

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

House of Assembly

For the period

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

February 25, 1977

The House met at 3p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I am pleased to welcome to the gallery, to welcome on behalf of all hon. members, five students accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Lloyd Stone, and the students are, Grade 11 students from Musgravetown Central High School. I know all hon. members join me in welcoming these people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of 109 voters of the community of Freshwater-Carbonear, and the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows: "We the undersigned, resident voters and property owners in the village of Freshwater-Carbonear district do hereby petition you to intercede with the Department of Municipal Affairs and do all possible to obtain further action on the digging of an artesian well for the section of the village of Freshwater known as Freshwater Hill. It is our understanding that funds were voted for and assigned to this project approximately two years ago, but were diverted to try and complete a well under construction in another part of the town. Your co-operation at this time would be greatly appreciated."

Mr. Speaker, in supporting that petition I would like to point out that the 109 voters in this community make up approximately 68 per cent of the total electorate, and this town, although the provincial government has done an admirable job of trying to supply it with a water source, at the present does not have one, and that is due in part to a number of reasons: Firstly that the local committee made some errors when it sank the original well and dug the adjoining pipelines, the committee, rather than test the lines before covering it up, tested the lines after they covered it up, and found that there

MR. MOORES:

were a number of leaks, and so far it has cost the government an additional \$2000 to attempt to find the leaks, that have not as yet been found. So the town is still without water, and the government has spent slightly in excess of \$4000 over two years. The other reason why this petition has been prompted, is because of petty and personal reasons within the community, and I believe that this is, in fact, a salient feature of all these local water committees throughout the island.

Some member of the committee who has something personal against his neighbour, or his neighbour's son, or his mother-in-law or something else, refuses to connect that person or connect a group of people who maybe near him or adjacent to him. Thirdly, this group of people, in this particular location in the community, were already allocated funds by the Department of Municipal Affairs,

Mr. R. Moores:

and because of this petty and personal feeling by one member of the Committee the money was diverted to another part of the community. Thus this location that is now petitioning the House of Assembly does not want any water, not by any fault of its own but by the fault of the Committee involved.

Mr. Speaker, I table this petition, and I would hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, which is the department to which it relates, will have a comment upon it. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Bellevue.

MR. W. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but support any petition that has anything to do with water or water and sewer. I thoroughly support the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to third the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Sir, it is ironical that 109 residents of Freshwater should be looking for fresh water over in the district of Carbonear. I might say, Sir, that I have a lot of friends in the community of Freshwater and Victoria and Upper Island Cove and Carbonear who were former miners who worked on Bell Island, lived on the North Shore of Conception Bay. They are hard working people. And I believe they are entitled to a little drinking water, Sir, and I do hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs will see fit to grant these requests for wells that people are asking for through petitions that are brought in by various members of the House. Because, Mr. Speaker, if we do nothing else in this House, I think, the least we could do is give people a drop of drinking water.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Land Development Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. W. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the hon. House to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Stephenville Linerboard Mill Agreement Act, 1972." To avoid any panic or any worry that is the one that raises the loan limit and gives us the authority to give them more money, it is not -

MR. NEARY: Too bad.

MR. DOODY: I am sorry chaps.

Mr. Speaker, I also give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to introduce a bill, "An Act To Enable The Bennett Brewing Company Limited To Become A Federal Corporation." And also, Your Honour, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to introduce a bill, "An Act To Appeal The Canadian Javelin Limited Acquisition Of Crown Lands Act of 1970."

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Local Government Elections Act."

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Social Services, and it grows out of his department's programme of make work projects. He made a ministerial statement here in the House, oh a week or ten days ago giving some details. One of the projects, Mr. Speaker, to which the minister referred was the project at Salt Pond which is located in the district of Humber Valley near the Northern part of that district, in the Hampden, Jackson's Arm area

Mr. Roberts:

of White Bay. Mr. Speaker, I have had complaints from a number of people in that area, and I ask the minister if he is aware of these, I will mention them now, and if so, what action he has taken? Complaints to the effect, Sir, that the minister's officials who are organizing this project have told people who are receiving social assistance on grounds of medical incapacitation, medical incapacity,

MR. ROBERTS:

that if they do not work, if they do not take the job, they will then have their social assistance removed. I have names of three or four of these people. I do not wish to give them in the House, and so I will not, but I will supply them to the minister if he wishes outside the House so he can check into it. But, Sir, I ask the minister first of all if he is aware of these allegations and then there are some supplementaries.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Assistance.

MR. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that and I certainly would appreciate it if the hon. member would give me the names outside the Chamber.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the hon. minister tell the House, assure us, that it is not the policy of this government to require people who are receiving social assistance because they are permanently or on a reasonably long term, incapable of earning a living either for medical reasons or for social reasons that they will not be required to work on projects of this sort?

MR. BRETT: It is certainly not the policy of the government, Mr. Speaker, to tell people who are medically incapacitated that they will not receive social assistance if they do not accept jobs. But if a person is socially incapacitated -

MR. ROBERTS: I meant widows and -

MR. BRETT: Oh that is different. I am sorry. Certainly we would not advise these people that they have to take jobs.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. Would the minister outline the policy with respect to the hiring of younger people who may or may not be receiving social assistance because of the policy the administration have of being extraordinarily reticent and forthcoming with assistance for younger people who are unemployed and do not have unemployment insurance and have no source of income? Would the minister tell us the policy with respect to hiring this type of person to work on this kind of project? Will these people be given the opportunity to get work?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Assistance.

MR. BRETT: This question I would assume, Mr. Speaker, stems from a problem that we did have particularly in the Salt Pond-Hampden area. There were a number of single able-bodied men who were looking for positions. I have suggested to my regional directors that first choice should most certainly be the married man with children and secondly, married couples or married men without a family. But if we have listed a project in a community where we cannot find sufficient married men with families to carry out that project then I think we will have to take a second look at it and probably decide to move to an area where we have a large number of people on assistance. I have -

MR. ROBERTS: Does the minister mean we move the project or go elsewhere to bring people to work on the project?

MR. BRETT: Well that may cause some difficulty, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh yes, it would.

MR. BRETT: It is sort of our unique way of living here in this Province. I think the hon. member knows what would happen if we had a project in, say, Salt Pond and we did not have enough people in this category to work on this particular project. To go outside and bring them in from another community, I think, would cause quite a rift. So we would like to stay away from that if we could at all.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary. Sir, would the minister undertake to give the House at any early date, hopefully on Monday, a full and complete statement on the Salt Pond project? I will let him have the names if he will meet me behind the Chair, Sir. But I also understand that there are people in the community - and I have done my best to discourage them and I think we all would - who are talking somewhat intemperately, that passions are running very high, as I understand it, in the Salt Pond area now as a result of this project. Would the minister undertake to make a full statement on Monday dealing with the problem and explaining what has happened and what is being done to correct any deficiencies there may be?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT: It may be difficult, Mr. Speaker, to have that information

MR. BRETT:

by Monday since my people will not be working, I suppose, after five or six this afternoon. But I most certainly will undertake to get that information as soon as I can, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova, followed by the hon. gentleman for LaPoile.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, my question was prompted by the petition so ably presented by the member for Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) and

MR. LUSH: also is a result of queries and questions raised by several hundred constituents with relationship to artesian wells. And the question, Sir, is to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and I wonder if the minister is in a position to inform the House as to what criteria or what standards are used in granting artesian wells to the various applicants or to the committees or whatever, what is the criteria used?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, they are granted on the basis of need basically and we get many, many requests for artesian wells and we try to fill those as quickly and as expeditiously as possible. But they are basically based on need and we realize that everybody has the same needs so you have to make a judgement. That is basically it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir. Would the minister inform the House if the government have looked into the practicability, the legality, the constitution validity if you want of the Government of Newfoundland placing a royalty or a tax on every kilowatt of power exported from this Province to the Province of Quebec.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Before recognizing the hon. minister I should point out that certainly a question with respect to practicability is certainly in order but it would be out of order to ask a minister for a legal opinion.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that the government over the past three or four years have looked at every conceivable possibility as it relates to the export of Labrador power outside the Province, and therefore that would include the kinds of questions that he has asked, that

MR. PECKFORD: the government has examined the many various avenues that possibly could be opened to it from all the points of view contained in the hon. member's question.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister then tell the House why it is possible for the Province of Alberta to place royalties on gas and oil being exported from Alberta to other provinces, why they can do it with gas and oil and we cannot do it with electricity?

AN HON. MEMBER: Because we have a contract.

MR. NEARY: No, we do not have a contract, not for taxes.

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

MR. PECKFORD: It is very, very difficult to answer that question as His Honour has pointed out you are talking about some constitutional law there that I would not be able to reply to with great accuracy or depth or knowledge. I could only point out off the top of my head which means nothing I suppose, the Alberta situation as it relates to minerals, I do not know if you can do the same thing with hydro power, number one point. Number two point would have to do with the existing agreements on the contract, existing statutory agreements which are not the same case as one finds with the royalties being charged by the Province of Alberta on minerals or oil and gas on land.

So these would be some of the points which would differentiate the position relative to the export of power in Newfoundland as opposed to the royalty charged on minerals or oil and gas in Alberta. So I think these are two points which would -

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The original questioner, a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the Minister of Justice then care to tell the House whether or not there is anything in federal law or provincial or in the agreement itself between Churchill Falls Corporation and Quebec Hydro that would bar Newfoundland from imposing a royalty or an export tax on every kilowatt of electricity going into the Province of Quebec?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would have to repeat what I pointed out earlier and that is the quite strict rule with respect to asking a legal opinion or an interpretation of the law. An hon. member cannot ask for an interpretation of the law.

Now I realize the hon. gentleman's question, part of it dealt with a different matter and part of it could well be regarded as an interpretation of the law. In that it was not that then obviously it is in order, but that aspect of it would not be.

MR. NEARY: The part, Sir, I think Your Honour is referring to that does not deal with interpretation is there a federal or a provincial law barring this Province imposing the tax. And the other

MR. NEARY: part about the agreement I will drop.

Can the minister tell us if there is anything to bar?

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize the hon. minister, in my understanding that would be an interpretation of the law, the first two matters referred to by the hon. gentleman. The third matter, I do not recall exactly what it was.

MR. NEARY: I was asking the minister, Sir, if he could tell the House if there is anything in the existing agreement between Churchill Falls Corporation and Quebec Hydro that would bar Newfoundland from imposing a royalty or an export tax.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, all the matters raised in that question surely fall into the category of the interpretation of law. I think that every hon. member would agree that it most assuredly would not be in the public interest of this Province for me or for any hon. minister to comment on a matter that is presently before the courts, to some extent, most assuredly before the courts -

MR. NEARY: That is not before the courts.

MR. HICKMAN: - most assuredly before -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: It is not before the courts. Do not be so foolish.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: - most assuredly before the courts, Mr. Speaker, and I for one will not place myself in a position where I can be accused of giving away -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I have to hear the hon. gentleman on a point of order I will return to the hon. minister after.

MR. HICKMAN: Right.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. He states it is in front of the courts. The question that is in front of the courts is the question of recall of power. The question of -

MR. HICKMAN: Oh! I thought it was the interpretation -

MR. STRACHAN: The question of hydro power is not before the courts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: On that point of order I do not think it is necessary to give a ruling. It would appear to be a difference of opinion as to what specifically is before the court.

