency - when I say 'collecting agency' I do not know if that might be the Credit Bureau or not - but arrangements are made to collect our portion of the money which is due us. Very often the collector of that money, instead of remitting the total of whatever it might be, \$50,000 or \$60,000 or \$10, instead of remitting the total, remits the appropriate amount minus his commission.

MR. COLLINS: The Auditor General claims that the total amount should be remitted and we should pay the collector. It ends up the same way. It is a matter of bookkeeping, as I understand it.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, the minister obviously anticipated my supplementary because I did not ask him that question directly. But since he got onto it, the supplementary will be, since this appears to be illegal, or in contravention to the Financial Administration Act, is the minister's department contemplating any action to recover this money from those people who are keeping it in contravention of the law?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, certainly if there is anything done which is in contravention of the law I am sure I will not have to remind the people down in the Department of Health to take whatever measures are necessary, and that has always been done. As I said, and I will repeat to the House, it is a matter of bookkeeping procedures, as I understand it. I will certainly look into the matter again, but as I understand it it is a matter of bookkeeping.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister has assured us that whatever is necessary to observe the law will be done, and of course the minister would agree that he is responsible, not his officials. Only the minister is responsible to this House, Sir. Can the minister tell us what steps he has taken to recover this money in light of the fact that the Auditor General states quite clearly - unless the minister does not accept his opinion - the Auditor General states quite clearly that the action of the minister or his officials, for which the minister is responsible, is unlawful, improper and against the Financial

MR. ROBERTS: Administration Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, as has been said in this hon. House in the past, at any given time in a year whenever the Auditor General's staff might visit a department of government, there are conversations between auditors, conversations between officials and the Auditor General, and there is generally correspondence exchanged. Not always are arguments or disputes settled, and until such time as this report comes out we really do not know what the Auditor General might report on in terms of where our explanation might not have been satisfactory to him.

Since this book has been published I have taken note of the areas with regard to Health and the officials in the department are preparing a report for me and I will certainly make sure that I will get back to the House on this particular one.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this question to the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications. Would the minister advise the House if the American Smelting Refining Company at Buchans have advised his department that they intend to close down the Buchans-Millertown Railway and transfer their shipments of ore from Buchans to Botwood via the Buchans-Badger Highroad?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge there has been no correspondence or any information of that type relayed to my office or through the department.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: The point of the question, Sir, is that whether or not there has been any information or not, it is a fact and there has been information. There has been discussions.

AN HON. MEMBER: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The hon. gentleman now is debating the hon. minister's answer. He is recognized for a supplementary question.

MR. FLIGHT: Supplementary, Sir, Will the minister indicate to the House whether his department is satisfied that the existing roadbed is capable of taking the type of payload that is about to be transferred to it by ASARCO? And in the event that the roadbed is not capable, what will be ministry do about the damages that may be incurred by the type of payloads that is going on that road when ASARCO closes the railroad?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the supplementary is hypothetical because I indicated I have not received, and I am not aware of any correspondence or any requests or any knowledge of that type being forwarded to my office from the company concerned. However, I will check with the officials in the department to reconfirm what I am saying now, and if there is correspondence I will be only too pleased to forward the information that is going to be debated in the House of Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. George's.

MRS. MACISAAC: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works and Services. Referring to the Auditor General's Report, page nineteen, item twenty-three, the Auditor General indicates that there is an amount of \$272,300 outstanding from the St. John's Housing Corporation, I would like to ask the minister what action he will be taking to recover this amount?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I gave an undertaking that I would have a complete report on all items covered by the department in the Auditor General's Report and I gave the undertaking for tomorrow. I might have to beg apologies of the House, because I have been at a situation in Labrador City for the last three days have tied me down. I will have the report in the morning,

MR. ROUSSEAU:

the preliminary report. If that is satisfactory, I will but I may need a little longer than tomorrow morning. When I do I will answer all the questions raised by the Auditor General.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: A question for the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services. I am wondering if the minister could tell us what is the current policy of the government regarding the purchase of meat. I am particularly - I gave the minister private notice yesterday that I would ask this - I am thinking about local meat specifically, and what if any preference is given to local meat. And in addition to that I am wondering if the minister would pursue this further by enquiring what is the policy of the government regarding any instructions they might have given to, say, Crown corporations like the General Hospital to give any preference to local meat. I am asking the question because of enquiries I have received that he is familiar with.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I read a statement here I think last year about the goods wholly or partially manufactured in the Province, that the government would give a preference of up to ten per cent for locally produced or mainly manufactured goods in the Province, and that in special instances that Cabinet could consider beyond ten per cent, and that would be very special circumstances. This of course was done with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and a minute in council was so issued that the director of the Government Purchasing Agency would where possible with goods mainly or wholly purchased in the Province give a preference to local producers of ten per cent.

This minute in council or substantially what was said in the minute in council, of course, was passed on as information by the Clerk of the Executive Council to all the Crown corporations across the Province, asking for their best efforts in doing this sort of thing. Of course the Department of Public Works, or the Department of Forestry

MR. ROUSSEAU:

and Agriculture at that time, under which the minute in council was issued, do not have the authority to order Crown corporations to purchase. They can suggest to them what the government policy is and in certain instances, of course, can exert some pressure which can be done. And they have certainly been notified of government's desire in the area of locally manufactured, mainly or partially, mainly manufactured goods in the Province. So they have been notified of government's procedure and government's procedure is as that.

So in respect of locally produced meat, I would assume that the same ten per cent preference would occur.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The time is up.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Order one, the adjourned the debate on the sub-amendment to the Address in Reply.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, just to refresh -

MR. J. CARTER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. J. CARTEP: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Old nuisance, the big galoot.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER: Order please, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order that is rather complex and I have taken the trouble to write it out, so if the Page would bring a copy to Your Honour it could be more fruitfully discussed.

MR. NEARY: Go back to your savoury patch!

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

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, since there cannot be two motions of nonconfidence before the House at any one time, Beauchesne, number 124, page 112; and since the Leader of the Opposition has made a motion of no confidence in the government, thereby entitling him to unlimited debating time, Standing Order 49 (a); and since the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is speaking -

MR. NEARY: The big overgrown galoot -

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

Any hon. member does have the right to make a point of order and he must be heard at least by the Chair and any other hon. member who is interested.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And he must sit down when the Speaker is speaking.

MR. J. CARTER: - and since the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) please continue.

MR. J. CARTER: - and since the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is speaking only to an amendment, although his own, to the motion of no confidence, therefore they cannot both be movers of the motion of no confidence at the same time. That is to say, one has made a motion and the other has made an amendment. And according to Standing Order 49 (a), a motion of no confidence entitles only the mover and the minister or Premier replying to such a motion, unlimited time.

Therefore I submit that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is entirely out of order since he has already spoken for more than forty-five minutes, and probably, Mr. Speaker, owes this House some time. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, although this situation has arisen before it may be argued by some that the precedents, the

MR. J. CARTER: procedural precedents should apply and I would therefore quote Standing Order (1) which gives the order of authority to be Standing Orders and then Customs and Procedures of This House, then usage and customs of the House of Commons in Canada and then precedents of British House and then I suppose lastly, the rules operative in the country called Uganda.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: I really thought I heard it all but in this case submit that the point made by the gentleman from St. John's North, which I believe he made in good faith, I do not think he made it speciously, indeed that only makes it all the sadder, Sir, because logic is against him, precedent is against him and the rules are against him. First of all, Sir, there is no rule of this House that says there is only one motion of non-confidence before the Chair at any one time.

The hon. gentleman referred to no such rule and there is no such rule. There is however, Sir, a rule which says a point of order must be raised at the earliest possible moment, and the moment would have been at the time that the Speaker ruled that the hon. gentleman's motion was in order and it was a motion of non-confidence and that

therefore he had under Rule 49A unlimited time. Secondly, Sir, logic is against him because this is not a separate motion of non-confidence. If, as I hope, the hon. gentleman's motion which is to amend the amendment that stands in my name, if that motion commends itself to the House, as it does, as it does commend itself to the province, Sir, then all we are doing is amending the one motion of non-confidence.

