

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1977

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. P. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from some 130 tenants of houses in the housing area in Marystown, and the houses are owned by, leased the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition in brief is that these people object to a raise or two raises coming within the same year. The rates of the raises are between 25 per cent and 30 per cent. As of May 1, the houses, according to their type, some bungalows with basements and duplex houses, their rent was raised between \$25 and \$30 per month. Again in September there is another further raise of \$20 per unit; between \$27 and \$30 on May 1, and a further raise of \$20 on September 1. May 1, September 1, within four or five months the raise will be between 25 per cent and 30 per cent or a little over 30 percent.

The tenants object to the raise. They wrote the Anti-Inflation Board, and the advice that they got back from them was that they should refer their case to the government of this Province, which I now present to the House for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the amount of the raise seems a bit brutal, 30 per cent in one year, and the petitioners claim that, of course, it is far above the Anti-Inflation Board's regulations. Mr. Speaker, those tenants have my unqualified support, and I trust that I will have the support of both sides of this House. Mr. Speaker, there is no need of my even stating this will be a hardship on those people, They are people with, I suppose, average incomes, but with the high cost of living today, everything rising, continuing to rise, I am certainly sympathetic towards this group.

Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that the government will give it consideration, immediate consideration, because

May 3, 1977

Tape 2081

PK - 2

MR. CANNING:

within the letter that I received, and within the petition, it appears that they are prepared to accept the first raise, the one that has already been paid on the 1st. of May, but they ask that the government -

Mr. Canning:

or the department concerned, and the government would give their consideration in looking into this matter and perhaps prevent this second raise which goes on the 1st. of September.

Like I said there is no need of explaining to the House that this is pretty high coming within one year.

MR. MURPHY: Would you mind telling me, please, the monthly charge for these apartments? I want to compare it with Churchill Square Apartments. Is the hon. member aware - you know, he talks about the increases, but I was wondering what the actual monthly -

MR. NOLAN: It depends on the apartments, whether it is a one bedroom or a two bedroom.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, I am just wondering, 'John'. I just want to get a comparison.

MR. CANNING: They do not give the total per month.

MR. MURPHY: I see.

MR. CANNING: They say the raise increase effect May 1, is \$27, and another \$20 on September 1, and they consider this between 25 per cent and 30 per cent of a raise. I think in some cases it depends on the type of house; you have a bungalow with a basement at one charge, and then you have duplex at another, and I am not quite certain but they could have a two storey house, a single unit two storey.

MR. MURPHY: I will check with the Minister for Municipal Affairs and Housing anyway.

MR. CANNING: The figures given to me some months ago when they got this notice, it appeared to me that it was even over 30 per cent, I think, roughly 34 per cent or 35 per cent for the year.

MR. MURPHY: They have had about three raises in Churchill Square in the past year and a half.

MR. CANNING: I do not think it is in accordance with the Anti-Inflation Board. And I am sure that the Premier will give it

Mr. Canning:

his sympathy, because he freely accepted the inflationary measures that were placed on us despite the fact that we are poor and our cost of living is higher. He freely and willingly accepted them immediately, and told the Prime Minister of Canada that he was going to go along with him. But I am sure now when the regulations of the Anti-Inflation Board are broken, or the rules as laid down by the Anti-Inflation Board, I am sure that he will be considerate towards those people and intercede on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I give this petition my unqualified support and ask that it be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I give the petition presented by my hon. friend, the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Canning) my unqualified support, Sir. I have no hesitation at all in supporting the prayer of the petition on behalf of the hon. member's constituents who are complaining about the exorbitant increase in rents, in apartments rented from the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation in Marystown.

Mr. Speaker, this raises the matter again of whether or not Newfoundland and Labrador Housing should come under the Newfoundland Tenancies Board. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing is nodding his approval, I do not know whether the government has it in mind.

MR. DINN: We are having a look at it.

MR. NEARY: The minister says they are having a look at it. Well it is long overdue, Mr. Speaker, that the people who live in apartments and houses rented from the St. John's Housing Authority, the St. John's Housing Corporation, and the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, when they have a grievance they have no recourse to their grievance except to appeal directly to the House of Assembly. They cannot take their grievance to the Newfoundland Tenancies Board, the same as every other tenant in this

Mr. Neary:

Province. The Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, in case hon. members do not remember, are exempted from being scrutinized by the Newfoundland Tenancies Board.

And as far as the Anti-Inflation Board is concerned, Sir, well all Crown corporations in all the provinces unless, unless, Mr. Speaker, and this is a very big unless, unless the government decided to place the Crown corporation by mutual agreement under the Anti-Inflation Board then it is automatically exempt from the rules and regulations of the Anti-Inflation Board. That is unfortunate, because in this Province, I think, the government elected to keep all Crown corporations, government agencies outside the terms of reference of the Anti-Inflation Board.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: So therefore the onus of - yes, Sir, that is true - the onus of responsibility then is on the government itself. The government really then takes the place of the Anti-Inflation Board in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: In rents.