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: I was under the distinct impression, Mr. Speaker, that in the statement of claim there was some reference to the contract, but I have not seen it for a month and I may be wrong. But let me repeat, that it would not be in the public interest of this Province for any hon. gentleman in this House to give the slightest indication to Quebec Hydro or the Province of Quebec as to what various ace cards and trump cards we may have up our sleeves, and I certainly will not be the one to tell them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The original questioner on a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I want to ask the Minister of Justice then, in connection with Western Labrador, if the government have looked into the possibility of imposing a tax or an annual licence on the earnings of Labrador Mining and Exploration Company or Canadian Javelin who are simply taking money out of Western Labrador and providing no function or contribute nothing to the production of iron ore in Western Labrador?

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

MR. HICKMAN: That question more properly, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is for my colleague the Minister of Mines and

MR. HICKMAN: Energy. My recollection is there was legislation went through last year covering that point.

AN HON. MEMBER: Two years ago.

MR. HICKMAN: Two years ago.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been called.

MR. SIMMONS: I wanted and I believe another of my colleagues wanted to raise a supplementary on the preceding question. I would love to hear the answer to this one but I submit it is a new question and I hope that after we can return to a supplementary on the preceding question which related to the Churchill Falls power as opposed to mining production.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to whether it was a supplementary or not, there is no specific definition of it. It is a question which arises out of the previous answer. I think it would be fair to say in a wide sense it was supplementary they both deal with royalties. In a very strict sense it would not be in a wide sense it would be. It has been asked and if any hon. minister is going to answer it he may do so.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I was just going to say it is a tax act which I think is administered by the Department of Finance. But there was an act put through two years ago which levied taxes on LME and any other company who acted as an intermediary where they had acreage which they then rented out to a company who then explored and sold the produce. So as of two years ago this administration, in another one of its many moves to try to get additional income out of resource development for the people of this Province, passed that legislation and we are now receiving revenue from that company named LM and E on the basis of that legislation so that they

MR. PECKFORD: now have to pay for the rights that they have under that acreage, Labrador Mining and Exploration Company.

MR. SPEAKER: I have one further supplementary.

MR. NEARY: I am dissatisfied with the answers given to me by the two ministers and I wish to debate the matter during the late show on Thursday next.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. Hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: The minister answered that he did not know whether in the province of Alberta there was any relationship between the province of Alberta and this province in resource taxation.

MR. PECKFORD: I did not say that.

MR. STRACHAN: Could the minister indicate whether his government has looked at the resource taxation of other provinces in relation to the Hydro question, and whether there is any similarity between the taxation that could be levied on Churchill Falls power?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: The line of questioning is such that under advice from my colleague, the Minister of Justice and knowing other ramifications of it, I am not in a position to answer that question and I think any answers would only lead to supplementaries which would then place me in a position of answering questions that perhaps are not in the best interests of the province at this particular time.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am dissatisfied with the question and wish to debate it on the late show.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to supplementaries, I just wish to find the exact area here- Standing Order 31B and there has been some discrepancy in the practice of the House, there has not been a total consistency, perhaps it should be clarified- 31B "In the discretion of Mr. Speaker, a reasonable number of supplementary questions arising out of a Minister's reply to an oral question may be asked by any Members" There is a definition there of a supplementary, a supplementary is referred to as "a question arising from the previous answer". Now when the previous answer has been, a refusal to

MR. SPEAKER:

answer or taking under advisement, or requiring that it be on the Order Paper, then it would appear that it would be very difficult for a supplementary question to arise from it. Again, one can interpret 'answer' in the broader sense, in that in by saying, I do not wish to answer it, an answer has been given. I do not think that that is the sense in which it is meant. So, it would appear to me—I realize our practice has not been consistent and it probably should be clarified and it would certainly be my understanding that a supplementary is a question arising from the previous answer, and that 'answer' there does not mean reply in the broadest sense, including "I do not wish to answer" but means a specific answer or a substantive answer to a substantive question, I just do that to clarify the matter, that does not preclude an hon. gentleman from asking a question on the same subject. The hon. member from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SPEAKER: A Point of Order.

MR. HICKMAN: I should raise it at the earliest possible opportunity. The hon. member for Eagle River asked a question of my colleague, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy which under Your Honour's earlier ruling this afternoon, proper ruling, is clearly out of order. It was an interpretation of the law as it exists to the right of taxation and the imposition of royalties in other provinces, 'vis-a-vis the province of Newfoundland. The hon. gentleman then, and that was the reply given by the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy. The hon. gentleman from Eagle River, then indicated that he was dissatisfied with the answer and would give notice of his intentions to debate it on the late show Thursday next.

MR. RIDEOUT: He gave notice he wanted to debate the question.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, the question and/or the answer, I do submit to Your Honour that if the question is out of order, it obviously is

MR. HICKMAN:

not debatable on the late show on Thursday. It could not be, it could not conceivably be.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the rules clearly provide that it is not even necessary for a member to give notice of his dissatisfaction verbally provided he does so, provided he gives to Mr. Speaker notice that he intends to raise the matter on the adjournment. It is not required, Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Could we have some order and less —

MR. HICKMAN: Chit-Chat.

MR. SIMMONS: - jabbering by the member for St. John's Center.

MR. HICKMAN: It has been a hard week.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting that I am of the opinion or the rules are clearly of the statement that a member does not even have to give oral notice. All that is required is that he give notice to Mr. Speaker that he wishes to debate the subject matter of a given question on the adjournment of the House on the following Thursday. So whether or not my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) was procedurally right a few moments ago, it is immaterial to this right to give notice to Mr. Speaker of his intention to raise the matter on the adjournment of the House next Thursday.

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order.

MR. NEARY: I believe the point of order raised by the government house leader, the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General, relates to whether or not a question was asked and an answer was provided. Well the question was asked and the answer was provided. If I understood the minister correctly what the minister said was, "I have been advised by the Attorney General and the Minister of Justice not to answer that question because it can only lead to further supplementary questions," and then the minister said a few other things. Then when the minister sat down my hon. friend said, "Well I am not satisfied with the answer." But there was an answer. Whether it was good, bad or indifferent there was an answer given by the minister. My hon. friend objected to the answer and wishes to debate the matter and that is his right under the rules of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Before I hear the hon. member for Lewisporte. I would point out before recognizing him that a decision on this matter does not have any practical effect until next Thursday and there is no need for me to give a decision today. I in all probability will not. But I do not wish to preclude any hon. member from submitting argument.

The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out Standing Order 31 (g) which says nothing about the answer, Mr. Speaker. All it

MR. WHITE:

says is, "A member who is not satisfied with the response to an oral question," It does not say the answer to an oral question. All it says is the response.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think we have lost sight of - you know I am only raising this for future guidance. I am not raising this facetiously. The arguments that have been advanced from the opposite side of the House are in connection with the procedure. I did not raise it on a question of procedure. It is a substantive question, namely, if any hon. gentleman asks a question that is out of order - it is clearly out of order, it is contrary to the rules -

MR. NEARY: If it was out of order, why did not Your Honour rule on it?

MR. HICKMAN: If an hon. gentleman asks a question that is out of order and the fact that someone does not rise at that point does not mean that it is now in order. That was taken care of yesterday very ably by the hon. Leader of the Opposition when he put his argument there. What I do suggest is, and the practicality of raising this is that we have but three questions to debate on a Thursday and if we find by Tuesday that these three slots have been filled, it is highly unlikely that some other hon. member is going to give notice of dissatisfaction only to find then on Thursday afternoon that, say, question no. 1 is out of order.

It was only for the orderly, tidy, well organized House that we have seen this session that I asked the question. I commend my colleague from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) for his excellent co-operation which has resulted, in my opinion, in by far the most effective session of the House we have had in many, many years, to date.

MR. NOLAN: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order.

MR. NOLAN: I feel to some extent we are now moving into an area, I suppose, where we are now using up our Question Period time. That is item one. Is there any possibility of now having those concerned

MR. NOLAN:

get together with the Speaker after the House closes to -

MR. SIMMONS: The minister was putting you on. He is trying to kill time.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, I am aware of that. I was going to go on and continue that I appreciate the remarks of the hon. leader opposite but I can only tell you if you listen to the catcalls on my side that any compliments from him to me is the kiss of death. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that I have heard a sufficient variety of arguments and that over the weekend in consulting the authorities I shall be able to give a decision by Monday.

I believe the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir had been recognized when the point of order came up.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question. I will not call it a supplementary so as not to repeat the hassel of a few moments ago. It is a question on the same subject. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice and Intergovernmental Affairs a question. Would he indicate whether the government has sought legal ^{advice} ~~advise~~ on the constitutionality of a resource tax on, an export resource tax, on Churchill Falls power?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the answer is this very clearly and definitively; that insofar as seeking legal advice on all of our rights, and all of our options with respect to the control and taxation of our resources we have been fortunate enough to have presented to us the advice of, I would hope, the most competent constitutional lawyers in Canada. And may I add before the hon. gentleman rises to his feet, there is no conceivable way that legal advice is going to be made known to anyone other than to the Government of Newfoundland. It would not be in the best interest of our people for the Government of Quebec to be made aware or even get a hint as to what that legal advice is.

MR. NEARY: Does the hon. minister of the government know what it is?

MR. HICKMAN: And I have that advice, and I can assure this hon. House that whatever the outcome of all of our problems, difficulties, and in the future it will not be for lack of adequate legal advice we do not succeed. I think we are going to succeed anyway, but that is far as I can go, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Despite whatever it is, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: One further supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I also wish to give notice that I am dissatisfied with the answer, and wish to debate it on adjournment of the House.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I on this point of order, I make a point of order before we lose sight of this. I do say that would again fall into that category that the House is seeking Your Honour's advice in ruling for next Monday.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no such point.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I understand the minister has raised a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: I understand we are discussing the point of order raised by the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I clearly heard the minister say, the first several words of his response was "This is the answer." Therefore there can be no dispute that he was giving an answer. He was not declining to answer it, he was giving an answer. I am not satisfied with the answer, Mr. Speaker, and under 31 (g) I am giving notice verbally which I shall confirm in writing to Mr. Speaker that I wish to raise the matter on the adjournment of the House. I believe that is my right, and I do not believe it is open to any interpretation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Kilbride.

MR. R. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of Treasury Board, Mr. Speaker. The question concerns the strike at the Waterford Hospital.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: There is a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To interrupt the hon. gentleman then, there was a point of order up which very closely related to or developed from the previous point of order. I have informed the House that I would give a decision on that on Monday. This procedure does not take effect until Thursday. Frequently there are more than three notices and the Standing Orders provide how they are to be determined, if it is cut down to three. Yesterday there were four, one was eliminated. So that point of order will be decided Monday.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. NEARY: - I have a question for the Minister of Justice.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman to my left was in the midst of

Mr. Speaker:

a question when I interrupted him.

MR. NEARY: I thought there was a point of order before the House at that time, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Pardon?

MR. NEARY: I thought there was a point of order before the House, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: It may well be that I did as well, but the hon. gentleman was in the midst of a question and it would be wrong for him not to continue it.