Thirdly, Sir, precedent is against the hon. gentleman because there have been innumerable in this chamber, Sir, not in this session but in this House of Assembly, Sir, in this general assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador, there have been numerous precedents that there may be an amendment and a sub-amendment but not more than that

MR. ROBERTS: At any one time before the House. I submit, Sir, that the hon. gentleman's point is really, even for him, awfully badly taken and although he has been kind enough to write it out for Your Honour he would have been further ahead, Sir, to mail it to Your Honour and that Your Honour dispose of it genteely and without having to take up the time of the House in this way, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from St. John's North's argument is based, his point of order and his argument is based with specific reference to Beauchesne 124 and what I intend to do is to read that and to see if there is any further argument from hon. members. This is on page 112, Beauchesne 124 it is sub-section 2 that appears to me to be the relevant section and the latter part of it, but I will read it all " A member who has already spoken forty minutes on a motion of non-confidence ought not to speak again on an amendment to that motion, because Standing Order 31 cannot be construed as declaring that more than one motion of "no confidence" can be under consideration at the same time by the House. The final decision on the question of want of confidence will only be reached when Members have voted on the motion either as amended or in its original form. The right to speak more than forty minutes belongs to the Member who moved the original motion of no -confidence; it does not belong to the mover of an amendment which just added reasons why, in his opinion, the House should vote against the Government." I intend to adjourn to think this through, to consult authorities, and I will invite argument from any members and specifically refer them to the literal wording on page 113, it is the last sentence there, " The right to speak more than forty minutes belongs to the Member who moved the original motion of non-confidence; it does not belong to

MR. SPEAKER: the mover of an amendment which just added reasons why, in his opinion, the House should vote against the Government." What it appears to suggest is that where there is a differential of time then a mover of a sub-amendment does not benefit as does the mover of the amendment. That is what it appears to suggest. And here, of course, in Beauchesne we have the outline of practice in the House of Commons and the situation as it is according to our Standing Order (1). I think there is general agreement on what that priority establishes and that is the Standing Orders of the House, secondly the precedents of the House and thirdly the practice in the House of Commons where neither of the above apply. I do not think there has ever been any disagreement on what the wording of Standing Order (1) means and the order of priority it sets up. So it would appear to me one of the matters which I have to take into consideration, and on which if any hon. member wishes

MR. SPEAKER:

to submit argument I would gladly hear, would be whether there is a precedent in this House contrary to the practise in the House of Commons as outlined in Beauchesne, whether there is a precedent.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, I can give you a precedent from Beauchesne.

MR. SPEAKER: Right. I will hear the hon. gentleman.

Then going on a bit further, there were - at least my memory tells me - that last year there were three sub-amendments that I recall made. There may have been more, but I can certainly recall three. In at least two of them the hon. member - and again this is a factual question which I will check - but as I can recall in two of them the hon. member went beyond forty-five minutes. Now nobody can say if anybody has gone on unlimited time or not, because nobody would still be around -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: But there is no doubt that hon. members went beyond forty-five minutes. And there has been one sub-amendment in this session where the hon. gentleman has gone beyond forty-five minutes. Now any points of order that have come up have been with respect - at least in this session that I recall - to whether the hon. gentleman was obstructing, or needless repetition or reading. That was the original objection. That was one objection of the hon. member for St. John's North and the hon. Minister of Justice had one. He did not think the sub-amendment went to the root of the matter, and the sub-amendments have always been ruled in order. I do not recall the specific point that has now been brought up - having been brought up.

In summary what I would be pleased to hear and invite from hon. members is their views and arguments on the question whether we do in fact have precedent which, therefore, negates the applicability of the practise in the House of Commons, because it takes priority, whether we have it or whether we do not have it.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour has already adverted to the precedent which I would cite for Your Honour, and that is in the first session of this present General Assembly, there was an amendment to the Address in Reply put down.-I am not sure whether it was by me, Sir, or by one of my colleagues - but it was put down by a member of this group here.

MR. SIMMONS: By me.

MR. ROBERTS: Was it by my friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir?
At some point in that debate, Sir, the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) was speaking. He put down a sub-amendment to the amendment, and this again was on the Address in Reply, Sir, and the hon. gentleman quite properly in my view was allowed to speak for longer than the forty-five minutes which would otherwise have been the limit of his time. In fact, as Your Honour will probably recall, the House adjourned debate on that particular sub-amendment for some considerable time, for a period of some months whereupon the House resumed debate, and if I am not mistaken, Sir, we sat all through the night or through most of the night with the hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) speaking until -

MR. SIMMONS: Until 6:30 in the morning.

MR. ROBERTS: My colleague from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir tells me it was 6:30 in the morning. Sir, I think that is a precedent directly in point. I do not have the wordings of the amendments before me, because the point in my view is so well-established that, you know, the reason it has not come up is that it is so well-established. The citation in Beauchesne I could distinguish, because in any event I do not think it applies here. I think the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has given us more than added reasons. I suggest, Sir, his sub-amendment, his amendment to the amendment, is different qualitatively as well as quantitatively, and that would be a second reason why the point would fail. And thirdly, Sir, may I repeat

Mr. Roberts.

the point I made before, the one of timeliness. It is the most basic of parliamentary rules, Sir, that a point of order must be raised at the earliest possible moment. Surely, the earliest possible moment would have been the forty-sixth minute after the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) spoke in support of the sub-amendment which he moved, and which Your Honour ruled in order.

MR. ROBERTS:

I could probably find other precedents, Your Honour, if we had a moment to look. But I think the one to which I referred in this last session was directly in point, and I suggest, Sir, established our rules in this matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, and the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) also wishes to speak.

MR. PECKFORD: The question of whether there is a precedent or not is the salient point here. And if it has been established from last year, if such was the case, then the question is whether that in itself constitutes under the rules and regulations of convention and precedent, whether that constitutes a sufficient precedent. That is number one point, because I do not know whether one particular example has always been used as being sufficient to warrant the kind of precedent which we are now talking about. So that is point number one.

Point number two, Mr. Speaker, from the sub-amendment as I remember it - and I have not got it right before me now - there does not seem to me by recollection to be a difference - there is only a difference in quantity and not in quality as was indicated by the Leader of the Opposition.

And then thirdly, the question arises as to whether because the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has been allowed, if you will for want of a better term, to proceed beyond the forty-five minutes in this particular instance, whether that in itself constitutes a precedent which would then lend weight to the example of the previous year, the previous session, so that those culminations, both of last year's, which is being contended as being a precedent, plus the fact that the hon. member has been allowed to extend his time beyond forty-five minutes this year, together would constitute sufficient precedent so that that would be the means by which it would be judged.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I think we can take it perhaps as given,

MR. MARSHALL:

that precedents have been perhaps established. But God help us that we follow precedents in this House. If we did, we would still be borrowing money in secret Cabinet session. But, Mr. Speaker, I think despite the fact that a precedent has undoubtedly been established with respect to unlimited, or the custom shall we say, unlimited debate on a sub-amendment, the fact of the matter is also that what the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is bringing up, if you consult Beauchesne, is well taken and certainly does not merit the grins on the other side of the House that greeted him when he brought it up.

Section 124 of that - Your Honour has read it, I do not need to read it again - reads that there can be no more than one motion of non-confidence at a time. Now, Mr. Speaker, what has happened is the hon. Leader of the Opposition has proposed a vote of non-confidence and a sub-amendment has been proposed. So you have to ask yourself which non-confidence motion is before the House. I would submit it has to be the no-confidence motion of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition because a sub-amendment cannot exist, Mr. Speaker, unless the amendment itself first exists. So there can be only one non-confidence motion at a time. The non-confidence motion proposed by the Leader of the Opposition has to be the one, because the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has no entitlement to speak on any non-confidence motion, certainly on a sub-amendment, when the other motion is before the Chair.

So it is one at a time as far as I can see. I say that if there is precedent - and there would appear to be precedent in this House, there is no doubt of that, precedent and custom - the fact of the matter is that thanks to the well researched views of the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) he has brought to our attention the fact that perhaps we are following a custom and a precedent which has not been proper, that the proper mode and the proper way to regard it is that there can be only one non-confidence motion at a time which is the hon. Leader of the Opposition's motion.

MR. MARSHALL:

Now I would say that that is the technical way that I would look at it. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, and I would say that you have a conflict here between one and the other. You have a custom and a precedent that we cannot deny on the one hand, and you have the undoubted authorities and reasons on the other hand put forth by the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). So it is up to Your Honour to decide it. The only thing that I would say is that I would hope he would decide in favour of the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) because this sub-amendment has, in fact, been moved not really for the basis of a ~~non~~-confidence motion in the government, but to give the hon. member unlimited time. And he has had unlimited time all throughout this week in the House and

MR. MARSHALL: I think we should be spared from any more of his talk and let other people get on.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may respond simply to one point raised by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), namely the role to be given to the facts of precedence. It seems to be, I think, common ground, the House Leader for the government or the Acting House Leader for the government, I think, took this position and the hon. gentleman from St. John's East, who was for three or four sessions the government House Leader, and I, all seem to be on the same ground when we say that there are precedents in this House. That only then leaves, Sir, the question of precedents versus a citation from Beauchesne.