MR. NEARY: Not only in rents, in other things. The Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities is outside the AIB. They take the place of the Anti-Inflation Board in this Province. So the government really takes the place of the Anti-Inflation Board. But where Crown corporations are exempt from the terms of reference of the Anti-Inflation Board, they are expected to live up to the spirit of the increases that are allowed under the rules and regulations laid down by the Anti-Inflation Board, which in this case would be around eight per cent.

So as my hon. friend said, the people are not objecting to the first increase and they are probably not objecting so much to the second increase. But what they are objecting to is the thirty per cent increase. The two increases should not amount to any more than half that, fifteen per cent, when in actual fact the government, the minister, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation have decided to sock it to the tenants in these apartments by adding an additional thirty per cent to their rent in a very short period. And it does not make any difference - Mr. Speaker, I heard one of the minister's say, "Well how much do they pay in Marystown compared to Churchill Square?" What difference does that make? They are getting thirty per cent added on to their rent in Marystown which is upsetting their budget procedure.

MR. MURPHY: Thirty per cent on \$100 is not as much \$200.

MR. NEARY: Well it does not make any difference, Sir. The people who live in these apartments have adjusted to a certain way of life.

MR. MURPHY: I agree.

MR. NEARY: And if you add on thirty per cent over a matter of a

MR. NEARY: period of a few months you are going to upset the whole routine. Whereas the people over in Churchill Square may be paying a little more but they have adjusted to it. That is their way of life.

MR. MURPHY: But they are mostly retired people. I think everybody understands that.

MR. NEARY: Well I do not know what they are, Sir. They are not mostly retired people. I lived over there myself one time.

MR. MURPHY: I know but you were retired sure years ago.

MR. NEARY: I would not consider myself -

MR. MURPHY: Retired from work, I mean now.

MR. NEARY: - to be retired, not yet anyway.

But, Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition and I do hope that the minister and the government will reconsider this matter and roll back these exorbitant increases in rent to a more realistic figure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the minister, who is once again conspicuous by his reluctance to speak on a matter that falls within his jurisdiction, perhaps I could say a word or two in support of the petition.

MR. NOLAN: Who is the minister?

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Municipal Affairs is the minister responsible.

MR. NOLAN: He is right there.

MR. ROBERTS: I know. I said, "In the absence." I know he is in the House, but he is absent - he is here in -

MR. LUSH: He is mute.

MR. ROBERTS: He is mute. That is the word I wanted. I thank my friend.



MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition is I think straightforward and I think it ought to commend itself to the powers that be and I think it ought to be granted. I agree that these Crown agencies ought to be brought under the provisions of the Landlord and Tenant Act. It is quite anomalous that the government are prepared to put all the private landlords in this Province under legislation that sets forth their rights and their obligations and protects the tenants' rights, but is not willing to do the same for itself despite the fact that the government are one of the largest landlords in this Province and in many instances the government are commercial landlords.

The St. John's Housing Corporation may have begun as a development body but it is in now in most ways a commercial operation and there is no reason why they ought not to be subject to exactly the same rules as Your Honour would be if Your Honour decided to go into the rental business. But a more important point is the way in which the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation is run, and here I think the minister has something for which the minister must answer and has not answered in the last two or three months despite the fact the matter has been raised in the House on a number of occasions.

The corporation have advanced as their justification for these raises the fact that their costs have gone up. Now the minister has not had the courage to do that, nor has he had the courtesy even to reply to a letter which I sent to him some time ago about Marystown. He is either too busy or too contemptuous of the business of the House to answer a letter which was sent to him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must point out to the hon. Leader of the Opposition the requirement to confine his remarks to comment on the petition and support thereof but to avoid debate.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honour.

AN HON. MEMBER: Try to be decent.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I would like to be decent and I wish the minister would be decent too and answering one's mail is a decent thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that the Corporation have not advanced to the tenants, have not given the tenants any explanations or any justifications of it. The Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation is another of these agencies that operates as a law unto itself. It may or may not answer to the minister. I know it does in the formal sense. It may or may not in any effective sense. It has made no effort to tell these tenants why their rents must go up or whether the costs are too high or not. We had a long discussion in support of some petitions which came from Stephenville earlier in this session where I