MR. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The question is to the President of Treasury Board in connection with the strike at the Waterford Hospital, Mr. Speaker. Bearing in mind that things seem to have reached an impasse in that particular strike, I would like to ask the minister if there is any initiative that he could take or his department could take to bring the parties back to the bargaining table in the hope of some sort of reconciliation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: The difficulty is, Your Honour, as I understand it that the unit at Waterford refuses to discuss any part of the package, wages or anything else, until such time as we, government, concedes completely on their demands on the pension area. Government is not in a position to give that concession. We are willing to sit down at any time, anywhere, I have indicated that before, and any advances that we can make in that direction or any moves, that we can make in that direction we would be only too happy to do so. But unless the other side agrees to sit down and discuss the area then there is very little that we can do at the present time. We have already made concessions in the pension demands. We have sent them a list of people whom we felt, and I explained it a few days ago here in the House, and I do not want to go into it again,

MR. DOODY: it is all recorded in Hansard. Those people who were employed prior to 1960 and 1960 on and so on who may have been working under adverse conditions and so on we are willing to concede that point and go along with it. That apparently is not sufficient. But if the union wants to come in and sit down or if they want us to go over there and sit down we are prepared and willing and anxious to do so at any time that it is available. Certainly the worse thing in the world that we could have is a strike, in my opinion, at Waterford and we would like to get it cleared up and cleaned up as quickly as we can. But we cannot obviously concede to the union everything that they demand without even sitting down at the table.

MR. SPEAKER: Time for one further question, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice, Sir. Would the minister tell the House if fuzzy busters that are being used by operators of motor vehicles, put on their dash, it is some sort of an electronic device to detect radar traps and so forth.

AN HON. MEMBER: What do you call them?

MR. NEARY: I think they are called fuzzy busters. And they are being sold all over St. John's. Is it legal to sell these fuzzy busters and to use these in Newfoundland? Is there any law against it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, how many times has Your Honour had to rule this afternoon on an interpretation -

MR. NOLAN: This is a legal opinion now.

MR. HICKMAN: - on an interpretation giving a legal opinion. So I will not answer it from the point of view of the legality of it, other to say that if there is any question as to the

MR. HICKMAN: legality of it I am sure that every hon. gentleman in this House, and lady, will want us to move promptly and quickly and would enthusiastically support any legislation to cure any defect which may exist.

MR. NOLAN: Answer the question.

MR. HICKMAN: But I was just told by the hon. the House Leader I am not permitted to answer an interpretation of the law.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, now do not spoil the beautiful relationships.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes that is right and there is not a question of whether there is a law, the question was put to me whether under the law this is now prohibited.

MR. NOLAN: Is there a law?

MR. HICKMAN: And may I say to those who buy them and to those who sell them in what is an overt attempt to try and defeat the Newfoundland Constabulary in their determined effort to enforce traffic laws in St. John's, and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to enforce traffic laws throughout the Province, they will not succeed and they should be condemned for it. And I condemn them right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1, the adjourned debate, the hon. member for Ferryland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I finished off yesterday afternoon after a very short period of time I had covered a few items of my remarks and I will just very briefly run over them again.

They were as follows: there was some road work in the Cappahayden-Renews area, artesian wells in different parts of the Shore which are badly need^{ed}, sewerage and fire hydrants in Petty Harbour, the promise of a stadium which I elaborated

MR. O'BRIEN: on yesterday evening, the medical clinic for Ferryland, the Witless Bay Line and some repaving on the highway going through the Goulds area and down into Petty Harbour, and that is basically where I ended off yesterday evening.

What I want to talk about now for a few minutes is the employment picture in the district and I am pleased to say that it appears to be pretty good. We are fortunate in that we have four fish plants pretty well centrally located throughout the district.

AN HON. MEMBER: Keep going.

MR. O'BRIEN: Right. Okay. You are ready. As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, we have - it is too bad we have not more people sitting in the House. But anyway I guess I will have to do the best I can, Sir.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, we do have four fish plants centrally located in the district and one of those is at Fermeuse and that employs, Sir, about 250 people, mostly full-time.

AN HON. MEMBER: We do not have a quorum.

MRS. MACISSAC: No quorum.

MR. O'BRIEN: Where are all the people? Are they not interested in my speech or what?

MR. SPEAKER: We have a quorum. The hon. member for Ferryland.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope I do not come out of this with an inferiority complex. But there is not much danger of that. But anyway as I was saying, I was talking about the amount of employment that we have in the district. I think we are rather fortunate for two reasons. One of course, being as we have the fish plants there and the other being our geographical proximity to St. John's. We have a fish plant in Fermeuse which employs some 250 people, mostly seasonal but probably a little less in the Winter months. But - rather basically it is full-time, I am sorry, 250 people. Down at Tors Cove we have another plant there which is seasonal which operates for about six or eight months of the year. And that employs 150 people. Newfoundland Quick Freeze in Witless Bay, an additional 200 people. Bay Bulls Sea Products in Bay Bulls an additional 150 people. And then from the district working at the National Sea Products Plant in St. John's there are about 100 as well working there and that is full-time. That comes to some 800 people, Mr. Speaker. That of course obviously has a big impact on the district.

As well, Sir, we have approximately 350 full-time inshore fishermen and they prosecute just about every type of fishery that is available to be prosecuted. They start off generally in the Spring of the year with the salmon fishery that begins May 15. And they have all got a lot of salmon nets. So they prosecute that for about a month. Then they generally start their cod trap fishery and some of them use gill nets. In the Fall of the year then they all use hook and line or trawl lines, if you like, which is a very good way to catch fish in that you get a good quality of fish. It is not like gill nets. It is a much better product.

And of course like down in Petty Harbour again they have got a different type of a Fall fishery altogether. They all use hand lines. It is just the individual baited hook and they do really well at that. But of course there is a special reason for that in that down in Petty

MR. O'BRIEN:

Harbour, Sir, they only have a small piece of fishing ground. It is only about the size of two city blocks. If they were to put trawls or gill nets on that there would only be room for probably one or two men.

MR. MURPHY: Whereabouts is that?

MR. O'BRIEN: Oh just about a half mile outside the harbour.

So what they agreed to years ago - I think they were very wise people to have agreed to it, that is that they would not use any trawls - this is back forty years ago. And when the gill nets came along about fifteen or twenty years ago they agreed as well they would not use any gill nets because if they had well they would have ruined their fishery.

So the 350 fishermen, full-time, they are all doing very well, Sir. They are getting a good year's wages out of it. Granted there is always room for improvement. They are all getting adequate unemployment insurance stamps. I do not think there are any of them worried about the possible change from eight weeks to twelve weeks contributions and that goes for the plant workers as well. Also there are four or five dragger crews fishing mostly out of the Burin Peninsula plants, mostly from the Ferryland-Renews area of the district.

MR. O'BRIEN: I might add also, that although those plants are in Fermeuse, or in Witless Bay or in Tor's Cove, they draw workers from all of the settlements in between. There is not a settlement but there are people working in one plant or another out of it. Of course, also there are some 600 to 800 people from the district, mostly from the Northern end of the district but all the way through who work in St. John's full-time, all heads of families - well mostly all these people are heads of families - and they are working year-round with different branches of government both federal and provincial and on construction work and so on.

So, of course, then there are a good many jobs in the district that you might call miscellaneous types of work, school teachers, garage workers, Department of Highways workers, small supermarkets and stores and so on. So all in all I think we are very fortunate in that there is very little unemployment, or rather, people who cannot get jobs, at least seasonal jobs in the district.

I do not really have any figures to back this up but I believe that probably the least relief or social assistance money in any of the fifty-one districts, probably the least of all is handed out in the district of Ferryland.

MR. MURPHY: You mean able-bodied.

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, able-bodied, Sir. We are quite proud of that and quite pleased with it and we realize that we are fortunate to be in that position and we do not relish the people who are less fortunate, in a more awkward position. So that speaks for the employment situation in the district.

As well, there is not only talk it is pretty nearly a reality now, that the federal government, the Federal Department of Fisheries are going to spend a large chunk of money in Bay Bulls on this fisheries marine base. They have expropriated the old Royal Canadian Navy Base that was in Bay Bulls and I have been talking with some federal people and

MR. O' BRIEN: they hope to - they are surveying up there now and have been all Fall. They are still surveying and they are hoping to start wharf construction this coming Summer. There will be a large wharf affair going in there capable of tying up ten or a dozen ocean going ships. These are going to be patrol vessels for the 200 mile limit and there will have to be, of course, land facilities as well for supplies and repairs and oil storage and whatnot. So we are very optimistic in the Bay Bulls area that that could come to be a great employer. I might add as well that the old Navy base, the wharf is gone, the buildings are all falling down and it is a terrible eyesore anyway.

MR. WOODROW: A criminal act.

MR. O' BRIEN: A criminal act to let it fall down, right. Thank God it looks like it is now under way and about time, and it is good.

This year as well, of course, we are nearly overendowed with LIP grants along the Shore, we have some fourteen, plus we have a community stage which is going to be built in Renews which is going to come out of the Provincial Treasury out of that \$200 million, I believe, we talked about earlier. The LIP projects, I will just briefly run over them, are as follows: In Cappahayden there is a church and a community centre going in for \$33,660; in Renews there is a community stage, that is the provincial one, \$75,000; in Fermeuse there is a slipway and a storage shed. The slipway is for pulling in and out boats and the storage shed for repairing boats and engines and fishing gear and whatnot and for probably salting fish in as well and selling fresh fish out of.

Also, small craft harbours are putting \$20,000 into that as well which brings it up to a \$100,000 project. Down in Port Kirwan in Fermeuse, a small settlement down the North side of Fermeuse, there is a community centre being built there for \$37,400; in Aquafort another slipway and workshed for \$83,095. In the community of Ferryland they

MR. O' BRIEN: have three projects: One is a community stage for \$47,788, they are relocating a garbage disposal site which is going to cost - they are going to get \$71,000 for it. I do not know where they are going to put it for that kind of money. It seems to be a big pile of money for to relocate a garbage dump but, of course, you never know.

MR. O'BRIEN: They have got a softball field and recreation area going in Ferryland as well, for an additional \$30,540. In Calvert a playground and general recreation area for \$31,500, that is the playground and general recreation area for Calvert. In Cape Broyle they are putting in a sports centre for \$62,600. Bauline Burnt Cove.-St. Michaels area, that is just to the south of Tors Cove, a ball field and parking lot and improvements to a community centre that they built last year out of a LIP grant and they are going to get \$41,663 for that. In Tors Cove they are building a new community centre which is going to double as a hall as well. Their hall was in bad shape there. And they are getting \$85,680 for that. In Witless Bay, playground facilities and a swimming pool for \$57,120. In the Goulds and in Petty Harbour; in the Goulds they are getting \$50,000 for general community improvements and that means I believe, Sir, cutting brush around the edge of the roads, cleaning up the drains and the general tidying up of the area. And in Petty Harbour they are getting \$90,000 for the same type of a project.

So they are going to have plenty of money to spend this Winter and lots of employment and of course, as I said, there were some people, not many but some, who could not get any work in the Summertime or were not around or were too lazy to go, or the weather was too hot or something. At least they will get work now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like for just a few moments to go and say a few words about the joint venture that we have on at this present time between some West German company or companies and a couple of Newfoundland fish companies and indeed the Newfoundland provincial government.

MR. O'BRIEN:

The joint venture itself, I realize that the fish that is going to be caught, is going to come out of, not our quotas but the West German quota and, of course, that cannot be all that bad for Newfoundland. Most of the work is going to be done on the factory ships, done with machines, I presume, most of it and the fish will be frozen there, in blocks and brought into the different companies in Newfoundland to be thawed down and reprocessed, I think mainly only deboned and repacked into different smaller packages probably and eventually shipped back to Germany again. I do not see how that can be bad as long as it is not our quotas, which everybody claims, the provincial government and the federal government, say it is coming out of the West German quota.