Now, Sir, Your Honour just outlined it and I think that speaks for itself. Our Standing Order (1) to which the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) referred, is in all cases not provided for hereinafter or by sessional or other orders. Well we agree we have no sessional or other orders in this case. "The usages and customs of the House of Commons of Canada as in force at the time shall be followed so far as they may be applicable to this House."

Now, Sir, I submit the only way in which that Standing Order can be read is that the first place to which we look are our own rules, and if Standing Orders have a rule that settles the matter. The next place to which we look are sessional orders, and there are no sessional or other orders in force at this time affecting this particular matter. The third place to which we must look are our own precedents. The fourth place to which we look is the practices of the House of Commons, and we have fallen into the practice of relying upon Beauchesne, even though in Ottawa now Beauchesne is no longer used because the orders have changed so much in the House

MR. ROBERTS: of Commons that Beauchesne is valueless and until Mr. Clerk Fraser, Mr. Alistair Fraser, the Clerk of the House, produces his commentary we will be flying blind.

So I do submit, Sir, that the practice is well established. I would think if we researched it we would find a number of precedents going back through the years and I do not think there is any question of the weight that should be given to the precedents. Precedents must take precedence, that is "ents" in one and "ence" in the other, the precedents must take precedence over the citation in Beauchesne.

The only other point I would make is a small reference to the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), Sir, who I think and I am sure did not mean to, questioned the motives of the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in moving it. I think the gentleman from LaPoile's motives, Sir, speak for themselves. He obviously feels a lack of confidence in the administration and wishes to express it in his own particular and peculiar way, as is his right. I do not think the gentleman from St. John's East, Sir, should, and indeed the rules prohibit him, from questioning the motives or assigning ulterior or improper motives to the gentleman from LaPoile.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, just one point.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's South I believe wishes to make a submission and I notice the hon. member for St. John's East also wishes to.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I will just make one point in relation to what the Leader of the Opposition just said and that is the question seems to me, what constitutes precedence? Any kind of circumstances surrounding it, does that give it less validity than a bona fide precedent situation. A precedent is a precedent but whether the circumstances surrounding it are sufficient to dilute its work as a precedent therefore must be overruled by the citation from Beauchesne, that is the question as I see it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's South.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the point has been raised whether the point of order is valid because of its timing. I will direct Your Honour's attention to section 70, sub-section (2) in Beauchesne and perhaps I might be permitted to read it in whole or in part, whichever the hon. members would desire -

AN. HON. MEMBER: Go ahead.

DR. COLLINS: Sub-section (2) of section 70 which reads as follows, "Any member is entitled, even bound, to bring to the Speaker's immediate notice any instance where he considers a breach of order. He may interrupt and lay the point in question concisely before the Speaker. He should do so as soon as he perceives any irregularity," and I would draw your attention to when "he perceives any irregularity in the proceedings

DR. COLLINS: which are engaging the attention of the House. The Speaker's attention must be directed to a breach of order at the proper moment, namely, the moment it occurs. A point of order may be taken after a debate is concluded and the Speaker is about to put the question to a vote, also, whilst the House is voting, after the vote has been taken, in fact, at any time, but not so as to interrupt the Speaker when he is addressing the House. Even the provisions in Standing Orders say that "action must be taken "forthwith" or "forthwith without debate" with respect to certain proceedings do not debar a member from raising a point of order when a serious irregularity occurs."

It would seem to me, therefore, that the question comes down to, when did the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) precede the irregularity? If we could possibly determine that by asking the hon. member to clarify on that point, but if he perceived the irregularity relatively recently and therefore brought it to the attention of the House with reasonable dispatch, I would not think his point order therefore invalid.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. the member for St. John's East and then the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARSHALL: The point by the hon. the member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins) is well taken. There is another aspect that I did not bring out to which the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has referred. Certainly he is correct on his statement with respect to precedents, but, Your Honours, I think the question here is whether a precedent has really occurred. The fact that something has happened in this House in the past does not necessarily mean it is a precedent. Perhaps it may mean that it has occurred because of acquiescence.

Now I do not recall since I have been in the House that a point of this nature has been brought up, that

MR. MARSHALL: this specific point of order has been brought up, I do recall that people have appeared to have spoken for longer than the allotted span, but I would submit that something really does not become, it may have happened, but it does not become a precedent and a custom until someone objects to it, as the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) has for the first time. Then it becomes ruled on and it becomes then a custom for people to speak longer on sub-amendments than the forty-five minutes. Then and only then does it become a precedent or a custom.

I would submit that this is the first time this has come up. Whilst members have talked for a longer period of time on sub-amendments, the fact of the matter is, Your Honour, that we are only really saying that from hearsay because, really, right now we have no measure other than the hon. the member for LaPoile's present speech and, as I say, the fact of the matter is that it has to be taken as acquiescence, just as if any member in this House gets up and speaks in a normal fashion, without a sub-amendment, speaks over his forty-five minutes. And if I get up in answer to the hon. gentleman, or two or three speeches later, and speak for fifty minutes or fifty-five minutes, that does not mean that the next time I am allowed to get up and speak for fifty or fifty-five minutes, or any other hon. member.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, this argument seems to be broadening all the time. Let me deal with two separate points, first of all the one just made by the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

Sir, I submit there is no way that a precedent can be established other than to look at what has been done in similar circumstances in the past. That is the basis of the doctrine of stare decisis and to use a term that learned gentlemen would use, if the matter is on all fours

MR. ROBERTS: with what has gone before, then that is a precedent. It surely, Sir, is observed, and I do not use that in a pejorative sense, I use it in the proper sense, pejorative to say that unless a point of order has been raised, the matter has been argued at length and the Speaker has given a considered ruling, that unless that has been done in respect of a specific practice of the House there is no precedent.

Mr. Speaker, I refer Your Honour to our financial procedure in this House which is nowhere set down in Standing Orders. In fact, Sir, the Standing Orders in a sense have been disregarded. To my knowledge, Sir, the points of order have never been risen on many proceedings and yet I venture to say, Sir, that Your Honour would have to rule that the precedents with respect to our financial business in this House, the way we deal with money bills when they are reported out of the Committee of Ways and Means, that that is as precedent-clad as if it were in the Standing Orders. The only problem is it may not be as well understood because it is nowhere clearly spelled out.

Mr. Roberts:

I know of no test for a precedent other than that which has gone before - and the fact that nobody objected to it must surely speak for itself.

Now with respect to the point raised by the gentleman from St. John's South (Dr. Collins), the Deputy Speaker of the House, Sir, and a gentleman for whom I began with a great deal of respect, and a gentleman for whom my respect has increased in the Chair, I suggest, Sir, that his point cannot be well taken because what he was saying is that the matter of timeliness is subjective. I do not know if I am quoting him precisely, but I think I am producing his thought accurately when I say he said "We must ask the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) when he perceived what appeared to him to be a breach, in the points, in the rules.

But, Mr. Speaker, such a subjective test would render the whole timeliness rule a mockery, because all that anybody would have to say was, "Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, my friend from St. George's made a speech, Sir, last week, and, you know, I have been thinking about it, and I have talked to one or two people, and you know, Mr. Speaker, I want to raise and say that that is out of order, you know, and it is only now, Mr. Speaker, I have perceived it." You know the timeliness rule, if it means anything, must mean immediately.

And again, Sir, your own rulings and those of your predecessors are voluminous on this point, timeliness means timeliness. If an hon. gentleman is absent from the House, Sir, and he comes in and he says, "Mr. Speaker, I was not here when a certain word was used, I wish to object to it on a point of order." He is ruled out of order. He is ruled out of order because he was not here at the moment the offensive phrase was used. If the hon. gentleman from St. John's South was in the Chair of Committee, and somebody raised a point about a word that had been used five minutes before, he would have to be ruled out of order. The timeliness test, Sir, must be objective. And nothing in the particular citation from Beauchesne would imply anything else.

Mr. Roberts:

All that Beauchesne says is the well known rule that a point of order is in order at literally any time provided only the Speaker is not speaking, and that is Speaker with a capital 'S', not the member who happens to have the floor in the procedure. I do think, Sir, that the point of timeliness, you know, cannot bear the interpretation put on it, else, Sir, the rule of timeliness if it is to be subjective would be of no account at all. All that a member would have to say, if somebody objected on timeliness, is, "Well, I only now noticed it, Sir. I only now perceived." I mean, that is a mockery.