MR. ROBERTS: think there was considerable matter led forward, considerable evidence led forward to indicate that the Housing Corporation was being less than candid in its dealings with the people who live in those particular units which are located on the Harmon complex, and the minister does nothing about it. Well I am here to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the petition is a reasonable one. I think that these people have a right to expect that they will not have their rents raised without explanation or without shown cause. They also have a right that their rents will not be raised quite as quickly. If any private landlord treated his tenants the way in which the government through the Housing Corporation treat their tenants there would be strong speeches in the House, there would be near riots, and I am sure that the Open Lines would be humming with indignation from the same government members - the same ministers who now sit callously by and do nothing at all to alleviate the situation which exists in Marystown and in Stephenville and in a number of other areas throughout this Province. I support the petition, Sir, I hope the minister will respond. I hope he will take some positive action and I hope that he will satisfy what I believe to be a reasonable request made by these petitioners.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of the petition as submitted by a number of people in Marystown, signed by approximately 140 names and an increase of twenty-five to thirty per cent. What we are getting into here with the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, Mr. Speaker, is that the government is really into the retail or the rental business. For example, we have petitions time and time again here in this House on behalf of the people for the situation regarding the power increases. And while we attack the Newfoundland Light and Power

MR. NOLAN: the fact is, if there is fault, if there is, we have to look at Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. Now we are told that this is going to go before the Public Utilities Commission. There is no reason in God's world why the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation should not have to appear before some such board or commission before they are permitted to adjust their rents up twenty-five or thirty per cent. Now how did this increase come about? Did Mr. Vivian, in his capacity of Chairman of the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation, heartlessly and callously decide "Ah, we are going to slap another twenty-five or thirty per cent onto these people." No, that did not happen. The name of the game, Mr. Speaker, and here is how it works, is as follows: (1) The various departments involved at a certain time of the year go to the group that our good old friend, the Minister of Finance, is so proud of - his troops, his battalion of which he is the financial commandant, the Treasury Board. Right? And when the Department of Municipal Affairs goes up with their estimates they are told that you have to cut back \$1 million or \$2 million and so on, otherwise we will do it for you arbitrarily.

Now then there can only be two culprits in this case, Mr. Speaker. It is no good merely going after the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporations, because they are merely the arm or the agents of one, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who has not yet decided to address himself to this problem publically; or secondly, the President of the Treasury Board, who is the Minister of Finance, who sits there now chewing on a hard candy knob or something, whatever he is munching on this afternoon.

MR. DOODY: I do not have anything in my mouth except my -

MR. NOLAN: Gud.

MR. DOODY: Gud. That is all I can afford.

MR. NOLAN: Right. Well anyway, the fact is we are not going to

MR. NOLAN: bring Mr. Vivian before the Bar of the House are we, Mr. Speaker, when we do not need to?

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: It would seem to me that the hon. member for Conception Bay South is ranging into the field of debate and explaining to us, as I am sure all hon. members are aware of anyway, the procedure which is followed by governments in all jurisdictions as to how things are decided. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is really not germane, the remarks that the hon. member is making now, to the Prayer of the Petition which is to indicate -

MR. NEARY: You do not need to cover it.

MR. ROBERTS: It is favourable compared to most of what the minister says.

MR. PECKFORD: - support of a complaint by the residents that their rents are being increased higher than they think is necessary at this time. And so launching into what I would consider to be a debate on the way in which governments go about making these kinds of decisions is really not showing support for or against the petition for which he is supposed to be doing just that.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I might speak to that point of order, I submit that what seems to the hon. minister to be out of order is not therefore out of order. In fact in this case it

Mr. Roberts.

most decidedly is not. Your Honour was good enough to bring me to the straight and narrow when I strayed. Your Honour, I am sure, would have intervened here had my colleague been straying, but he was not. He is supporting the petition. He is doing it in the entirely accepted way of buttressing his remarks, of setting forth a chain of logic, supporting a very strong argument, and I submit he should be allowed to do it without the attempts by the Minister of Mines and Energy to harass him, to throw him off his train of thought. It is only a five minute procedure at most we are allowed to use in support of petitions. My friend from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) is making his argument, Sir. He is not straying in the debate. He is simply explaining the way in which the system works to show why he comes to whatever conclusion he is going to come to. I think that is perfectly in order, Sir. It is not argumentative. It is not debate. It is simply logic. I realize that that may escape the gentleman from Green Bay (Mr. Peckford), Sir, but we should not have to be troubled in the House with that.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order.

As the hon. member for Conception Bay South is aware, in speaking to a petition he is required to comment on it and indicate his support of it by way of comment and not of debate. I would not rule his remarks to this point as out of order. If the subject matter of his discourse were to be something separate and distinct from support of the prayer of the petition, it would be. He has made references to matters not identical with the prayer of the petition, but in my opinion thus far logically related to it. And I now call upon him for the minute remaining to continue his remarks.

MR. NOLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well in conclusion may I say that here we are, and it is the whole point, never mind let us bellyrag the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. Maybe they are at fault, but they are only the instrument of the government, financially the instruments of the Treasury Board and the minister, and they are doing what they are told. It is as simple as that.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the whole point as the minister knows.