So that in itself is a good thing, but I only hope that in the near future, I know the West German quotas have been dropped and all the European quotas have been dropped and dropped sharply, but, Mr. Speaker, they are going to have be dropped a whole lot more sharply. In fact, I would hope in the near future that they will not be coming here at all, at least for a number of years until our stocks build back up to a reasonably good sustainable yield. And surely goodness it is not in very good shape now, and when all of these countries, their quotas have to be dropped from tens and twenties and thirties of thousands of tons down to eight and ten thousand tons, so it must be in bad shape to have to drop their quotas at all, so I just hope they can drop them even further.

AN HON. MEMBER: I believe that is a good move in the right direction.

MR. O'BRIEN: Oh yes, but we have to go further with it, we have got to go a whole lot further with it. This year, at the present time, the European fleet is out here now, the West German fleet is only eighteen ships at the present time out here, and

MR. O'BRIEN:

they did have a lot more than that. The European fleet this year on our eastern coast of Canada, will be some four to five hundred ships. And back in the 1960's in the late 1960's would you believe that they had 3000 ships out there, 3000, now it is down to 400 to 500.

AN. HON. MEMBER: It was like a city out there.

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, it was like a city to say the least. So there is room for improvement here, but I really think we are working in the right direction. I believe as well that the inshore fishery, of course, as well as the deep-sea, I think the inshore is certainly equally as important as the deep-sea fishery because really it employs many more men and because every small community or just about every small community, all around the island of Newfoundland and up the coast of Labrador, there are people fishing out of these small and large communities, in small boats and longliners and what-not, and it is a big employer.

Mr. O'Brien:

If the inshore fishery drops, you know, we are going to be in big trouble. Because I believe really as the outport way of life goes in Newfoundland so goes Newfoundland, and if the inshore fishery goes the outports are gone and what have you. You cannot send them all off to Toronto, they all cannot go to Labrador City, surely goodness they cannot all come to St. John's, so we have got to maintain the outport way of life, and if we do not salvage the fishery what is left of it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. O'BRIEN: It is gone, and Newfoundland is gone with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: More power to you, boy! I could not resist that boy!

MR. O'BRIEN: Back in 1972, 1973, 1974 and 1975 in that area we had severe ice conditions up on the East Coast of Labrador, generally up in the Hamilton Inlet Bank area, and that in itself proved to be a great conservation measure - and this is not just for my own conclusions or viewpoints I got these figures from Federal Fisheries, some of them, and they tell me that in 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, that area in there, that severe ice conditions seriously curtailed the fishing of the European fleets, the ones that fished so well through the ice. They had grave difficulty, they had a lot of ships damaged, they lost a lot of time and consequently they did not go any way near to getting their quotas. And I could see the difference last year, I am in the fish business myself, I am not very big in it, I am not National Sea Products or anything, but I make a living at it. And in 1976 the amount of fish that was available to trap fishermen, and inshore, that is, the hook and line man in the Fall of the year, it was substantially increased over the year before. And in 1975 there was a substantial increase over 1974. So it is gradually getting a bit better.

Now, Sir, with the 200 mile limit which came into effect January 1, and hopefully with severe ice conditions as well, and the

MR. O'BRIEN:

quotas being cut down I am hopeful that maybe 1977 might be even a better year again.

MR. MURPHY: You still believe that the inshore fishery is still a very, very important part to the fishermen.

MR. O'BRIEN: Oh, Sir, every bit as important as the deep-sea fishery, and the fishery in general as far as Newfoundland is concerned. As far as I am concerned it is the most valuable resource we have. It is the only real one to talk about. Oil might be a good possibility, gas might be a good possibility, but how long are oil and gas going to last for, that is if it is there at all. But fish will last if we take care of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. O'BRIEN: So gentleman I thank you very much for your time and that concludes my remarks for now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from the Bay of Islands.

MR. L. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like at the outset of my remarks to congratulate the hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations on the part he played in bringing to a successful ending the strike in Labrador City. His sincerity and human and psychological approach no doubt played a big part in bringing this strike to an end.

I would like also, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the hon. member from Kilbride (Mr. Wells) who gave so eloquent, and may I say, so instructive a speech in this hon. House of Assembly. And I also congratulate the member from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), he is not here at the moment, but he certainly deserves a lot of credit for the sincere manner in which he spoke also.

And last, but not the least, the hon. member from Ferryland (Mr. O'Brien). It is always a chore to make a maiden speech in this hon. House of Assembly especially to people who did not have the privilege in earlier life or earlier vocations to talk in public. So I enjoyed every word he said, and he certainly is a sincere member of the House of Assembly.

Mr. Woodrow:

Now as I continue on into my few remarks I will be critical of some people, of some hon. members, and be praiseworthy of others, but whatever I say I hope I will try to be sincere and try to do some

Mr. Woodrow:

good for the people of the Province of Newfoundland, and for the people of the Bay of Islands district whom I have the honour to represent in this hon. House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, may I at the beginning of this second session of the Thirty-Seventh General Assembly of the House of Assembly of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador avail of this opportunity to congratulate the three members elected on June 30 in the by-election, namely, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) for whom I have great respect, and the member from Exploits (Mr. Twomey) whom I knew since 1947. Believe it or not we both were at that time stationed in Harbour Breton, on the South Coast of Newfoundland, and Harbour Breton then was not as prosperous as it is today. We worked in two different capacities down there, he worked in curing bodies, and I worked in the healing of souls.

I also want again to congratulate the member from Ferryland (Mr. O'Brien) on his election also. And, of course, I cannot forget my good old friend the member from Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe), he waived for awhile, he finally made a decision, and I hope he made the right decision.

MR. NEARY: He came across. He saw the light!

MR. WOODROW: It must be very dark on the other side for him also.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I was impressed by the protocol surrounding the opening of the session, and if I get a little bit dramatic I hope you will excuse me. As the guns saluted the arrival of Her Majesty's representative, and also the very fluent manner in which he delivered the Throne Speech, and also the dignity of His Gracious Lady, not forgetting the representatives of the St. John's Constabulary, and the representatives of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and also the judges of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland. The Chamber was also crowded with such high dignitaries of the church, as the

Mr. Woodrow:

Metropolitan Archbishop of St. John's, the Most Reverend Robert L. Seaborn, who was a good friend of mine when I was over in Corner Brook. The appearance of all of the above mentioned, not only outlined the dignity of the House of Assembly - this is probably a point I should emphasize - but should remind each member of the special role that he has to play as a representative of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth the Second, and also the important trust placed in every one of us by the people who sent us here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: Okay we cannot talk against Her Majesty in the House of Assembly.

I would like to congratulate the Premier, too bad he is not here in the House today, for the efforts he has made over the past five years to get the Province on an even keel, after inheriting such a monstrosity. And you know I just read this, this morning, I was reading last night a book called Beyond The Road, it is a book about the Northeast Coast of the Province, and these are words of Andrew Elsworth, Rocky Harbour, it would be really worth reading today. "After we got Confederation fishing seemed to slack up, Joey, our Premier, well he told them to burn their boats, he would have four jobs for every man he said. On the whole though Confederation was a good thing, but a lot of people took advantage of it."

MR. WOODROW: I hope to speak at length, Mr. Speaker, on as many of the various departments as I can, of course, with the time that we have at our disposal. I would like to say that I was under the impression that this session, after witnessing what we had last year, would be different from last year.

But when the Leader of the Opposition spoke - I am speaking now on the opening of this hon. House of Assembly, the day it opened - I was convinced if he opened out in the same old way under such decorum and protocol as we had here on opening day, he would not restrain himself on the days to follow. Certainly this has been continued in the House.

His Chief Lieutenant from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir even called the hon. the Premier a liar and this, in fact, is brought out in the first copy of Hansard which says; "Direct lie".

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Your Honour well knows and the members should know, Sir, that it is against the rules of this House to call another gentleman a liar, and if the hon. the member for Burgeo Bay d'Espoir did slip over the line I am sure the hon. gentleman apologized and had to retract his statement, Sir. So if the hon. member is going to quote from Hansard he has to quote the whole episode involving the hon. member for Hermitage-Bay d'Espoir and just not quote out of context. That is another rule, Sir, that we have to follow in this hon. House.

MR. PECKFORD: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is a foolish and specious point of order. The hon. the member for Bay of Islands was pointing out and quoting from Hansard on a statement that was made by an hon. member on the other side of the House. It is quite in order and the hon. gentleman was continuing on with his speech and he has said nothing that breaks any of the rules of the House. It was a foolish and specious point of order.

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

I think the point of order raised by the hon. the member for LaPoile is an exceptionally good one. Because had the hon. member who was speaking continued to read the rest of that particular incident in Hansard he would have seen that the point of order was raised, that my colleague from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir had done what Your Honour had required of him to do and that, in effect, what the member from Bay of Islands is doing, and I am not saying deliberately so, he is leaving the wrong impression with what actually occurred.

MR. NOLAN: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I have to rise and it is not often that I do to interrupt any hon. member, especially new members in the House or my hon. friend opposite who does not speak too often, and so I do so with some regret. But I am sure that in a sense of fairness he would want to leave the right impression not a wrong one in the House. As hon. members have stated, what happened on opening day, if something was said that might have been out of order in any way, there was a retraction that is recorded in the Hansard of that day and our hon. friend opposite in his remarks did not indicate that.

He mentioned something that happened or allegedly happened, whether it is exactly the way he said or not I will not get into an argument or attempt to at this moment. But I feel, Mr. Speaker, that no one in the House can call someone else a liar. I believe there is some parliamentary way of getting around it one way or another that has been used in the House of Commons or, at least in Westminster. I believe it is parliamentary in exactitude is the term.

AN HON. MEMBER: Terminology.

MR. NOLAN: Terminology, I am sorry.

AN HON. MEMBER: Terminological.

MR. NOLAN: Terminological inexactitude, right.

But anyway the fact is that I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this will be - we cannot let this go and we will continue to stand on

MR. NOLAN: points_of order or any other
privileges available to us in the House unless this is corrected.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may just speak to
that point of order. I do not know what all the discussion
is about. The hon. member just quoted something that was said.
No one can deny what is said. It is like if I go over and
give you a punch in the mouth and I say I am sorry afterwards.
But I did punch you in the mouth and saying I am sorry did
not cure your bleeding nose or anything else. "This statement
was made by him that it was a direct lie that the Premier told."
That is all the gentleman said. I mean, he can go on and say
look he went over forty-seven times and he told him he would
take him out for a drive around the park and he said he is a
lovely fellow, but it does not alter the statement that was
made by the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. PECKFORD: He was just quoting that.

MR. MURPHY: He was just quoting that. That is in Hansard. If he wants to he can take off copies and give them to everybody to see, the aftermath is not a part of it.

MR. SPEAKER (Young): Order, please!

I feel this is just a difference of opinion between two members and the hon. the member for Bay of Islands was quoting Hansard.

MR. WOODROW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is just another example of how time is wasted in this hon. House. I did not have time to finish what I had to say but I will do it now about this particular thing. That is another example.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Young): A point of order has been raised.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, raising points of order and points of privilege in this House is not a waste of time.

MR. WOODROW: I have an answer to that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you are not allowed to slander or libel another member of this hon. House. And if the hon. gentleman was quoting my hon. friend out of context, and if that had been allowed to stand on the record, Sir, that would be slander.