So I think, Sir, the matter really is clear cut. The reason it has never come up before, and I agree with the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) - I have been in the Chamber, what? eleven or twelve years now, as long as nearly anybody here except the gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), the gentleman from, well longer than the gentleman from Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe) who was absent for a bit, the gentleman from St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) has been here longer than I have, one or two other hon. members have sat here as long as I have - Sir, I have never heard the point raised before simply because I think all have accepted it as being a valid and a proper point of procedure. And I am not surprised the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) raised it. If he thinks it should be raised then he should raise it. But, Sir, I do not really think it is worth the - we have spent the better part now of half an hour on what should be a very simple matter because it is clearly governed by our precedents, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I do not appreciate the Opposition's attempt to present my argument or my point of order as being the application of that Latin maxim de minimis non curat lex. This is not a frivolous point of order. To my way of thinking it is as clear as the nose on hon. gentlemen's faces. It comes directly from the

Mr. J. Carter:

second half of Standing Rule 49, Subsection (a) "That a member making a motion of "No Confidence" in the government etc. etc."
"Only the member making a motion of "No Confidence" in the government and the minister replying thereto shall speak for more than forty-five minutes."

There is only one motion before the Chair. There can only be one motion before the floor. There was only one mover, that is, only one motion of no confidence. There only was one mover of no confidence. Only the mover of no confidence has unlimited time, quod erat demonstrandum.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: There are a number of important points obviously that have come up and are related to the decision on this matter. I thank hon. members for their argument. I would hope not to delay the House long, I have proposed to adjourn, I would trust, for no longer than ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I have considered the arguments put forward by all hon. members, and have verified to my own satisfaction certain factual data which it was necessary that I be assured of. Although a number of matters were referred to in the argument heard on the point of order, the essential matter to be decided, as I understand it, is whether the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) may continue to speak without specific time limitation or whether - the ninety minute proviso is out - he was limited to forty-five minutes.

Standing Order (1) is quite clear, and on this I am not aware of any disagreement as to the order of priority to which I must address myself. Leaving out sessional orders which we do not have in this session, or at least yet, they are the Standing Orders, the precedents of the House, and thirdly, the contemporary practice in the House of Commons where applicable, and that must mean where there is vacuum in terms of our own precedents. So there is a factual question to be determined and that is, do we, in fact, have precedents. Including the present sub-amendment, there have been in this session four sub-amendments to either the motion before the Chair on a budget debate, or a motion or amendment before the Chair connected with the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

MR. ROBERTS: In this General Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: - in this General Assembly, yes. Three last year, and the present one.

Now the three last year, hon. members will recall that in Hansard of

Mr. Speaker:

September 2, 1975 will show that a sub-amendment was made by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) and that on March 16, 1976, Hansard will show that a sub-amendment was made by the same hon. gentleman, and indeed the hon. member for St. John's North himself made a sub-amendment which is in the Hansard of May 14, 1976.

However it is in the first two that the mover of the sub-amendment went beyond forty-five minutes, so the third one, I do not think, is germane here.

We are in the position, as I see it, whereby what we have to establish is - it is quite clear what the practice in the House of Commons is, according to Beauchesne and what was cited by the hon. gentleman for St. John's North, and I understand this is the contemporary practice, it is quite clear what the practice in the House of Commons is, and that is that the right to speak for more than the regular amount of time, there it is forty, belongs to the member who moves the original motion of no confidence, in this case it would be the Leader of the Opposition, and does not belong to the mover of an amendment which just added reasons why in his opinion the House should vote against the government.

It is quite clear that if we were to go to authority third in line, it will be the practice of the House of Commons. We do however have the precedence of this House. And I certainly have to address myself to those.

When last year, during the last session rather, and indeed during this session, hon. members proposed a sub-amendment and went in excess of forty-five minutes, the action of the House, or inaction of the House, certainly suggests that the opinion that the hon. men were doing this as of right, not by grace. There are only two ways the hon. member could go beyond forty-five minutes; either unanimous consent or by right, where unanimous consent is not necessary.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or by leave.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave, yes. Either by leave, by grace, by leave or by right.

Last year when the hon. member from Twillingate presented a sub-amendment, and indeed up to this point, during the sub-amendment proposed by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), although there have been points of order on different matters, last year the hon. gentleman spoke in excess of forty-five minutes without any suggestion from government or Opposition, from any hon. member, that this was being granted by leave, by unanimous consent. It certainly appeared to be the conviction of all hon. members that this was being done as of right.

I can therefore only conclude that we do have a precedent in this House, that it is not a question of acquiescence, that there was no suggestion of tacit unanimous consent, that the hon. gentleman in speaking did so as of right, and not through unanimous consent, and that this is the decision of the House. It is certainly not my intention to overrule that decision. It would only be in the most serious of circumstances, I think, that a Speaker would overrule the Chair. Because if one is to do that, then the whole concept of precedence is undermined, and of consistency. And certainly when one or two hon. members have a right, and in similar circumstances another hon. member acts in the same way, he must be afforded the same right as well.

Mr. Speaker.

Therefore, in my opinion, there is a precedent of the House which allows the mover of a sub-amendment to have unlimited time, and that that is more than acquiescence but a right, and that this takes precedence over what might be the contemporary practice in the House of Commons, and that it would be quite wrong in this instance to overrule the practice of the Chair, and that the hon. gentleman continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a great day for democracy in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Hon. members on the government benches, Sir, the gentlemen who persist in harassing members who are speaking on this side of the House, if hon. members will recall, are the same hon. gentlemen who talked about the power of the Legislature being placed in the hands of a few, being placed in the hands of the Cabinet, and now these same hon. gentlemen come into this House and try to limit debate, restrict debate, and try to enforce closure through foolish points of order. These members, I submit to Your Honour, have nothing but nuisance value in this hon. House, and they could do their constituents a favour, Sir, by going out and resigning, because they are not doing anything for their districts or their constituents anyway. They have not made a plea, they have not made a speech in this hon. House on behalf of their district or their constituents since they got elected. And I think now the voters in these districts are getting wise to these hon. gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, I want to move on, and I am afraid, Sir, that I am going to have to rearrange my schedule. I was going to go to Labrador City tomorrow morning, Sir, but because I cannot possibly finish my few remarks by 5:30 P.M., when we start the Late Show this afternoon, i am going to have to rearrange my schedule and I will have to go to Labrador City on another day, and I will have to carry

Mr. Neary.

on with my address tomorrow, and Monday, if necessary, Sir, maybe Tuesday and Wednesday and Thursday of next week. But as long as hon. gentlemen keep up with these delaying tactics -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - as long as we have these delaying tactics, Sir, well now I am going to finish what I have to say supposing I have to stay here until Christmas. And hon. gentlemen on the opposite side who are trying to get the House closed up in a hurry better take note.

I want to move on to another subject, I want to talk for a few moments about the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, the Federal Business Development Bank and the Rural Development Authority. As hon. members are probably aware, these three agencies either loan or grant the taxpayers' money to people who are interested in establishing business and industry in this Province. Now, Sir, straightaway I want to say that after about a year of research on the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and on the Federal Business Development Bank, that I have to come the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that it was a gross error in judgement, it was a mistake to establish the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation in the first place, although it was heralded, Sir, as a great reform. It was heralded by - and I might say by the previous administration - it was supposed to be a God send, God's gift to Newfoundland. It was supposed to work wonders for this Province. It has failed miserably. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, reflecting back over the events that led up to the establishment of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation it is now my humble opinion, Sir - and if I can be proven wrong by hon. gentlemen I am prepared to listen to their arguments - it is my

MR. NEARY: humble opinion it was a mistake to set it up in the first place, that the old Industrial Development Bank could have accomplished the same objectives as the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. Now we started the wheels in motion to set up the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, the old administration, the crowd that got kicked out in 1972, January 18th, but we did not finish the job. The present administration carried on, finished the job, and made the appointments and so forth for that corporation.

Now I claim, Sir, that the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation is just a political vehicle for pork barrelling, to give the administration an opportunity to do a little pork barrelling, to give the administration a little opportunity to pass out patronage and favoritism to their buddies and their friends. It serves no other useful purpose, Sir, it serves no other purpose that the old Industrial Development Bank could not have served, which is the present Federal Business Development Bank, That is a new name they have on it. It used to be the old Industrial Development Bank, it is now the Federal Business Development Bank.