MR. NOLAN: The department is going in the hole, jack up the rents. Now that is the name of the game. Now if we have the other agency that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) referred to, who is quite prepared to carry, for example, Mr. Dobbin and his apartments before the board regularly and so on - I am not trying to protect that gentleman. He is quite capable of protecting himself, but what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. And the Minister of Municipal Affairs cannot stand by innocently and mute and let this 25 per cent or 30 per cent go into effect. It is heartless, cruel and brutal in a very difficult time in our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: I support the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, first of all let me compliment the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning) on his presenting the petition in the House on behalf of his 140 constituents in Marystown. It is unfortunate that at this time we put the rents up in several areas in Newfoundland. But before the rents were increased in any of those areas the financial statements were presented to me. I had them checked out and was satisfied that the rent increase was put

Mr. DINN:

on only to recover operating costs. So with respect to the people in Stephenville, I went out there, had a meeting with them, and made them an offer, and I have to do the same with respect to the people in Marystown. The fact of the matter is the rent increase pays only for the operating costs, and we have to recover operating costs. The people in Newfoundland cannot be called upon to subsidize people in Marystown. It is as simple as that. And they have to pay their way as do people in St. John's or anywhere else.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Act, 1975."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I undertook to give to the hon. House the termination and completion bonus arrangements for the Labrador Linerboard Limited staff. The document that I have here to circulate was prepared some time ago and so the preamble might appear to be something less than it should be, but it is the original document. I cannot say if it has been circulated prior to today or prior to yesterday through the mill, but obviously it had been prepared some time ago.



MR. DOODY: The document is prepared here and ready for circulation and I offer it to the House. There are enough copies here for everybody and there are some for the press gallery. I have no doubt that there will be questions and these people in the mill will be asking why this and why not that. There will be anomalies which hopefully we will correct as time goes on. But that is the plan as it now exists.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I want to table the answers to questions that were put to me on the Order Paper some time ago. Answer to Question 5, asked by the hon. member for LaPoile. Answer to Question 25, asked by the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde. Answer to Question 73, asked by the hon. member for Lewisporte. Answer to question 82, asked by the hon. member for LaPoile. Answer to Question 115, asked by the hon. member for LaPoile. Answer to Question 165, asked by the hon. member for LaPoile. I hereby table the answers to those questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to three or four or five questions here. Question 4, asked by the hon. member for LaPoile, dealing with the influenza vaccination programme. Question 1, asked by the hon. member for LaPoile, dealing with abortions and hysterectomies. Question 223, asked by the same hon. member, with regard to the cost of the Carbonear Hospital. Question 235, asked by the same hon. member - member for LaPoile - relating to the Central Supply Division of the Department. Question 236, dealing with Central Supply Division. Question 237, asked dealing with Central Supply.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: A question for the Premier Sir, arising out of the situation at Stephenville. There is apparently a great deal of confusion in the minds of the employees of Labrador Linerboard between two apparently contradictory positions of the Government.

MR. ROBERTS: On the one hand, the government has put forward a severance pay scheme, which the Minister of Finance just mentioned, which indicates to many people that they should go. On the other hand, the Minister of Finance has said they may go or should go. I say to the Minister of Finance many of the employees in my understanding take it as an indication they ought to go, they should go, not simply that they may go. On the other hand, the Minister of Finance has said, and has been quoted as saying and widely reported as saying that we want the men to stay in the mill until the final closedown or the final temporary closedown and even talked of bonuses to keep them to stay there. People generally are just confused. Can the Premier please make a definitive statement to set the matter straight?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The Minister of Finance might want to add to what I have to say, Mr. Speaker. As I understand it, it certainly would be desirable from everybody's point of view I think if people could stay until the inventory is at least completed, until further reports have been received. As I understand it the severance pay is much more lucrative; I think it is six months for those who stay for the completion, for some people, but lesser for people who leave, say, immediately.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, original questioner.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the Premier be willing to go to Stephenville to attend a public meeting to discuss this question and others with the people of the area?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I am always glad to go to Stephenville and meet with the people. I think before we have any public meeting I think it is very important to deal with the people directly involved and work out some of the ground rules so that they and ourselves have some idea of which way we can expect to go and which way it should be done. And at the appropriate time when there is something definitive to be gained by such a meeting, certainly we will do it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary - the original questioner.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier willing to go to Stephenville to meet with the employees involved and to meet with them within the next few days?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I think the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations is out there now, Mr. Speaker, and as I say when these details are -

MR. ROBERTS: That is why they want to meet with the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: When these details are ironed out we will gladly go there, but we are not going there for either the gain of the Opposition Party or ourselves politically.