MR. MURPHY: It is on the record.

MR. NEARY: So therefore all we were trying to do -

MR. WOODROW: It is on the record already.

MR. NEARY: - was set the hon. gentleman straight.

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

I think again it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members and I feel sure that if the hon. member for Bay of Islands is allowed to continue he may clarify his statement.

MR. WOODROW: This was certainly uncalled for, Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: What was uncalled for? What was

MR. NEARY: uncalled for?

MR. WOODROW: I consider the Leader of the Opposition -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Young): Order, please! A point of order has
been raised.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One of the sternest rules of
parliamentary procedure is that when a matter is disposed of in
a session it may not be revived for the remainder of that
session. It may be referred to in the session that follows
afterwards. For instance, what happened in this House last
year, in the session last year, may be referred to this year
but what has happened in this House this year and been disposed
of, it is still open, if it is still not settled, if it is still
not voted on, not adopted, then of course, obviously the debate
goes on. But once it is disposed of you cannot revive it in
the same session.

 Now what happened on opening day was
a motion that a committee be appointed to draft an Address in
Reply to the gracious Speech from the Throne. To that motion
an hon. member spoke, another hon. member spoke by way of
seconding it. On this side of the House the Leader of the
Opposition spoke and the Premier closed the debate and the vote
was taken and the motion was carried, it was disposed of. It
cannot be revived in this present, current session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order:
The hon. member has said that the vote was taken and the matter
disposed of. That is not so. It cannot be so. We are even now
debating an amendment to the Address and Reply.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No we are not! No we are not!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WELLS: What are we doing then? Mr. Speaker,

MR. WELLS: what are we debating? I am sure we are on an amendment to the Address in Reply and that is the matter that was begun on opening day was it not with the Speech from the Throne?

MR. MURPHY: That is right 'Bob', sure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to that same point of order. On opening day a piece of business was proposed, there was a motion. It was proposed and seconded, and two other members of the House spoke to it, and the motion was put and carried and disposed of, that a committee be appointed.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now subsequently the committee that was appointed brought in a report -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. LUSH: That is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - an Address in Reply. That is what is being debated now, not the motion that a committee be appointed to draft the Address in Reply. We are not debating that now, we cannot, it is not permitted under the rules, and what happened in that debate cannot be repeated in this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Young): Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: To that point of order. I have to take some issue with the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood). My understanding of the rule is that when a matter has been debated and disposed of it cannot be debated a second time during a sitting of the House. For instance, we recently passed thirteen bill; the subject matter of these bills cannot be commented upon or debated again during this session of the House. As I understand it the exchange and the points of order that have been raised at this time is that the hon. gentleman from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) is not attempting to debate what was debated on opening day but simply referred to an attitude of behaviour and a comment that was made -

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is debate. That is debate.

MR. HICKMAN: - and that I do submit is not debate,
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course it is debate.

MR. PECKFORD: No it is not.

MR. SPEAKER (Young): Order, please! I feel the hon. the
member for Bay of Islands is debating -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Young): Order, please! - debating the sub-
amendment and I will ask him to continue.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG) Order, please!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. I would suggest to Your Honour that you leave the Chair and ask his Honour, the Speaker, to take the Chair and hear this point of order, and give a ruling. I would suggest this sincerely, because the whole House knows, and I had been a strong supporter of Your Honour's appointment, I voted for it, I spoke of it, but it is understood that Your Honour is not an authority on parliamentary procedure, and whereas his Honour, the Speaker, is, he is probably the best Speaker Newfoundland has had for fifty years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER: Vexatious!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! If the hon. member from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) feels he would like to challenge my ruling he has ways and means to do it. Thank you.

Carry on the hon. member from the Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: If the hon. members feel that they are going to try and stop me from working for the people of the Bay of Islands, Newfoundland, in this House of Assembly they have something else coming to them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY: Carry on 'Luke' you are doing wonderful.

MR. WOODROW: I consider the Leader of the Opposition to be a very intelligent man.

MR. MURPHY: The truth hurts.

AN HON. MEMBER: Raise your eyeballs.

MR. WOODROW: But it is unfortunate that he is doing his very best to destroy the Liberal Party in our Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What?

MR. WOODROW: And, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you -

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

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

MR. ROBERTS: Is that why you did not run for us 'Luke'?

MR. WOODROW: Yes.

MR. NOLAN: Is the Liberal Party, I mean is this what we are supposed to be debating in the House now, and about the Leader and so on?

MR. J. CARTER: Anything is relevant. It is all relevant.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is your point of order?

MR. NOLAN: This is the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I rise again, we are apparently—we have now cleaned off one member of the Opposition here by indicating certain things, and now we are on to another one. I mean is this the way we are going to continue this debate?

SOME HON . MEMBERS: Shocking!

MR. PECKFORD: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. It has become an established practice in this House that on the amendment to the Address in Reply or on the Address in Reply it can be and has been for the number of years that I have been in this hon. House a wide-ranging debate in which members address themselves to all kinds of issues, doing with their districts, doing with the economy, doing with political parties, the whole gamut is covered in this kind of a debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: And the hon. member from the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) surely in that context is not out of order, and there is ample precedent for the last four or five years to substantiate that very point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Young): To that point of order.

MR. NEARY: I would like to submit to the House, Sir, that my hon. friend has a valid point of order: Sir, whether - Mr. Speaker, Your Honour knows that you cannot attach motives to what any member of this House might or might not do. If the Leader of the old-line

Mr. Neary:

Liberal Party, Sir, is destroying the Liberal Party, if he is destroying the Liberal Party, and I doubt if he is, well then, Sir, that is attaching a motive to why my hon. friend is Leader of the Opposition, and under the rules of the House you cannot do that.

Now the hon. Leader of the Opposition may in fact be destroying the Liberal Party, I do not know. He may be doing it accidentally, the hon. gentleman may not know he is destroying the Liberal Party, but, Sir, the hon. member -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: - cannot attach motives to what the Leader of the Opposition is doing or not doing.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I feel that the point of order raised by the hon. member from St. John's South (Dr. Collins) was not a point of order, but in this debate you have a wide-range -

AN HON. MEMBER: Conception Bay South.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Conception Bay South, I am sorry - of debate, and I will ask the hon. member for the Bay of Island to please continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House would be sincere -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. WOODROW: I happen to know what happened at the convention they had at Cona Beach during the Summer.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order, Sir. The hon. gentleman is still questioning the motives of members of this side of the House, Sir, "If we would be sincere." If that is not questioning our motives, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is. And I submit, Sir, that you try to set the hon. member straight.

MR. F. WHITE: No problems in your district?

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I take strong -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker I want to speak on that point of order. I take strong exception, I think my motives are as sincere on this side of the House in representing the people of Baie Verte-White Bay as any hon. gentleman on that side. And I demand the hon. member over there to retract that statement, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker to that point of order. My recollection is, and I have to confess I was writing something here, but the hon. gentleman from the Bay of Islands was not even given the opportunity to complete his sentence, he started to talk about if the hon. members are sincere, and he was interrupted right there, he may have gone on to say, are sincere in their purpose which I know they are, -

MR. RIDEOUT: This Kona Beach what has this got to do with it?

MR. HICKMAN: - you know. And may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, I have heard some rather vicious attacks

MR. HICKMAN: on the policies and the programmes of parties -

MR. WHITE: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

MR. HICKMAN: I am just hearing one now from the hon. the gentleman from Lewisporte (Mr. White).

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Let us get on 'Freeman' for God's sake.

MR. SPEAKER (Young): I will ask the hon. the member for Bay of Islands to please continue.

MR. WOODROW: I regret, Mr. Speaker -

MR. RIDEOUT: On a point of order. We would like to have a ruling on the point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Young): I feel it was not a point of order but just a difference of opinion between two members and I will ask the hon. member for Bay of Islands to continue.

MR. WOODROW: I regret, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition Leader chooses to act this way, but being Leader I suppose it is his prerogative.

Mr. Speaker, to say that the P.C. Government did nothing since coming to power five years ago is like an ostrich hiding its nose in the sand. I have a word of praise for the member for Baie Verte-White Bay, which I appreciate - I do not know whether I should give it to him or not, you know.

MR. PECKFORD: Go ahead, give it to him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: What?

AN HON. MEMBER: Give it to him. Give it to him.

MR. WOODROW: I heard the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) a month or so ago, maybe about six weeks ago now, praise the Minister of Mines and Energy for some good done in his district. In fact the member went up in my estimation. I wonder sometimes of all hon. members on this side is there any good they can do?

MR. RIDEOUT: I will criticize them when necessary too.

MR. WOODROW: Really I think we should give credit

MR. WOODROW: where credit is due.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now - I must say, it is becoming very, very interesting. I am amazed at the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) -

MR. J. CARTER: Shocking!

MR. WOODROW: - a member who is supposed to be trying to great Newfoundland and trying to help everybody.

MR. J. CARTER: Disgusting!

MR. WOODROW: I do not know what he has against me, I have no idea. But he is trying to silence me because I am respected in my district. I would ask him to come over and run against me in the next election.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): Order, please! A point of order has been raised.

MR. NEARY: I am not trying to silence the hon. gentleman, Sir. The hon. gentleman has the same rights and privileges as any other member of this House. The hon. gentleman must realize, Sir, that he cannot attach motives to my behaviour or my actions in this House and that is what the hon. gentleman is doing, and I ask Your Honour to ask the gentleman to retract and apologize.

MR. J. CARTER: How about silencing yourself?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The point has been raised as to whether the hon. the gentleman for Bay of Islands is casting aspersions upon the conduct of the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) as a member of this House. As far as I could hear there may have been a difference in the hon. member for Bay of Islands' interpretation of remarks made by the hon. member for LaPoile, but I did not get the impression that he was spurning the hon. member for LaPoile as a member of the House or in any way casting reflections upon his

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): conduct as a member.

The hon. the member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted I am not here just out of high school, but I am here with a lot of experience behind me.

MR. J. CARTER: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: That is the reason why I feel I can speak and speak, in fact, intelligently on behalf of the people who sent me here. That is the reason why I am here.

MR. J. CARTER: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Give us the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

MR. WOODROW: Let me now speak about my own district, the district of Bay of Islands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: To say that nothing has been done is utter nonsense. I am just going to point out a few of the things that happened since I became member. In fact, I could speak of what happened since September 1975, but I am just going to go back over 1976. I have a word here to say - I have this written down to say to the Opposition if I get a chance before I finish.

On the North Shore of the Bay of Islands last year, there were \$210,000 spent on recapping and paving and \$35,000 was spent on paving the shoreline road. By the way, that is in Halfway Point. I would like to ask any hon. member is this nothing?

Mr. Woodrow:

A salt depot and a highways depot employing sixty-five people including four mechanics at a cost of \$85,000 was constructed. Actually the depot is in the hon. Minister of Education's district, but is bordering on mine. Now this does not include the many dollars in regular maintenance jobs, especially in the field of snow clearing.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should at this point, in trying to thank sincerely the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications, who I find to be a hard working man, I do not know if there is anybody in the Province of Newfoundland, in any field, who works harder than he does.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: I do not even know if the hon. the former Premier worked as hard as he does.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: Not only, Mr. Speaker, do I thank the hon. the minister but I also thank the workers over there, in fact, I will be coming to this later on in my few remarks. I want to say that we had a very, very difficult Winter over on the West Coast of the Province, and the employees deserve every praise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: They were out, in fact, at times, Mr. Speaker, when none of us would dare go out.