Mr. Speaker, that Industrial Development Bank could have done the same thing. However, Sir, I have to say this, I have to qualify my statement by saying that, in my opinion again, the Industrial Development Bank got off the rails, and if it had not gotten off the rails there would have been no thought at all to set up a Rural Development Authority which is another form of welfare, only this time it is welfare in the form of hand-outs to their buddies and to their friends, political patronage. If the Industrial Development Bank, Sir, had not gotten off the rails and restricted themselves to financing cabarets in this province - I might say, Sir, for the benefit of hon. members that according to my research that 27 per cent of the loans made by the Federal Business Development Bank, the old Industrial

MR. NEARY: Development Bank, 27 per cent were for taverns and night clubs, 27 per cent of the loans. Mr. Speaker, they lashed out so many loans for cabarets, for night clubs and for taverns and beer joints in this province that the head office of the Federal Business Development Bank have now issued an ultimatum to the St. John's office that they are no longer permitted to finance cabarets, beer joints. In other words, in this province. They are no longer permitted to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Perhaps at this time I will inform hon. members, and I have to do it within the next four minutes, of the matters which will be debated at 5.30. I have received notice of two, and the order in which I received them and it is in that order that they will be debated, first notice was given to me by the hon. member for LaPoile arising from a question asked to the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy with respect to a uniform price for gasoline and heating fuel throughout the province. The second matter, notice of which was given me by the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde arising out of a question asked to the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications on the subject of the transfer of the highway depot at Old Perlican.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to add insult to injury, the old Industrial Development Bank, the new Federal Business Development Bank, apparently narrowed their thinking down to loans less than, say, \$150,000. Somehow or other, I do not know how they got this into their thick skulls because the sky was the limit as far as setting up the Industrial Development Bank was concerned, it is a federal loan agency, the federal government did not place any restrictions on the Industrial Development Bank, but somehow or other the local people themselves took it upon themselves—and this was an unwritten law, an unwritten policy—to restrict loans to, say, anything below \$200,000. And that is

MR. NEARY:

another reason why the administration of the day probably thought about setting up a Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation that could lash it out by the millions.

MR. NEARY: Now, Sir, I do not know what the reason for this thinking might be. It was probably due to the fact that the people who were hired by the Industrial Development Bank were former employees of regular chartered banks or were former employees of finance companies, and they had already seen some of these people coming in already when they were in their former positions looking for loans and they were turned down because they were a poor risk. And later when these people went on and became counsellors or employees of the Industrial Development Bank- Lo and behold!- the same people to appear before them were the ones who they had already turned down as being poor risks.

And so this policy somehow or other developed that the Industrial Development Bank and the Federal Business Development Bank sort of restricted, they were afraid, they were in fear of giving out big loans and of course in one sense you cannot blame them, Mr. Speaker, because a lot of these people were scoundrels and rogues and were a poor risk. Now a lot of them were good risks, Sir, a lot of them started up some good industries. But a lot of them were con artists and so the Industrial Development Bank lost its nerve and they restricted themselves to more or less small loans. I would say the average loan given out by the Industrial Development Bank was probably, the average now I am talking about, was probably around \$25,000, just enough to start up a beer joint or a night club. Twenty-seven per cent of their loans went for that purpose. And so into being came the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and then later the Rural Development Authority.

Now, Sir, let us look at the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. Well one fact I can tell the House about

MR. NEARY: the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation is that they have their own solicitor. They have their own lawyer who probably draws down \$35,000 or \$40,000 or \$50,000 a year. I do not know how much. They have their own lawyer on staff. He does not practice law. He is a permanent employee of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. I believe the hon. gentleman is from my friend's district of Humber East.

DR. FARRELL: From St. John's originally.

MR. NEARY: From St. John's originally but residing in Corner Brook when the gentleman was hired by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation as a full time solicitor.

DR. FARRELL: No, he was with the Department of Justice last.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, he is with the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation now.

DR. FARRELL: What I am saying is he lived in Corner Brook, was with Bowaters, then the Department of Justice.

MR. NEARY: But anyway it does not make any difference, Sir, how he got there. He is there. The hon. gentleman is there. And what does he do, I wonder? What does the gentleman do to justify his big fat pay cheque that he gets from the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation? There is not enough work there Sir. I have pretty well got a list of all the loans that they have given out since 1973. I have not got them all because my research is not complete, and this government, the Minister of Industrial Development, refused to give this House a list of loans made by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. And, Mr. Speaker, they are aided and abetted by the Government of Canada because the Minister of Dree, the hon. Marcel Lessard, who is responsible for the money that goes into the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, has refused point blank in a letter to me a week ago, refused to allow the list to be made public. The hon. gentleman, I must say, was a little more apologetic than the hon. members on the

MR. NEARY: opposite side because there is tremendous pressure on, Sir, in Ottawa at this very moment for disclosure of information to the people of Canada and the hon. gentleman mentioned that in his letter to me. Unfortunately I was just looking for the letter. I must have mislaid it and left it down in my office. I meant to bring it up and read it for the House. And you have this great movement on in Ottawa right now for full disclosure of information to the people of Canada, to the taxpayers of Canada, especially, Sir, when their money is being lashed out by the administration here in this Province, either wisely or unwisely, and I suggest, Sir, in a good many cases, unwisely. And they have refused, Sir, to table the information in this hon. House. As well as my hon. friend, the Minister of Industrial Development has refused to table a list of those who got loans and grants from the Rural Development Authority.

Now, Sir,

Mr. Neary:

I have done a lot of research and I have come up with some of the reasons why these loans were made. I have not got them all. It would take me too long, and I do not have the research staff. You have to go down in the Chattel Mortgage Registry and go through it, and you have to do an awful lot of cross checking and so forth, but the ones that were in the Registry Office -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Why do you not get the annual reports and you could have gotten them there.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, you do not get them in the annual reports, I have got an annual report here in front of me.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The Monthly Newsletter.

MR. NEARY: The Monthly Newsletter does not show the list of names, Sir, of companies and individuals who got loans from the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. I could go down in the Registry and get a list of all those who got loans from the Rural Development Authority, but it would take me six months to do it, but I could get it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I will give you a lot more information - this year.

MR. NEARY: The minister should give us a list of the individuals and companies and corporations, never mind a lot more information. The minister is hiding something, concealing information from this hon. House.

Mr. Speaker, in my research one loan from the Newfoundland Development Corporation that I detected was a loan of \$67,500 in 1974, and again in 1975 \$30,00, that is two loans, \$67,500, \$30,000 that is \$97,500, and I believe there was a third one, Sir, an outfit called Valmont Theatres Limited, Hughes Brook, Valmont Theatres Limited. Well I called up the manager of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, and I wanted to know how a drive-in theatre could fit in the terms of reference of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, how they

Mr. Neary:

could fit that into their terms of reference? And on what basis? On what grounds did this crowd get \$97,000, almost \$100,000 from the Newfoundland Development Corporation to build a drive-in theatre out in my hon. friend's district the Bay of Islands

(Mr. Woodrow).

MR. WOODROW: No, no.

MR. NEARY: No. Humber East. Which district is it in?

I do not care which district it is in.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I would say the loan is up to date.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I would say the interest is up to date.

MR. NEARY: The interest is up to date. Is the loan up to date?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Absolutely.

MR. NEARY: The interest is up to date, so the hon. gentleman tells me. Well that is a good thing.

But, Sir, what I would like to know, and I asked the gentleman I was talking to at the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation to tell me how that fitted in to their terms of reference, developing our natural resources? And I am afraid the gentleman I spoke to could not give me a satisfactory answer, could not give me a satisfactory explanation. The hon. gentleman could not give me any explanation. Apart from the fact, here is what he said to me, he said, "The only thing I can tell you is that they did not have a drive-in theatre out in Corner Brook."

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It does develop some tourist resource out there.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, I will tell you what it develops, it develops, it pollutes the mind. It develops sex movies, R rated movies, that is what it develops. It corrupts the minds of the young people in that area, that is what it is doing, because when I discovered it I immediately called up to see what was playing there at this drive-in theatre.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROWE: Restricted, but the children admitted free.

MR. NEARY: Restricted, Sir, well I do not know about out there, but I know in St. John's where they have these advertisements in the newspaper, restricted to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Eighteen.

MR. NEARY: No, restricted to individuals, to persons under eighteen years of age, and then down in very small print, children admitted free.

Well that is one example, Sir, And I would like to know - they could have just as easily done that through the Federal Business Development Bank, could they not? Could they have not done it, Mr. Speaker? Of course they could. But there was a little bit of patronage here, I am afraid, a little bit of favouritism when you look at the owners, the owners of the drive-in theatre, One of the principals of it was a gentleman, so we have been told, who was involved, he was a courier in the Bill Saunder's scandal, the Bill Saunder's affair, he was a courier.

MR. NEARY: He was the pigeon that carried the little bundle, and so, Sir, is that the reason, Mr. Speaker, is that the reason the loan was approved for this drive-in theatre? And, Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour ruled in this hon. House this afternoon, now we have a precedent; can the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation which was set up to develop manufacturing industries, to develop our natural resources, can they ever again refuse a application for a drive-in theatre when they have ample precedent for it? And, Mr. Speaker, I was rather fascinated also by the number of loans given out by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation involving shareholders of companies that happen to live right over in Kentwood Park, living on the same street, I can give the hon. gentleman, if he wants it, a list of companies where people live on the same street. Is that just a coincidence; or was all this decided over a glass of vino, or over a few cocktails?