MR. NOLAN: Some Opposition, how about the people out of jobs?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is a much broader question that I would like for the Premier to straighten out and this is not in any political sense at all. It is a serious matter. But the people in the Bay St. George area, as it was reported to me, feel that the government - and this may sound nonsensical, by the way - that the government announces bad good before it announces the good news, and that people are expecting a multinational company to move in, Consolidated Bathurst or somebody like that. Now I would like for the Premier to lay this rumour to rest once and for all. Is it true?

MR. NEARY: Is it not true? Is there a possibility of a company coming in to take it over? What is the situation concerning this?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I wish it were true but the fact is it is not. There is absolutely no proposal or undertaking by any multinational company. That would be an absolutely criminal thing to do if anyone had it in mind. It is not the case at all. As I have said and I have said many times, and I certainly do not mean to be political here at all, I do not think anyone wanted to see that mill closed. I do not think, whilst there may be differences of opinion, I think great extremes were gone to to try to keep it open and I think that will be proven in the debate here. But that is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that during the four to six months ahead that every effort will not be made, and that there are not possibilities. But it certainly would be very, very wrong to give false hopes to the people in Stephenville at this time.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. I understand the Premier was in PEI yesterday. I trust he had a good trip. But otherwise I wonder would he indicate to the House whether he discussed with his colleagues, the other Premiers in the Atlantic Provinces, the matter of possible co-operation in the hydro area and also if he would indicate what other possible areas of co-operation might have been discussed or were discussed in fact.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The fact was, Mr. Speaker, the reason I was in Charlottetown yesterday was the CBC are putting on a five hour show, I think it is, with various people in the Atlantic Provinces, all four Atlantic Provinces, and one of the hours was the four Premiers dealing with the questions of Atlantic Canada in the future and the various views we had and the various difficulties that could arise in Canada with the unstable situation we have today. One of the

PREMIER MOOPES: subjects discussed was energy, on the programme and off after, and certainly there is a great deal of interest and I think a great deal of co-operation that can be done between the Provinces to have a uniform approach. For instance, the sort of thing that in the national interests, I think a regional grid which would include Quebec as well, but even a national grid whereby energy, whether it is from Churchill Falls or whether it is from the nuclear plant in New Brunswick or wherever, that you have the security of an intertie which a grid provides. This is one of the things that I think there is a great deal of opportunity for in the future, and I think in the national interests the regional grid, whether it goes through Quebec or not, is equally as much of national importance and a national responsibility as was, for instance, the pipeline which also transcends the provincial borders.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. Some press reports I saw this morning coming out of Saint John, New Brunswick quoting the Premier of New Brunswick, Mr. Hatfield. He indicated that the four Premiers had discussed some other possible areas of co-operation. Would the Premier want to inform the House about what other areas were specifically discussed? Not so much in the public forum, the tv programme, but in the meeting that obviously took place among the four Premiers.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOOPES: There was very little that took place that was not on the tv programme, Mr. Speaker, but we were in areas of transportation, areas of manpower training, just about every area in the general sense that affects us all uniformly - unemployment, inflation, the works. But what we were

PREMIER MOORES:

talking about were in areas where we could be mutually helping each other as opposed to go off in different tangents. Newfoundland does have a different situation than the other three Maritime provinces in one respect particularly, I would suggest, and that is that there are a great deal more resources potentially that can be developed on the Island and in Labrador as compared to Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick or Nova Scotia. So whereby priorities - there are mutual priorities, priorities that are mutual. We also have priorities here which are not to the same effect or the same degree as to the other provinces.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, we are aware that the other three Maritime Premiers are involved in a council of Maritime Premiers. I wonder would the Premier here indicate whether his government or whether he has taken a definite decision either to seek an expansion of that council to become an Atlantic council of Premiers or whether there has been a definite decision against such an involvement, and if so if he might state the reasons to us?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Neither, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier, Sir, in connection with the Newfoundland Construction Association which is trying to seek a meeting with the government to get an outline of plans that may help the industry. Would the Premier care to comment on the charges that have been levelled at the government by the Newfoundland and Labrador Construction Association on the low level of activity and involvement in the construction industry this year by the Provincial Government? Would the Premier outline, give the House some indication, will there be any help for the sagging industry this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I am meeting with the representatives of the construction trade I think probably early next week, Mr. Speaker. The situation is that in this Province we had some very large projects, like the Linerboard Mill and like the refinery and like the Upper Churchill, that took a disproportionate number of people into the construction force as opposed to other industries, where at the one stage, I guess it was last year, that forty-four per cent of the gross provincial product and earnings was from the construction industry which was very disproportionate compared to other industries. I think there has to be a levelling out. There is only so much government can do and that has been spelled out very clearly. Whilst I wish there was enough work for everyone in the construction industry, I am afraid until such time as the Lower Churchill or something like that is developed it will be highly unlikely. The other thing is of course that private capital being expended in this Province is very low compared to the rest of Canada, and in Atlantic Canada it is very low compared to the rest of Canada. The construction industry, not like many other industries, say, well what are the government going to do for us. It is unfortunate that we do not have primary resource-based industries that expand and build new factories and so on that could take up some of that slack, but unfortunately we do not.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, after I will recognize the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NEARY: Could the hon. the Premier just give me some clue as to what projects, if any, both federal and provincial - the Premier must have some idea now what federal projects will be going ahead in Newfoundland this year and what provincial projects will be going ahead to help the industry, to help the construction workers get back to work?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I certainly cannot do it in detail, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: No, not in detail. Just give us a general outline.