MR. SIMMONS: They were well paid to do it.

MR. WOODROW: And I have kept - well if they have they have been trying to work for their families and their children and so on.

MR. SIMMONS: They deserve more pay.

MR. WOODROW: Well perhaps they do, perhaps they do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again I want to ask is this nothing or is it negative? Nothing! Now I have a very little mild reminder, a little mild criticism of the hon. member from St. George's (Mrs. MacIsaac), you know, I really, - it is the worse thing I want to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame! Shame!

MR. WOODROW: It is the worse thing I want to do. Maybe the member from Stephenville (Mr. McNeil) as well.

MR. SIMMONS: Go back to Bristol.

MR. WOODROW: You would love to get me there I know that.

AN HON. MEMBER: I would not be with you.

MR. WOODROW: Pardon? You would not win my district either, and I challenge you to come over, hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: I heard the member from Stephenville and St. George's say that -

MR. SIMMONS: On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. WOODROW: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, let him go - no I am sorry about that.

Mr. Speaker, the member has badly misinterpreted what I said. I was saying only that I would hope he would get another trip to Bristol very soon, he performed so admirably the last time over there. I hope he goes far and soon.

MR. NEARY: And the Minister of Justice take him away.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, may I first of all draw to Your Honour's attention that the hon. member from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) did not say anything. The hon. member from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir was not even within the confines of this House, he was standing outside, as is his right, with a cup of coffee -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: - in his hand, making some rather unkind remarks toward the hon. gentleman from the Bay of Islands. And I say it ill-behooves that hon. gentleman to now come into this House and rise on a point of personal privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. member like to have all of this televised?

MR. HICKMAN: I would not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It would impress Newfoundland would it not?

MR. HICKMAN: No, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Especially the jaw breaker the hon. gentleman is chewing on.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! This is getting towards the end of the week and towards the end of the day, and I would think that the decorum of the House, perhaps naturally, has declined a little, but I would feel that we should not let it decline too far. I do not believe a legitimate point of order is before the Chair, so I would ask the hon. member if he would care to continue with his remarks.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, quite separate from what I just made. I was out of the House just now when the member for the Bay of Islands was making, I understand, some statements in reference to me. I do not know whether they can be called allegations or not.

MR. SIMMONS: These remarks have

just come to my attention, Mr. Speaker, and -

MR. WOODROW: It is in Hansard.

MR. SIMMONS - I give notice now, Mr. Speaker, that once I have procured a copy of the transcript and had opportunity to look at it, I intend to raise the matter if the need arises. But it is the first opportunity I have had to raise the matter because I was absent from the House when the apparent attack was made on me. I would hope that the member would have seen fit to do so when I was in the Chamber. I was unavoidably absent, but that notwithstanding, I shall reserve the right to defend myself once I have seen the information from Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): Order, please! It is quite in order for an hon. member to request another hon. member if he will yield temporarily for him to make a remark in explanation and that is what happened on this occasion so I will now ask the hon. member for Bay of Islands to continue.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, the cameras were here, they will certainly see how negative the Opposition are, trying to put a member down who is trying to work for his district. If it is unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw it also.

In any case I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that I had some mild remarks, little mild criticisms to make about the member for St. George's (Mrs. MacIsaac) and the member for Stephenville (Mr. McNeil), and it was concerning remarks that I heard, it was long, not long, a few weeks before the session opened, concerning the Department of Transportation and Communications. The remarks went something like this; I may not be quoting verbatim, but they mentioned the outdated and the outmoded equipment used in the Bay of Islands area, in general, and in the Stephenville-St. George's area by the Department of Transportation and Communications. So I contacted the Department of Transportation and Communications and I enquired as to where

MR. WOODROW: the members got their information, and I was told, not from the Department of Transportation and Communications. Yet, anybody can go and obtain this information. So I have here, Mr. Speaker an outline of all the equipment used in the Bay of Islands area, in the Stephenville area and in the Stephenville area. The Stephenville-St. George's area, I guess.

Now I am not saying that it is all 1976 equipment, but I think we should bear in mind that last year, yes it was last year, \$4 million was spent on capital in acquiring snow equipment for this Province and I understand \$5 million will be spent this year. So, at least, I suppose we can say that this department and the administration in general are trying to do their best in the trying times that we are going through.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, another little title called "Snowbelt". I go along with all the members from the Western part of the Province, the member from St. George's, from Stephenville, from Port au Port and from Humber Valley, Humber East and Humber West and -

MR. NEARY: And LaPoile.

MR. WOODROW: And Lapoile. Right you are!

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: - and say that, in fact, we are living on the West coast of the Province, we are living in literally a snowbelt. In fact, Corner Brook is compared to a snowbowl.

MR. RIDEOUT: You should come out to Baie Verte.

MR. WOODROW: Well, the hon. member, it is his duty to work for his district and to speak on behalf of his district and I hope he will.

AN HON. MEMBER: You will hear it when I get up, do not worry.

MR. WOODROW: Yes, I know. And the hon. member probably will be critical too. But I would ask him not to tear down the good things he has already said.

So I feel that there should be much more equipment but I suppose, like everything else, there is only so much money to go around.

Mr. Woodrow:

I for one certainly feel that we certainly should have a lot more equipment than we have.

I have a lot of stuff to say I must say, Mr. Speaker, and I am just wondering what point I should make next. Yes, I must now come on to - I am going to speak first about news releases. You know sometimes the hon. members, and especially the Cabinet ministers and the hon. the Premier are accused on this side of the House of not doing anything. Well I happened to get yesterday the number of news releases given by members on this side of the House since January 23, 1977, and they amounted to 400, this does not include releases made on weekends, on public holidays, and on special features, in fact, it gives another example of how the members are working. Also, I might add, probably for the sake of the hon. member from Baie Verte, that a lot of news releases - I know I have made a lot from Corner Brook, and I am sure that other hon. members of this House of Assembly are doing the same also.

So what I am trying to find out really, and I regret that the hon. member from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) is not in his seat now, yes, I consider him one of the greatest members, unbiased, in fact, sincere, that ever sat in this House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: I regret that he is gone. But what I am trying to bring out is this, you know, that we are sent here, we are sent here by people -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: - when people elect us they have confidence in us, they have faith in us, and imagine any of us coming here and wasting the time of this House of Assembly and not trying to help the people who sent us here. That is what I am trying to bring out, Mr. Speaker. I think we should try to the best of our ability not to be conniving, not, for example, to be huddled together saying, "How am I going to get after the Minister of Finance? How am I going to get after the Minister of Justice? The minister of something else?"

Mr. Woodrow:

That is not the way to do it. The thing, in fact, to do is try to be constructive.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has only five minutes left. Sir, I am satisfied to give the hon. gentleman leave to carry on for an extra ten or fifteen minutes if he wants to finish his speech.

MR. WOODROW: Thank you.

Mr, Speaker, now I would like to go on again to the matter of water and sewerage, and I want to say I am with any hon. member on any side of this House who is trying to get water and sewerage for his district. I need it in my district. I need it very badly. In fact, really, when I heard the petition that was presented - there was a petition presented from the Straits of Belle Isle and a petition presented from Fortune Bay a couple of days ago in the House, well this is what came to my mind, what was done between 1949 and 1956 to bring water and sewerage to this Province? It should have been started, in fact, many, many years ago, but I hope now it is not too late. In fact, it is a very, very important thing because there are still many places in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador where we cannot get a sample of clean drinking water. And I wish that we had this year in the budget, I wish we had \$75 million, I wish we could fulfill every member's need because perhaps at the present time the greatest need today in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador is for water and sewerage.

MR. WOODROW: Now I have been, I suppose, very fortunate. I am really not pleased with all that has been done in my district, but I had, like any other hon. member, I had to go to the Ministers of Provincial Affairs and Housing, especially the former minister and to the present minister, who is sitting, I see, at the present time, I had to go to them, I had to beg them. I tried to make my case as sincere as possible and I come back, I think, to what I said last year. There are fifty-one districts in this Province and we are not going to bring water and sewerage to all those district in a matter of years. It is going to take God knows how many years.

But I just mention here now last year. In 1975-1976, we had Cox's Cove which has become, in fact, an outstanding place in the district of the Bay of Islands. We had something like \$341,000 and there has been a contract let of late, in fact, it was only let there about, I do not know even if it is awarded yet or not, of \$77,000 to put a main pipe, I suppose you could call it, through the community. In McIvers, following up the North Shore, we received \$100,000 and again last year \$25,000, \$125,000 and I think this has been spent relatively good. Gillams \$100,000 and \$30,000 which makes \$130,000. I really have to give tribute to the councils in all my communities. I try to work with the councils I do not try to work against them I try to work with them because they are the governing bodies in the communities.

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): Order, please!

I just want to remind the hon. member that he has approximately one minute left to wind up his remarks.

The hon. the member for Bay of Islands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

MR. WOODROW: Do I have leave, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): Does the hon. member have leave? The House must give unanimous consent.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): The hon. member does not have unanimous consent so he has one minute.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, have the points of order been considered in my speech?

MR. MURPHY: The clock does not stop.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): The hon. member has approximately one minute, that is the correct time.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I had many more things to say. I had many projects about CN and about various other things in the district, about the flooding in Badger, Mr. Speaker, and so on. But I think it is very, very small to see one member refusing to let another hon. member continue even by leave.

Mr. Speaker, I know I do not have it and I thank you very much.

MR. SIMMONS: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to give the member leave if I can have the same privilege.

MR. J. CARTER: Certainly! You always do.

MR. SIMMONS: All right! But otherwise, he has had his forty-five minutes and I am prepared to be restricted to the same amount of time.

MR. WOODROW: You will be given it.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): Order, please! As the hon. member has finished his remarks now I feel that it would not be productive to get into a long discussion on the point of order so I would call upon the next hon. member to rise.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am now in my twenty-fifth year as a member of this House. As a member of the House this is my twenty-fifth year. Then before ever I became a member I was a newspaper reporter, a parliamentary correspondent, to put a fancy title on it, covering the sessions and the sittings of the House of Assembly. Of course those ten years were

MR. SMALLWOOD:

in the old Colonial Building. So that I have had now thirty-five years personal experience of this House of Assembly. I do not know that there are many other members of the House whose experience goes back that far or that long. I notice no marked deterioration in the quality of the debates in the House today compared with ten, twenty, thirty, or thirty-five years ago. Some deterioration perhaps in some ways but no marked, no considerable deterioration. I say that notwithstanding the fact that I have sat either as a member or as a reporter and heard some outstandingly good speakers participate in the debates.

I have sat in the House of Assembly and heard the great Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond and the great Rt. Hon. Sir Edward, later Lord, Morris. I have heard J.M. Kent, afterwards as you know, Mr. Speaker, a Justice of the Supreme Court. I have heard the superlatively great stump speaker, Sir William Coaker, and of course the Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Squires. More than once Sir Richard Squires told me privates before the sitting began, "Smallwood, watch carefully this afternoon and tell me afterwards what you think." I would listen carefully to anything he said, but I knew he referred to more merely than what he was going to say, some maneuvering, some operation of strategy or tactics and then afterwards we would sit for minutes and discuss it and compare notes.