SOME HON. MEMBER: Where? In Kentwood?

MR. NEARY: Yes, in Kentwood, I will not name the street. Kents Pond, over in that area, Sir.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Are they your average people?

MR. NEARY: No, they are not your average people, Sir. And I can tell the hon. gentleman that no public tenders were called for that building that the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation occupies. And that is a very good deal, that is a sweetheart deal if I ever saw one, No public tenders!

AN. HON. MEMBER: Were Lundrigans involved?

MR. NEARY: No, Lundrigans were not involved.

MR. SIMMONS: Who was the landlord?

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not know, I got it here somewhere, Sir, I will probably come to it shortly. But, Mr. Speaker, I noticed also, and maybe members will agree that there is nothing wrong with this, Ralland Forest Industries established a lumber mill down

MR. NEARY: in Bay d'Espoir, I believe, down there in my friends district. And ever since it was started it has been in trouble. The government have had to bail it out, the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation have had to bail it out, and are still bailing it out.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: A hundred jobs.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a hundred jobs, but the hon. gentleman, Sir, who set up that company, who was a former chief forester of this province, the hon. gentleman, knowing the ropes-

MR. LUNDRIGAN: He was bailed out, to.

MR. NEARY:- knowing the ropes, managed to milk well over \$1 million out of the Labrador Development Corporation for that one company alone.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is false.

MR. NEARY: That is not false, Sir, I have it here in front of me. \$1 million, Mr. Speaker, - Ralland, where is it? - \$420,000 one smack.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That was the company.

MR. NEARY: That is the company, that is what I am talking about, the company. \$244,000 in another crack, \$165,000 in another crack

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Pretty close, pretty close, Sir, on a \$1 million and

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You just said well over \$1 million Ed Rolph and them.

MR. NEARY: I do not have all the loans here, I only have three. \$420,000, \$500,600, \$844,000 and I have not got them all here. Well over \$1 million taken out of the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation by a gentleman who knew the ropes.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I am very deliberately avoiding allowing him to get my goat.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: on this stuff, but I think that if an individual is dragged into a debate in a manner like this, especially somebody who does not have the right to defend himself, it is a bit unfair of the hon. member. The Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation made funds available in a loan to a company. The loan is still in place. It is in arrears. The former owner is no longer the owner of the company, and that company is still operational. It employs almost a hundred people. It is one of the larger mills in the province

AN HON. MEMBER: Seventy people.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Seventy people, the hon. member says. There are four other companies that feed lumber into that company, and I think it is a bit it misrepresents, Your Honour, and again this is maybe more for clarification, it misrepresents the facts; and I think the hon. gentleman should exercise a bit of responsibility. I enjoy his fanaglings, his wranglings, his display of theatrical performance and the like, and this is all good colour for the House of Assembly. But certainly he should exercise a bit of restraint and responsibility. There is a debt by a company to the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation that still is in place and hopefully will be redeemed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! As the hon. minister admits himself really we do not have a point of order. It was a point of explanation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. minister would just restrain himself and not be so touchy, I am not condemning the company forthright. I am condemning the policy of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. This gentleman, the former chief forester

MR. NEARY: was the principal of this company, the President of the company when it started and took \$1 million, borrowed \$1 million.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The hon. member is -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, look, I do not want to get into a debate over the former Chief Forester of this Province. Because God only knows he got us in enough trouble in Goose Bay in connection with the Linerboard Mill, both he and this expert now on offshore oil drilling, the chip mill, and got us in enough trouble over that. But now he is off in the lumber business. Okay, good for him! But the point that I want to make here, Sir, is this, that the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation gives out loans, have given out loans in the past without knowing who the shareholders of the company were. They did not have a list of the shareholders of the company. And I will tell you how I found that out, Sir.

This same gentleman is also a shareholder in another outfit called Rayo Forest Enterprises Limited, and they have close on \$600,000 out of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. And when I called up the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation to ask them who the shareholders of both of these companies were they could not tell me. They could not tell me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They could not or would not?

MR. NEARY: They could not tell me. They did not know. And I had the share list in front of me. I had gone to the Registry Office and got copies of the share list. And when I said to the now Manager of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, "Are you aware," I said, "of this particular gentleman who is the principle of Ralland Forest Products is also on the share list of Rayo Forest Enterprises Limited?" He said, "It is not true." "Well," I said, "it is true." He said, "It is not true." I said, "Well, okay, fine. We will not argue about it. I will go and get the share list

MR. NEARY: and then I will call you back." I went and got the share list and sure enough, Sir, there it was. His name was there. I called him back. He said, "Oh, he is only a consultant." Only a consultant, Sir, and he said, "His name was not on the original share list." I said, "I beg your pardon, Sir, his name was on the original share list." And I had to go back to the Registry Office for the second time. He bet me a bottle of wine as a matter of fact. He said, "I will bet you a bottle of wine that that gentleman's name was not on the original share list." And I went back and sure enough, Sir, here was his name on the share list from the time the company had started.

Mr. Speaker, I was aghast. I was flabbergasted. Shocked right out of my shoes to learn that the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation would give up loans to companies when they did not know who the shareholders were.

MR. MORGAN: Did you get your bottle of wine?

MR. NEARY: I never got my bottle of wine. No. And I do not want it. I am out to do a job for the people of this Province. I am not interested in a foolish old bottle of wine.

MR. MORGAN: Do a job for your district first.

MR. NEARY: Do not worry. I will do a job for my district as well as the hon. gentleman will do it. And there will be no pork barrelling either.

MR. MORGAN: No wonder there are complaints coming in.

MR. NEARY: There will be no pork barelling.

MR. MORGAN: Take care of your district first.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman would be well advised to put some salt down there. I believe we got it down there now, but it took a little while. But anyway I am not going to be carried away, Sir, by the interruptions from the hon.

gentleman.

MR. NEARY: So I put the question to him. I said, "Look, my son," I said, "Do you mean to tell me that the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation gives out loans and they do not know who the shareholders of the companies are?" He said, "Yes, that is right. We do not care." I said, "You do not care?" "No", he said, "we do not care." Well that had to top anything I have ever heard in my life. I do not know if they changed their policy now or not, Sir.

MR. NEARY: But anyway, in the process this gentleman got between the two companies well over \$1.5 million out of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation in six or seven loans. Some of it, I would submit to the House, was used for operating expenses. They were bailed out. They found a way to put more money in to bail them out. Otherwise, Sir, it would not go into five or six or seven loans.

And now, Mr. Speaker, lo and behold! the owner of Ralland Forest Products, the principal is no longer the principal. And I wish the company well, Sir. I wish it well. I am not condemning the company. I hope they carry on. I hope they do well. But that gentleman is no longer the principal. He is allowed to get off the hook. And I doubt very much if he is the principal of Rayo Forest Enterprises Limited. I heard recently that he is back at the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation now looking for another loan to start a hardwood factory out in Central Newfoundland somewhere. And somebody else told me that the same gentleman is writing a book on how not to start a lumber industry in Newfoundland. Well I could not think of anybody more experienced to write that kind of a book, Sir, and the gentleman has managed to milk well over \$1.5 million out of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. There are all kinds of other examples, Sir, that I could go into. I do not want to bore the House.

The Green Bay Mining Company, \$1 million that will never be paid back, never be paid back. Purely, Sir, pumped in for political reasons, to save the hide -

MR. PECKFORD: Untrue.

MR. NEARY: To save the hide of the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: That is wrong.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is not one benefit to the people involved or to the people of this Province, not one benefit. They

MR. NEARY: got a little extra time out of it. They bought a little time that cost \$1 million. That is so, Sir. And now I am told they are back looking for another loan to start a mining school.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: They are not looking for a loan.

MR. NEARY: They are looking for a loan, Sir. Well then I will not quote my source, my authority, but I would say the gentleman who told me knows more about it than the hon. minister.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You mean you cannot quote your sources?

MR. NEARY: I will quote my source. My source is the same source I have been quoting all afternoon.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Tell us. Do not make accusations you cannot back up.

MR. NEARY: I can back it up, Sir. To start up a mining school, to train underground miners, for what? What are they going to spend another \$300,000 or \$400,000 of the taxpayers money to start up a mining school down in my hon. friend's district. What for?

MR. PECKFORD: More money spent, more money, more risk.

MR. NEARY: More risk, more risk, Mr. Speaker, there are enough underground miners over on Bell Island unemployed to fill up all the mines in Newfoundland, unless the hon. minister is going to train them for Sudbury or Thompson, Manitoba somewhere. Most of the mining that is done in Newfoundland now, Sir, is surface mining, not underground mining, surface mining.