PREMIER MOORES: Well there is the finishing up of the hospitals you know about, Mr. Speaker, the Health Sciences Complex and the Corner Brook Hospital completions. There is a fair amount of work on DREE roads, on provincial roads. There is no other hospital construction. And there will be water and sewerage, but do not think the projects have been announced as yet, but not to the degree that will be necessary to take up all the slack in the industry here. We are hopeful to get a couple of other DREE agreements signed which will have, I think, serious effect on the construction industry, on the beneficial side of it. And at such time as these projects are ready, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Will these be water and sewerage or roads or what, these new DREE projects?

PREMIER MOORES: Buildings and roads.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know if any hon. gentleman is raising on a supplementary.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. SPEAKER: No. I have indicated I will recognize the hon. gentleman for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: A question for the hon. the Premier. I am wondering if the Premier is -

MR. ROBERTS: We do not get enough of you when you are here, we have to ask questions.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes, dear.

MR. NOLAN: I hate to break up the social. In the news in the last few days there was a report allegedly originating with the Shaheen outfit in New York,



Mr. Nolan.

possibly attributable to Mr. Taube or Tubb or something, and referring to the fact that there may be an announcement in perhaps a six week period on the Come By Chance refinery. Surely, they would not make an announcement without some consultation with the government because of the government's obvious involvement from the very beginning. Could the Premier be good enough to bring us up to date on the current situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The current situation is, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge we have no proposals before us that we can react to and hopefully - well we know people are interested- and hopefully those people who are interested, including Mr. Shaheen, then I will get the proposals in so we can examine what they have in mind.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition, followed by the hon. gentleman for Fogo.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I will give the Premier a question off. My question is to the Minister of Mines and Energy about St. Lawrence. Could the minister tell us whether he has received any indication from the Alcan officials, the Alcan Company as to whether or not they have completed their review of the status of St. Lawrence, which I understand is aimed at determining whether that operation will continue or not? And could the minister tell us if he has received the report or a report? What the decision is? And if he has not received a report could he tell us when he expects to receive it?

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, on Friday, I think, I got a review of the St. Lawrence situation. From what we were told by the company last week they have not made a final decision on

Mr. Peckford.

what they will do at the St. Lawrence operation. There are a number of proposals that they are now looking at that have been done both by the local officials in St. Lawrence and by some people from head office for expanding the operation, expanding the processing of the ore to help bring down the cost. Their problem is one of cost, that the output at St. Lawrence per ton is higher than they can now purchase the same quality processed product from Mexico and other places in the world. So they are looking towards trying to cut their costs, their operating costs. But they have not made a final decision. I understand that the operation as of today, say, or Friday, is good for the end of this year -

MR. ROBERTS: The calendar year.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, the calendar year.

- and that before that time they hope to make a final decision on what they are doing in St. Lawrence. They have indicated that they hope that decision will be forthcoming before June. That is the latest information that I have on it. That is of Friday past. But one of the major things they are trying to do is through an additional processing facility concentrating the rock, to bring the capital cost down which would mean perhaps only another fifteen or twenty jobs, but which would apparently bring that concentrate cost down to a more reasonable level so it is competitive so that the enterprise can remain open.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I thank the minister. Can the minister tell us whether any of these proposals of which he speaks, these possible changes in the operation thus making it more economic and thus more competitive, whether any of these changes depend upon assistance from the government of the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, not at this point in time.

The company has not approached us for any assistance on the business of modernization or expansion or change in what is down there now. About two or three months ago the manager of the operation in St. Lawrence visited me and we talked about -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Gillies.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Gillies, yes.

- we talked about changes that could possibly come about, and I arranged for a meeting with DREE people for him and he went to the meeting. But I have not seen him since.

MR. ROBERTS: DREE do not get into processing, do they?

MR. PECKFORD: No. But there was some kind of clause in one of the DREE programmes that I thought might be applicable, but apparently it is not. But in any case I did indicate to the manager and to the company that we would be willing to look at ways and means of keeping the operation open if they decided that, you know, some major input of money and assistance was need, and we would be willing to look at it. Whether in fact we could do anything for them will depend upon the kind of proposal put before us. In any case Alcan in St. Lawrence and at head office are aware of our eagerness to keep the operation open and of our co-operation in every way to ensure that that occurs.