I have heard Sir Michael Cashin who perhaps in the thirty-five years of my personal experience with this House was incomparably the most effective, the most truculent, the most uncompromising Opposition speaker. Sir Michael Cashin was superb as an Opposition speaker. I can see him now stroll into the Chamber holding his hard hat, his bowler hat in his hand, take his place, bow to the Speaker, sit down and prop the hat on his head knowing as he did, of course, that you must be uncovered when you are on your feet in this House. If seated you can cover, you can put on any kind of hat or cap, any kind of head covering. I do not know if the House is carrying on that tradition. In the twenty-three years when I was first here I saw to it every year that there would be at least one member who would be covered in his place in the House. I hope that tradition is continued. I hope it will

MR. SMALLWOOD:

be done again in the present session. And if no one else does, I will.

I have heard W.J. Higgins who was afterwards, Mr. Speaker, as you know a judge of the Supreme Court, a very, very able speaker, a very, very able debater, shrewd, cunning, effective. And then in a way of the great stump speakers the House of Assembly has ever known, the late W.J. Walsh, William J. Walsh. In those days of course there was no time limit on speeches and Billy Walsh could go on quite literally and without effort hours and hours and hours,

MR. SMALLWOOD: never repeating himself but always with something fresh and challenging to say.

I am reminded frequently of him by my hon. friend to my right, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). He does remind me somewhat of the late William J. Walsh, who by the way was the father of Mr. Bren Walsh at the CBC, and the former magistrate whose name I forget at the moment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Len.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Len, two very abled sons of a brilliant father who was one of the most original, colorful politicians over a period of many, many years.

MR. NEARY: Liberal or Troy?

MR. SMALLWOOD: And then, Mr. Speaker, the great Cyril J. Fox, there was a man who was a lawyer, learned, polished, with a magnificent flow of language, a genuine orator, and yet I have heard Cyril Fox, as a member of the Opposition, indulge in some of the most ferocious language I ever heard in the House.

I remember once he is looking across the floor from the Opposition benches at Sir William Coaker, and saying, "Mr. Speaker, I would myself be proud to lead a mob to tear the hon. gentleman's heart out of him." That is pretty violent language in an elective Chamber.

John H. Scammel, who succeeded Sir William Coaker as President of the F.P.U. was an extremely fluent speaker, fluent and eloquent indeed. But, Sir, of all the stump speakers I have ever heard, James R. MacDonnell, or MacDonnell, of St. George's district, the son of Magistrate MacDonnell, or MacDonnell, James R. MacDonnell. I am not sure how it is pronounced. D-o-n-n-e-l-l I think, MacDonnell, or MacDonnell.

MRS. MACISAAC: MacDonnell.

MR. SMALLWOOD: MacDonnell it is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I remember his first speech, by the way he was elected as the Liberal in 1919 under the leadership of Sir Richard Squires. And before the House met he crossed the floor. He did not wait for the House to meet, he crossed the floor before it met and when it met on Opening Day he took his seat and continued to hold his seat in the Opposition benches.

He was absolutely the most violent speaker I have ever heard. Major Peter Cashin was mild compared with Jim MacDonnell and any hon. members who have heard Peter Cashin in his prime will find it a little difficult to believe that there was once a member in this Chamber who was even more violent in his language and wonderfully eloquent and wonderfully sincere.

MR. MURPHY: Nish Jackman was very mild.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nish Jackman was extremely mild. Nish Jackman was no_ of course he was not a member of this House. He was a member of the National Convention.

MR. NEARY: ~~He was~~ twice elected to this House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: So he was, he was on the Opposition side, so he was. Well he and I were very close personal friends, very close personal friends. He sat one seat removed from me I think it was in the National Convention and I do not mind admitting that I helped him again and again to get elected to the House of Assembly. And in the House he was one of my warmest friends and supporters, though he never did sit on the same side of the House with me.

Now that was in the House of Assembly before the coming of the Commission system of government. After the Commission left under Confederation and the House of Assembly was restored, we had some magnificent speakers in here, the late Bill Keough, W. J. Keough, who of all speakers I have ever known, coined more

MR. SMALLWOOD: original phrases and words and slogans. He was superb in that. The House will surely remember his famous reference to the last forgotten fishermen on the Bill of Cape St. George. And I remember myself the excitement with which I heard him talk about Newfoundland culture. He said, "We hear of pine clad hills and we hear of Newfoundland culture, well," he said, "I saw a woman in Port au Port district down on the beach gathering up fish guts and filling a brin bag and struggling up the bank with the bag full of fish guts for a little manure for her garden. I wonder, Mr. Chairman," he said,

MR. SMALLWOOD: "I wonder was that part of Newfoundland's culture?"

He was superb. Phil Lewis, the lawyer, Philip J. Lewis, Q.C. was one of the most forceful and eloquent and convincing orators that I have ever seen in this House. The late Captain Uriah Strickland surprisingly turned out to be an eloquent speaker even a good orator. Myles Murray who late became a county court judge, was when he felt like it, which was not very often, a very forceful and eloquent and persuasive and convincing speaker.

On the opposition side, W. J. Brown, the present hon. W.J. Brown was a wonderfully effective, a telling speaker. I myself could never - I enjoyed hearing him - but I never could enjoy another speaker who was wonderfully fluent, who spoke without notes, not from written speeches, but who spoke extemporaneously and whose speeches, as he spoke would appear perfect in print. Now most speakers will break up their sentences, and they will retrace their steps and they will have an occasional blunder in grammar or in construction and so on, not James Green, he was perfect in his style of speaking.

Dr. Fred Rowe, the present senator, was one of the finest speakers in this House after the coming of Confederation and of course I can never forget the speeches of the late Dr. James McGrath, who was Minister of Health in my administration of the Queen's government and who was a magnificent speaker, who commanded great respect from the House and from the reporters and indeed from everyone else. Mr. Speaker, I have sat in this chamber and I heard a number of premiers, I heard Sir Robert Bond, and I heard Lord Morris, and I heard Sir William Lloyd, and I heard Sir Richard Squires. When I heard Fred Alderdice and Walter S. Monroe, and William R. Warren, that was eight premiers, I heard, in this House and then in addition there was, J.M. Kent and there was Sir John Bennett who were leaders, there were ten leaders, I heard in this House before Confederation and before Commission of Government. Since Confederation I have in this House heard a number of other speakers, who were leaders, the late Senator

MR. SMALLWOOD: John G. Higgins was leader, a political leader, a party leader here and Major Cashin was a party leader here, and Senator Hollett was a party leader here, and the hon. gentleman who is now the member for St. John's center was a party leader here, in this chamber, and Mr. James J. Green, who was a lawyer was a leader, and Dr. Noel Murphy was a leader here and the present Premier is a leader here and, of course, the present leader of the opposition. Now that makes a total of seventeen-

MR. NOLAN: And Mr. Speaker. —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Exactly, as a matter of fact I deliberately left the Speaker's name out because I did not want to- he was a leader of a political party and I am not sure that His Honour would want to be reminded of that, he occupies the position so much above the battle here, I said earlier, in my opinion he was the greatest speaker this House has had for fifty years and I have known all the speakers-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Every speaker beginning with John R. Goodess from Carbonear, and W.F. Penny from Carbonear and Cyril Fox and Harry Winter and Sir Albert Walsh before Confederation, and since Confederation Reg Fox and the late John R. Courage. I did not know Mr. Speaker Russell.

MR. NEARY: George Clarke.

MR. SMALLWOOD: George Clarke. That was three in my time. So that I have known every Speaker but one, Mr. Speaker Russell whom I met casually once but never saw him in action as Speaker. I have known every Speaker since John. R. Goodess which carries you back to about the year 1912, seventeen leaders and eight of them Premiers. So I suppose I am in a fairly good position to judge the quality of the peoples' House as it is today, twenty-five years a member, ten years a correspondent in the Press Gallery such as the Press Gallery used to be in those days, thirty-five years. I have known every leader in the House and every Premier since about 1912 and I have spent a number of years here not as leader of the House but as leader of the government.

So I think it will be conceded that I have had a considerable amount of practical experience. I do not think that the quality of the affairs, of the conduct of affairs in the House has deteriorated greatly. I would say that the quality, the average quality of the members on both sides of the House is on the average as good as I have ever seen it. And I have seen the House with Bond and Squires and Morris and Cashin and Higgins and Sullivan and Coaker and Halfyard. I have seen the political giants. I knew them personally and some of them I knew very closely and very intimately.

But leaving out the giants - and of course as you look back you tend to make them more giantish than perhaps they actually were just as the day will come in Newfoundland when surprisingly people will say what a big man this fellow was and that fellow and the other fellow but that will be after we are gone. I believe the average quality of the members, their speaking ability, their attendance in the House, sitting

MR. SMALLWOOD:

in their places - it used to my despair and I quarrelled with my chief whip, whoever he might have been from time to time over his failure to keep the darn members in their places. You go out and you work like a dog to get elected and you plead with people to vote for you, you do everything in the world to get a seat in the House and having got it, you want to spend it out in the common room. Now I do not think they do today what used to be done in the old days, when you would see a minister walk into the Chamber with a sheaf of papers in his hand looking extremely important. He would walk up and he would bow and take his place and lay the papers on the desk and put on his glasses and begin working. He would only come in from outside having a game of forty-fives. But he had to look important as he came into the Chamber. I do not think there is much of that now.

But, Sir, if the quality of the membership has not deteriorated markedly, if the quality of the conduct of the business of the House has not deteriorated markedly, something has deteriorated. That is the amount of attention that the people of Newfoundland pay to the affairs of this Chamber. You know there was a time when about the greatest honour open to almost any man - well to the lawyers the great honour was to become a judge of the Supreme Court. Some how or other - I do not know if it is true or not - but I have the impression the judges lived longer in those days so there are not many changes. Anyhow there are only three of them.

Mr. Smallwood:

It was a great honour that a lawyer could aspire to reach, to become a judge of the Supreme Court, Doctors nothing in particular, Teachers, it was not a great and honoured profession as it has become since, but, Sir, to become a member of the House of Assembly was a thrilling experience, it was a thrilling ambition. I know myself as I sat for ten years listening, watching, I ached, I yearned to become a member. Would the day ever come when I too would get elected and become an MHA. I have had ten universities confer degrees on me, I am ten times a doctor more than any man in Newfoundland's 500 years of history. Sir Robert Bond had two, I think, Mr. Monroe had one, Sir Richard Squires had none, Lord Morris had, I do not know that he had even one, he had a degree that he earned, I mean, he earned academically at Ottawa University, but ten universities, two in one day, Dalhousie and the University of New Brunswick in one day, and I had to be in each University to receive it.

Mr. Speaker, ten university degrees were as nothing to me compared with MHA. As a boy I would dream of it, I would write my name down. Richard Gwynn tells the story because I happened to tell him in his book that he did on me-- as a boy I would write down Joseph R. Smallwood, MHA, and then getting really daring about it I would look forward to the day when I would be entitled to write down Hon. Joseph R. Smallwood, MHA. There was no honour, there was no honour that an ordinary man or some man a cut above the ordinary man, a cut above him perhaps in ambition, a cut above the ordinary man in determination, in his ambition to carve a career for himself, there was no other eminence toward which you could lift or look than to be an MHA. And the reason that was so, Mr. Speaker, was that in the eyes of the people it was a great honour. You were the member, you were the MHA. This is a tremendous honour today to be an MP at Ottawa, is not half the honour that it used to be here in Newfoundland to be a MHA. And today you might also say that none so poor as to do us honour. We fall completely flat in the eyes of the Newfoundland

Mr. Smallwood:

people. They do not look up to us. They do not. They do not look down on us. They do not look. They do not pay any attention to us. We arouse no attention. The people pay no attention. They do to the government because it is to the government that they look for grants, for water and sewerage, roads, paving, artesian wells, and a hundred other conveniences that they genuinely need, they look to the government.