So why are we going to train -

MR. PECKFORD: Train miners.

MR. NEARY: Train miners. Mr. Speaker, if you are going to train miners you can train them on the surface as well as you can underground.

MR. PECKFORD: That is right.

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, the concept that was outlined in this House was to train underground miners.

MR. NEARY: But anyway, Sir, it does not make any difference.

It is just still not a very good concept at this point in time.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What is right with the world one thing.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who was up in Ottawa barking like a crackie -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: What is the gentleman being like?

MR. NEARY: When the hon. gentleman was up in Ottawa barking like a crackie at the heels of the ministers up there for not disclosing -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - what about you?

MR. NEARY: - for not disclosing information, for not giving the people of Canada the information they should have and the people of this Province, now comes back to Newfoundland after getting clobbered in the federal election, comes back to Newfoundland -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: In disgrace! In disgrace!

MR. NEARY: - and commits the same mortal sin that he was accusing ministers in the Trudeau Administration of doing, hiding information, concealing information, political patronage, corruption, under the table deals, wheeling and dealing. And the minister now is sitting on the list, sitting on the list of loans made by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and the Rural Development Authority will not table a list of names in this House.

Mr. Neary:

Shame on the minister! Shame on the minister!

Mr. Speaker, that is for sure, Sir, all you have to do is read the Auditor General's report just to see how corrupt things are in this Province. The Auditor General said in his report that he is short staffed, that he cannot do his work because he has so many of his staff our working on misappropriation of funds and fraud. That is in the Auditor General's report.

MR. MORGAN: Fraud?

MR. NEARY: Fraud. So many of his men are working on cases of fraud and misappropriation of funds that the Auditor General was complaining because he was short staffed.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is what he said.

MR. MORGAN: He has three trade schools.

MR. NEARY: Three trade schools my eyeball! There are more examples of fraud than that. What about the fisheries scandal? What about the big fisheries scandal?

Mr. Speaker, without dragging this subject out, Sir, I want to come back to my original remarks.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Stay on the Rural Development Authority. I enjoy this an awful lot.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman, if he enjoys, it he should table a list. And I guarantee that list will be tabled because the NDP, suppose they have to go - the NDP have to fight to get it tabled in Ottawa it will be tabled. And there may not be one thing in the world wrong with it, Sir, there may not be. There may be no skulduggery at all. But the fact that the minister refuses to table a list makes people suspicious, makes the minister suspect. The people are entitled to this information. It is the taxpayers' money that is being spent. And that is just a classic example, Sir, of the arrogance, and the contempt that this administration have for the people of this Province. I say to the minister, table a list. Let us have a look at it, and let the chips fall where they may. I can table,

Mr. Neary:

Sir, I can table half, and I have not had time to finish it, I can table half the list that members wanted. In 1973, \$30,000 loaned to Blue Haven Enterprises Limited in Eastport.

AN HON. MEMBER: Name them.

MR. NEARY: Eastern Aviation, Gander, \$300,000; James Gillham & Sons, Robinsons, \$130,000; Green Acres Nurseries Limited, Topsail Road, \$75,000; John L. Hutching, \$7,000; Newfoundland Leather Fur and Hide Company, Carbonear, \$50,000; Terra Nova Shoes, Harbour Grace, Conception Bay, \$70,000; Vinland Motel, \$150,000; Woodman's Fisheries Limited, New Harbour, \$20,000; for a total in the Registry Office now, there are other loans in 1973, \$832,000.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Why do you report that, all of those were tabled -

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, it was not, the names were not there and I am giving them out now, and if the minister will just sit tight I will finish my list.

In 1974, Archibald Inn Limited, Harbour Grace, \$150,000; Bay Bulls Sea Products, \$63,000; Blomidon By-Products, \$245,000; Raymond Brett, Birchy Lake, \$10,000, City Pavers Supply Company Limited, Corner Brook, \$45,000; H.W. Duffit Limited, \$167,000; East Coast Recyclers Limited, \$170,000; Fort Amherst Sea Food, \$125,000; John Hulan, Heatherton, \$37,000; John L. Hutchings, Whitbourne, \$3,000; P. James and Sons, Hant's Harbour, \$215,000; KOA Limited, \$150,000; Newfoundland Leather Fur and Hide Company, again, \$20,000; Rayo Forest Enterprises, Gambo, \$60,000; Rayo Forest Enterprises, Gambo, \$225,000; Ralland Forest Products, \$420,000; Rowsell's Motel Limited, Robert's Arm, \$58,000; Robert's Motel Limited, Robert's Arm, \$24,000; Valmont Theatres Limited, Hughes Brook, \$67,000; Vinland Motel, St. Anthony, \$19,000; Walkin Enterprises Limited, Topsail Highway, \$42,000; White's Hotel Limited, Stephenville, \$125,000;

MR. NEARY: Whitten Fish Oils Limited, St. John's - \$56,000; Bay Bulls Sea Products again - \$8,000; Raymond Bishop, Steady Brook - \$90,000; Blow-Me-Down By-Products Limited again - \$57,000; Blow-Me-Down By-Products Limited again - \$88,000; Canadian Cushions Craft, I presume that is the hovercraft company, - \$111,000; the Newfoundland Development Corporation is trying to get back now. East Coast Recyclers Limited - \$135,000; Fahey Building Limited, Hamilton River Road, Happy Valley - \$340,000; Forward and Pike Manufacturing, Carbonear - \$45,000; Gulf Steel Newfoundland Limited - \$134,000; Hoddinott Sales and Services Limited - \$155,000; Jamestown Lumber Company - \$21,000; Coal Limited again, Newfoundland Limited, South Brook - \$60,000; Lower Ebb Steel Fabricators, Corner Brook - \$90,000; same company again, Lower Ebb Steel Fabricators, Corner Brook - \$20,000; Progressive Plastic Newfoundland Limited, Donovans - \$259,000; Provincial Poultry Co-operative Limited - \$120,000; Ralland Forest Industries Limited - \$244,000; Ralland Forest Products - \$165,000; Ralland Forest Products - \$100,000; Roddickton Industries Limited - \$200,000; Sceviour, Gerald J., Botwood - \$10,000; Southern Fisheries Limited, Bay l'Argent - \$30,000; Terra Nova Shoes, Harbour Grace - \$405,000; Valmont Theatres, Corner Brook - \$30,000; Bay Shore Foods Limited, Stephenville - \$65,000; Raymond Bishop, Steady Brook - \$14,000; Duckworth Street Investments, Eastport, now that is a sale of a piece of land to Mr. Harold Duffitt, East Coast Recyclers - \$60,000; P. Janes and Sons again - \$150,000. Mac Realities, that is the company that leased the building to the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation, I can talk about that one all evening; Notre Dame Fisheries, Comfort Cove - \$175,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! It being five thirty the first matter for debate is the subject -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! - is the subject of uniformity of gasoline and oil prices throughout the Province.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I can find my few remarks I got here. I am sure I got a few here somewhere, Sir. Could Your Honour just hold it for a second? I lost my few notes I had on this - Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I do not need the notes. I can go off the cuff anyway, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, this Province, we the people of Newfoundland and the people of the Maritime Provinces are the first in line, Sir, when it comes to fighting regional disparity in Canada, we are the first in line when it comes to equalization of transportation costs and my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance is the first in line for equalization payments for this Province.

But yet, Sir, yet we have all kinds of contradictions in the price of gasoline and heating fuel within our own Provincial boundaries. And, Mr. Speaker, in Port aux Basques, which is only ninety miles away from the Mainland of Canada, tankers come in there, unload their gas and heating fuel, you have to pay five to eight cents more for a gallon of gas in Port aux Basques than you do in Corner Brook which is 200 miles away. And you have to pay anywhere from five to ten cents in Corner Brook than you do in St. John's which is over 300 miles east of Corner Brook.

So, Mr. Speaker, before we can again get aboard of our white charger, before we can get on our high horse again, Sir, and

MR. NEARY: talk about regional disparity and equalization of opportunity, should we not, Sir, should we not as elected representatives of the people, sit down with the oil companies and try to figure out a way to bring in one price for gasoline and heating fuel right across this whole Province, within our Provincial boundaries? Should we not do that, Sir? Would we not be negligent in our responsibilities if we did not do it? Mr. Speaker, it would cost the oil companies nothing. It would be doing something for the ordinary people of this Province.

Mr. Neary.