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell us whether there is any requirement incumbent upon Alcan as the operators of this mine to give any particular degree of notice, any particular amount of time of their notice to cease operations if that should be the result? We do not expect the result. We certainly hope it will not be the result, but it is certainly a possibility and my question is, you know, is there any requirement? Do they have to give six months notice, three months notice, or can they shut it down overnight?

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are two issues at stake here, two points relevant here, One would be the agreement that they have in the ongoing operation there, whether there is anything in that agreement -

MR. ROBERTS: An agreement with their employees?

MR. PECKFORD: - yes - plus whatever the agreement is with the Newfoundland Government and their concession, I do not know if it is in that.

MR. ROBERTS: Their concession is back from the old, old, old days.

MR. PECKFORD: Right. And number two would be relative to the labour laws of the Province and whether notice has to be given under that, whether they come under that. I am just speaking in more of an academic -

MR. ROBERTS: But those specific -

MR. PECKFORD: So to answer your question, I do not know. I can see two points that I am going to have to -

MR. ROBERTS: Re the Termination of Employment Act.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes. Right.

MR. FLIGHT: While you are at it look at Buchans, 'Brian'.

MR. PECKFORD: Yes. Could you just let me finish so that I can keep my train of thought here? However, I have about seven or eight weeks ago written Alcan and indicated that I wanted to be informed as Minister of Mines before any decision was made.

MR. ROBERTS: Was that personally or officially now; we will get the Morgan distinction here.

MR. PECKFORD: Officially. Obviously.

MR. ROBERTS: I just wanted to be clear on that.

MR. PECKFORD: Officially, that I wanted to be informed in the same way that I requested that kind of notice from Rambler just before Christmas and also requested that I be kept fully informed so that I could inform all hon. members of the House and whatever. And so the information flow is the way it should be because in many cases the large companies get -

MR. ROBERTS: As of now he has no definite information beyond what -

MR. PECKFORD: Beyond December 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) I believe is on a supplementary. No. The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans I believe is on supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, supplementary to the Minister of Mines, relative to his answer to the Leader of the Opposition. Has the minister served notice on the operators of the Buchans Mine that he wants the same type of notice pending closedown, and while he is standing would he indicate as to whether or not he has received reports that he was supposed to have received at the end of January with regard to the life expectancy?

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the hon. minister to reply to the question, which I will not rule out, I will just point out that it does not appear to be a supplementary, which rises out of the previous answer. I realize it is related to mining, but the line of questioning previously was in respect to St. Lawrence and I would think it would certainly be preferable, and in a strict sense would be required, that it come as an original question. However, it has been asked so I will call upon the hon. minister, if he wishes,

MR. SPEAKER: to answer it.

MR. PECKFORD: We have been in touch with Asarco, the operators of the Buchans mine, and have ascertained them the latest information as it relates to the life expectancy of the mine which is somewhere between June - July 1979 to December - January 1979-80, depending upon the price of lead and zinc and how that continues to fluctuate, and hopefully it will move upwards.

And of course we are getting updating on a fairly regular basis, monthly to every two months, from Price (Nfld.) on their ongoing exploration activities to see whether in fact they are going to be able to bring on stream some new ore body.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: One supplementary, and then I previously indicated I would recognize the hon. gentleman for Fogo (Captain Winsor).

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister indicate at what level of management he received this advice from, whether it was the management at the New York office or the local management in Buchans itself?

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

MR. PECKFORD: I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, because I requested an official from the department to put together all the latest information and get in contact with the company. When I said company, whether they went to Buchans or whether they went to New York or Chicago or wherever they went, I understand it to be true and factual information and its source is unknown to me specifically at the present moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I had intended to ask a question to the Premier but he has left the Chamber. However I will direct a question to the hon. Minister of Fisheries. Has the minister, or

CAPT. WINSOR: Can the minister inform the House now whether or not there is a set price for lobsters? Has he been able to negotiate between the buyers and the fishermen a price that is acceptable to the fishermen?

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

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, a week or ten days ago I wired the four companies that were involved in the purchasing of lobster from the fishermen of Newfoundland and I expressed some concern with respect to the prices being offered by the four companies for the lobsters. I asked the four companies concerned to provide me with an explanation within so many days as to why the difference between the price being offered Newfoundland fishermen as opposed to that being paid the Nova Scotian fishermen.

Four of the companies have replied to my telegram and have submitted figures in which they have endeavoured to justify the prices they are paying. These telegrams have now been submitted to the Fishing Industry Advisory Board whose job it is to very carefully assess the figures and to provide me with a report, hopefully within a few days, as to their legitimacy or otherwise.

But certainly I am told that in some parts of the Province the price for lobsters has increased while in certain other parts of the Province they are still paying, I think, around one dollar and ten cents a pound.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Conception Bay South followed by the hon. gentleman for LaPoile.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for my friend the Minister of Consumer Affairs. The minister I am sure is aware that there is a group or a board here known as the Funeral Directors and Embalmers, with which the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) our friend

MR. NOLAN: 'Digger' is well familiar.