But as for the House no attention. Look at the galleries. I have here now, what, a year-and-a-half is it since the general election, since the House met in November was it?

MR. NEARY: Getting close. No September. September.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No but the House opened -

AN HON. MEMBER: November.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - almost a year-and-a-half ago. And the citizens, the Newfoundlanders who come up in these galleries to see and hear the laws made, to see Newfoundland moulded and shaped by the fifty-two, and there are only out of half a million, there are only fifty-two of us, we are the law makers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Fifty-one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Fifty-one of us. You think they would - no not interested. Look at all at all the numbers of people unemployed.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Why, in the old days the gallery would be jammed, crowded and dozens and even hundreds outside trying to get in. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is not entirely due to a decline in the quality of the conduct of the business of the House. It is due to the fact chiefly, I believe, that we are living in a new world, a different world altogether. You know before there was radio and above all before there was television and before the newspapers had the widespread circulation they do today, in those days the House of Assembly had practically no competition. Nothing competed with the House to attract the attention and the interest of the people. Today the competition that this House meets - and I suppose it must be true all across Canada - I do not know. I do know that in some provinces of Canada they have managed to conduct their sessions as to be marvellously short. I understand that in Nova Scotia, for example, every last scrap of legislation that used to come before the House, that is anything from 100 to 150 bills, every last word of every last bill has been written and printed and prepared before the House opens at all. And with relatively short debates and relatively short speeches the result is they get through in five or six weeks, six weeks out of fifty-two they get through the business.

Then you take up the Halifax papers or the Sydney papers or any dailies in Nova Scotia and what do you find? Jammed, crowded, pages and pages of stories of the affairs that went on in the House. Here was have two dailies, the morning paper and the evening paper. The morning paper has maybe as much as a whole column when it is all put together - at least some days they do - a whole column. The Evening Telegram, the evening paper will have rather more but it would not be two columns. The Halifax Herald, the Chronicle, Mail will have a page, two pages every day. There was a time here in Newfoundland when the papers would be full of the doings of the House of Assembly, full of it, every day be full of it. And the radio take I remember, the Doyle News - what was his name, he had studied to be a lawyer and he gave it up, he went to work with Gerald Doyle, I forget the name, he was a reporter covering the House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Quigley.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, before Mr. Quigley. He had studied to be a lawyer and - oh, I forget. Anyway -

AN HON. MEMBER: Father Tom.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not Father Tom who was my chum and we were on the radio together. I forget.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mulcahy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mulcahy it might have been, a tall man. He reported for the Doyle News and the Doyle News as you know was half an hour. And nearly half of that would consist of a report of everything that happened. So and so presented a petition from such a district. So and so presented a petition. So and so presented a petition. Every petition was mentioned. Who presented it, what district and what it was about. Everything that happened was reported on the Doyle News. Every night you got fifteen minutes. Tonight what will you have? I will tell you what you will have tonight. You will have thirty seconds.

Now I do not blame the reporters for that, I mean the press correspondents, the House of Assembly reporters who come here for their newspapers or their radio stations or their television stations. They are not here, they do not feel that they are here to cover the proceedings of this House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not why they think they are here. They are here to listen, if they can stay awake because some of it will put you asleep. They are here to listen to some striking phrase or some striking sentence or some sensational item, to get maybe thirty or forty seconds that night in an eight or ten hour summary of the news.

Now to start with, if you depend on radio or television to let you know what is going on in Newfoundland, if you do that you are going to grow up a complete ignoramus, are you not? If the only thing you know about Newfoundland's affairs is what you get in the news bulletins you are going to be an impenetrably ignorant person, are you not? Because it is only going to be eight, or nine, or ten minutes altogether. That includes somebody's house burning down, that includes somebody's horse's leg getting broken, that includes all kinds of little bits and pieces, much of it really of no earth shaking importance.

AN HON. MEMBER: About a house burning.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well it is important to the people who own the House. Yes. It is important. But even more important to them is what happens in this House. But the radio stations do not consider it to be their duty. The newspapers, yes to a point. They still consider it to be their duty to cover and report to the people, to their readers the affairs of this House. But the radio stations, no, television to some extent by their "Here and Now" programmes. They will invite two men on opposite sides to come and say something or other. And then there are occasionally other special television programmes.

But in the news, which is what everybody listens to, nothing. What can be done about that?

AN HON. MEMBER: Most of it is sports.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, a lot of sport, a lot of people are interested in sport.

MR. NEARY: We could form a sport in here I suppose.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I suppose it is. We are sort of gladiators. We are gladiators up to a point.

Mr. Speaker, I frankly, very frankly now, this is not wise to say what I am about to say, it is not wise. I am not wise to do it. I am unwise.

MR. NEARY: Do not say it unless you are not going to run again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But frankly, Mr. Speaker, I wonder what I am doing here. Well others may wonder that, but they perhaps are younger, and they have perhaps more years ahead of them than I probably will have, although I may outlive a lot if I follow the tradition in my family. But normally most of the hon. members of this Chamber will outlive me and they will be here years after I have left it. I wonder why I am here.

I have said, often said, and said truthfully, maybe not accurately but truthfully, so far as I was concerned I told the truth, I might have been wrong, I might have been inaccurate. But I was truthful, I have said repeatedly that I am a leader. Now I may be a bad one, I may be a good one, but a leader. And what do you do with a man who has spent twenty-three years leading a whole province, and leading a government, twenty-three years, and he comes back as a backbencher and he follows the leadership of a young man, a lawyer, young, married man, in his early thirties, who was in his Cabinet, and who is highly educated, a cultured, and educated young leader, he follows him. He is afraid to open his mouth to his leader for fear his leader will think, "Oh this fellow now he will tell me where I get off. He is going to tell me what I have to do." I do not dare talk with him for fear he will think that I am trying to boss him or that I am trying to boss the Party.

MR. ROBERTS: - the hon. gentleman unafraid to say what is on his mind.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Normally I am not. Except that I do not like to hurt anyone's feelings. And I never did. I never did.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am the most forgiving christian in this Chamber.

AN HCN. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: But here I am, I believe if I were to confide a secret to you, the secret that I would confide to you is that I think I ought to be the Premier. Now that is a secret. Keep it to yourselves. Do not let that get out.

MR. DOODY: It might get reported to the press.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no,

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are no reporters at this hour, no reporters would be found dead in the Press Gallery, getting up almost at 6 o'clock.

MR. ROBERTS: If they were found there, it would be that they were dead.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, like the famous Union Club in New York. A man was sitting in the comfortable club seat with the paper fallen down on the floor, he was dead three days before they discovered that he was dead. I listen here, I cannot leave the chamber, I am only member of the House in the last twenty-eight years who could not leave the chamber when he was a member, I never leave it, never. No I leave about a quarter, twenty minutes to six because I have a long drive and I try to avoid the worst of the traffic.

MR. NEARY: We often wondered about your bladder.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, a really qualified leader, a leader has to include among his qualifications, certain qualities of the elephant or is it the camel. I cannot leave the chamber and I cannot turn my mind off or my ears. I hear every word that is uttered in this chamber but that is not enough, I would go up the wall if I just had to sit and listen to every word that is spoken, and I do hear every word that is spoken, but that is not enough, so I read and I read and I read and I write and I make notes and I work like a Trojan here every day, I bring up an armful of work to do and never miss a word that is spoken, and I say to myself, is this what God shaped you for, Joe Smallwood, is this it. You are going to spend out the rest of your life as a backbencher, is that what you are here in the House for?

MR. MURPHY: I think you should seek the leadership.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman from St. John's Center advise strongly to seek the leadership of the Liberal Party?

MR. MURPHY: Indeed he would, and the hon. member from St. John's Center would be pleased to go to the meeting and invite an —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well now, I have never in my life accepted the hon. members advice, and I do not propose to begin now.

MR. MURPHY. Vice Versa.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, it is tit for tat. I am supposed to be speaking to an amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Yes, my time is just about up. I am going to vote for it, although to be very candid about it, to be very frank about it, I am very pessimistic about the present state of this province, economically and financially, very pessimistic, downhearted. In all my life if I had not been as buoyant and confident and optimistic as I was, I never well a lot of things would not have happened. But by nature I am downhearted and despondent but at the same time —

MR. ROBERTS: Surely by nature he is not downhearted.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, by nature I am not, but I am downhearted over the state of this province, financially and economically, and I cannot, I find myself incapable, perhaps it is because I am not a young politician just in here for the first time, perhaps it is because I am not a young politician who is hoping to get in the Cabinet one of these days, perhaps it is because I am not working and striving to change the parties so that we can be over there and they could be over here. Whatever the reason, whatever the reason or reasons, I cannot take any joy out of just defeating the government. I think it has become— oh, perhaps I will vote to defeat them, but I would not want to plunge Newfoundland into a general election right now, that is the one thing we can do without for a year or two.

Although, I will say this, if the government, if the Minister of Finance, who is only a spokesman in this matter for the government, if he fails to bring in the roughest and the toughest budget that we have seen here for fifty years, then perhaps a general election would be the best thing to happen. Perhaps to clear the air, to have a fresh beginning, but I am hopeful,

MR. SMALLWOOD:

I am hopeful that the minister will go down in history or up in history as the toughest Finance Minister that Newfoundland has seen, certainly since Confederation. By now the leader of our party is probably wondering what in the name of God is Smallwood doing here in this party. The rest of us want to defeat the government, the rest of us want to get over there and run the show and here is Smallwood saying he is not a bit anxious to do it. But I am speaking the truth as I feel it and as I see it.

I will vote for this amendment. I have forgotten what it is, the exact words of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: This House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: "This House condemns the failure of the ministry to prepare and to present to the House measures adequate to deal with the problems confronting Newfoundland and Labrador today and demands that the ministry forthwith take all measures possible within their constitutional authority to alleviate these problems." Well, I am going to vote for that although I wish it would come after the budget. The right time perhaps for that amendment would be after an unsuccessful budget, a budget which failed to arrange for Newfoundland to get on an even keel financially. That would be the time for that. But in the meantime as I am a loyal party member, a loyal member of the caucus I am going to vote for this amendment. And then I hope - I believe I understand, Mr. Speaker, that I will be allowed, I will have the right to speak on the main motion, the Address in Reply. Well in that I hope I can spell out, although I only have forty-five minutes now - I used to have anything up to five or eight or ten hours but now I have forty-five minutes. And I hope - perhaps that means I will have to prepare a little more carefully - I hope I will spell out my views about the Province and the government and the affairs of Newfoundland more clearly than I have done in this present talk.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

DR. COLLINS: I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at three of the clock provided that if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker after consultation with the government that the public interest requires the House should meet at an earlier time Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied and the House shall meet at the time stated in the notice and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned until that time.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved that the House adjourn until Monday next at 3:00 P.M. provided that if it appears to the satisfaction of the Speaker after consultation with the government that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier time, the Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied and the House shall meet at the time stated in the notice and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time. Those in favour "Aye". Contrary "Nay". Carried.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 P.M. or earlier.