It would cost the government not a red cent. The government are looking for things to do to help the ordinary people of this Province in these times of austerity. Why not the Minister of Mines and Energy convene a meeting with the oil companies, sit down with the suppliers of gasoline and diesel and furnace oil and stove oil in this Province, sit down, convene a meeting, and work towards bringing in uniform prices for gasoline and heating fuel right across this Province, and give the poor old consumer all over Newfoundland a break? Why should the Minister of Mines and Energy not convene that kind of meeting? It would not cost anything. It would not cost the government one cent - with threat hanging over their heads, with the threat of placing them under a regulatory body, under the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities, if necessary, to bring in one price for gasoline and heating fuel right around this Province, Sir, to eliminate the regional disparity and the second-class citizenship of people who live in various regions of Newfoundland who are paying exorbitant prices for gasoline and heating fuel. If we did that, Sir, in this hon. House, I would say that we would be serving, that we would be doing our duty and serving the best interests of the people of this Province. And I commend that suggestion, that constructive idea to the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, for action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that is not a new thought. It is not an original thought. It is not an original suggestion. It is one that I am sure any thinking man in this Province or anywhere in this nation has been aware of for quite a number of years, if not decades. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that this Province, as well as other provinces in Canada, have what is called a market economy, where prices on not only oil and gas, but on many other products, are determined by the marketplace. Now the last thing that came in my mind, Mr. Speaker, before I got up, when I was listening to the hon. member

Mr. Peckford.

for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I know of small business operators in my own constituency, when he started talking with his simplistic solutions about how to have a uniform price for this product or that product in Newfoundland, I know of individuals who are working, who are consumers, who are the ordinary people of this Province, who have small service stations in the constituency of Green Bay, where they have to charge one or two cents more a gallon than somebody else would in Springdale or Grand Falls, primarily because they do not have the volume of traffic nor do they have the volume of work for their mechanics to work at, so they have to charge more than another service station in Grand Falls or in St. John's in order to make ends meet and to provide jobs for people in their community. So when you talk about such simplistic solutions as the hon. member suggests, they just do not work.

Now the Province of Nova Scotia has tried the suggestion that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has brought up with very, very limited success, and they are having extreme problems. It is only recently we contacted Nova Scotia again, and they are monitoring their programme, and they are having real problems with it. And it is not a simple matter to do. Then the other question arises, Mr. Speaker, how far does government get involved in regulating? On the one hand you can espouse the great principle of helping the common people, but how far do you regulate individuals in this kind of an economy who want to sell gas or who want to create jobs by establishing garages or whatever around this Province or in this country, how do you go? The other question is simply that when there is discrimination or when there is a rip-off occurring, it is also the responsibility of citizens, in whatever region it is, to contact not only my department but the Department of Consumer Affairs, who will investigate the problem. If there is a rip-off occurring, you will not be long seeing, if that kind of a complaint is made, the prices stabilizing and becoming

Mr. Peckford.

realistic in line with other prices in that very region. It is not a simple matter, as the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) tries to make it. It is not a simple matter to regulate it. The whole question of how far government should interfere in the marketplace comes into effect, the whole question of how you try not to hurt the small businessman. And the question of whether, in fact, government should be involved there, in the first instance, is a real, real question. So these kinds of simplistic solutions that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) makes can be labelled as motherhood, but under close scrutiny, there are not as simple as he tries to make them to be. This administration is committed to, and has done more for the protection of the consumer of this Province in the last four or five years than the previous administration or other governments in this country or provinces have done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: We will continue within our power, within our legislative power as a government, within our power as a Province to do whatever we can to protect consumers with always keeping in mind how far we can go in relation to other people we might be hurting when we bring in that kind of suggestion that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) makes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The second subject for debate is the transfer of the highway depot in Old Perlican.

The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation this afternoon confirmed a rumour that I picked up that that highways depot in Old Perlican is to be moved to some other location, and he has not indicated what location that will be. And I hope that in his reply, when he reacts to this five minutes, that he will indicate where that highways depot will be moved, which location it will be moved to. Sir, what I would like to point out is this, that this particular highways depot employs approximately twenty people and more during the Summer, during the Summer maintenance activity, and it is very strategically located on the peninsula. The closest depot, major depot, on the Conception Bay side is in the Birch Hills and on the Trinity Bay side the closest major depot is in the Whitebourne area, a total of approximately eighty-four miles from that one depot to the other. And the Old Perlican depot is straight in the middle. And it is very strategically located in that area, because you have heavy school bus transportation in that area with high schools, and you also have the Old Perlican hospital in that area, so it is of paramount importance, Sir, that that highways depot remain in Old Perlican for these reasons. Now what I want to know, Sir, is why it is being moved, and where it is being moved? I think there is something a little more sinister to it than was indicated by the minister when he suggested that as a result of - I do not know, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Rowe.

what the two gentlemen over there find so amusing. They should be eliminated, kicked out of the Chamber. Sir, I think there is something a little more sinister to it than what was indicated by the Minister of Transportation and Communications when he suggested that this act is being taken as a result of recommendations that he has gotten from his officials. I know for a fact, Sir, that at the present time, there is a contractor who is taking care of the snow clearing from Brownsdale to Low Point.

MR. MORGAN: He is doing a good job.

MR. ROWE: He may well be doing a good job.

The question, Sir, is will he be expected to carry on with the snow clearing operations after this highways depot is moved, and will he be expected - that same contractor - to carry on with any additional snow clearing that is presently being carried out by the Department of Transportation and Communications? And another question I want to put to the minister, Sir: Did this contractor get this job, this contract, as a result of public tenders being called? Were public tenders called for the snow clearing in that area? And, if not, why not? And I might add, Sir, that this sinister activity that I am talking about - the minister knows the gentleman who I am talking about. It is the same gentleman with whom his own executive assistant and the minister negotiated with for the rebuilding of a fish plant in Old Perlican to the absolute amazement of the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier of this Province and everybody else. - the Minister of Transportation and Communications announcing the building of a fish plant in Old Perlican. What is going on out there, Sir? I have nothing against the gentleman in question, but I have something against the policy of this government where there are under the table deals taking place. Now were public tenders called or were they not? And will they be called in that area, and what is the real rationale

Mr. Rowe.

for the moving of that depot to another location? Where is it going to be moved? Why is it being moved? So there are two aspects of it, Sir. One is that it is a tragedy to move that highways depot out of that strategically located area, Old Perlican, right on the tip of the peninsula, and the other aspect of it is, what is going on between the minister's executive assistant and the contractor who has the contract for this snow clearing at the present time? Will he tell the real truth on it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think it is a regret that this House of Assembly gets involved in such parochial matters on Question Period, and we have to debate such parochial matters, and not urgent matters pertaining to the general overall economy of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh! Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it seems that whenever this administration, no matter what department, gets involved in doing something to improve service to the general public, there is always something sinister involved.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right.

MR. MORGAN: There is always something sinister involved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Well now you are telling the truth.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like for the people of Old Perlican, I only wish they could hear the views of their hon. member who represents them in the House of Assembly, that when this administration is taking steps to relocate a depot which is not proving to be satisfactory to service in the area over the past number of years, we are taking steps to relocate a depot or a Highway's headquarters from one area in Old Perlican to an area where the engineers and the officials, and the men who have been working with the department for years, long before I became involved with the department, they are the expertise in my department, they are the views and opinions I obtain, and they are making recommendations to me, and I make decisions on these recommendations, and the advice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: We are moving - Mr. Speaker, if he wants the question debated or answered, if not I will sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, we are moving and relocating a depot at Old Perlican to improve the service. Over the past year I have taken steps to relocate a number of depots, and headquarters of the operations of the department, and reassign the equipment and the allocation of equipment and men in areas around the Province, all over the Province. In everybody's district, I think, there have been changes made. And I think it is obvious this Winter that these changes have been beneficial by the services being improved all over the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Took them out of Gander and put them in Lewisporte.

DR. FARRELL: Took them out of Gander and put them in Lewisporte.

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was debating the question - the question I am debating, and I am replying to, is a question asked in Question Period, where is the depot being moved? Is it being moved, and to where? And that is all I am going to debate. I am not getting involved in any questions that were not asked in Question Period.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

The information regarding the location of the Old Perlican depot is that it is now situated in a place that we feel is not satisfactory. We are locating it to a place known as Flambro Head -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - where we can consolidate the efforts being now put in Adam's Cove in one depot, and another depot in Old Perlican. We are putting the two efforts in one to concentrate the effort of the maintenance operations to improve the overall service in the area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: And I defy, and I take strong exception to any hon. gentleman in this House of Assembly looking at me as one member of

Mr. Morgan:

this administration and saying there is something sinister in something I am doing to improve the service for the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER Order, please! The motion before the Chair is that this House do now adjourn. Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour "Aye".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Aye".

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Nay".

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the "Ayes" have it.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Friday,
February 18, at 3:00 P.M.