MR. DOODY: That is not what is really worrying you.

MR. NOLAN: No, not really, but we will get to that later.

MR. ROBERTS: Treasury Board provide the Embalmers with what they need.

MR. NOLAN: We are thinking about putting the embalmers in formaldehyde.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: I would like to get to the minister's question.

MR. SIMMONS: Treasury Board should be embalmed.

MR. NOLAN: Is the minister aware of the fact that the board -

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is that new name for Treasury Board?

MR. NOLAN: What is that now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is that title again?

MR. DOODY: The embalmers and funeral parlours.

MR. NOLAN: The embalmers?

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is that title?

MR. NOLAN: The Funeral Directors and Embalmers.

MR. SIMMONS: That is not the Treasury Board.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that the new name for Treasury Board?

MR. NOLAN: No, they are soaked in formaldehyde.

MR. ROBERTS: Digger O'Dell's goodies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: Could I get to the question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: I would hope that the hon. gentleman will soon direct himself to that.

MR. NOLAN: Well, I am wondering is the minister aware that the Board has not met since August of



- MR. NOLAN: 1976?
- MR. SIMMONS: They are dead.
- MR. NOLAN: At that time that they referred regulations and so on to the Department of Justice and they are still waiting to hear the answer. That they were supposed to have their annual meeting in April past and it has not been held? Do you think the minister could take a shovel to the problem and dig them out and get them to work? Would he give us some information on what is going on with that crowd? Ask his friend behind him over there.
- MR. NEARY: They are all dead on their feet boy.
- MR. SIMMONS: Give it to them 'Ank'.
- MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.
- MR. MURPHY: This is something new to me, this shovelling out undertakers and all the rest. What department does this group come under?
- MR. NOLAN: I believe it might be under the minister's department but I am not sure.
- MR. MURPHY: Well, I do not believe it is so I cannot give the answer. The minister will check it out.
- MR. ROBERTS: It is a consumer affair.
- MR. NOLAN: Well I just thought if it is the minister's department surely I should not be telling the minister.
- MR. ROBERTS: It is a consumer's affair.
- MR. MURPHY: I refer it to the Leader of the Opposition.
- MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile.
- MR. NEARY: My question is for the hon. the Premier. The Newfoundland Command of the Royal Canadian Legion -
- MR. SIMMONS: Good question 'John'.

MR. NEARY: If I can just get a little order here from the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, Sir. The Newfoundland Command of the Royal Canadian Legion are fighting the closing of the Department of Veteran's Affairs office in St. John's. Would the Premier indicate to the House if the government have been approached to join with the Royal Canadian Legion in fighting the closure of this office? And if so, what the Provincial Government is doing about it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, to be very honest I did not realize that the office was being closed. Certainly anything we can do to aid in any representation or anything else to keep it open we will gladly do so and I thank the hon. member for bringing it to my attention.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, followed by the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is just another example of running Newfoundland from Halifax. Would the Premier indicate to the House -

AN HON. MEMBER: Charlottetown.

MR. NEARY: Well maybe it is from Charlottetown this time, but I understand they are moving it to Halifax. But would the Premier indicate to the House if the government, the provincial government have made a list, say over the past five to ten years, of all the federal government offices that have been closed out, phased out in Newfoundland and the headquarters moved over to Nova Scotia, over to Halifax? If

MR. NEARY:

so, what was the result of the survey?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. But I think if an analysis was done I think we would find a great many more, to be fair, a great many more federal representatives here now than at any time in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: A question to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the House whether or not the government is considering selling the fishing lodge on the Gander River?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker.

CAPT. WINSOR: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

CAPT. WINSOR: Will it be called by tender or a set price?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: It will be tender. Hopefully the price will be high enough to accept, Mr. Speaker.

CAPT. WINSOR: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

CAPT. WINSOR: Will the same thing apply to the cabin on the Adlatok River in Labrador.

PREMIER MOORES: The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker, to both questions.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. G. FLIGHT: When is this going to -

MR. NEARY: Would the Premier indicate if both of these lodges will be replaced with other facilities or does the government intend to get out of this business altogether?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: They both may be replaced, Mr. Speaker. They may be expanded, may be torn down. That depends entirely on who buys them and what they intend to do with them.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the Premier be willing to consider the alternative to selling them, disposing of them because they are valuable. They can be terribly valuable for special guests of the government, that the government might bring into the Province from any part of the world. Would he consider trying to put the one on the Gander River, put it on some sort of paying basis so that it would not be a drain on the Treasury but that it could be made in some way or other to pay instead of abolishing it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: After government's experience of running the Linerboard, Mr. Speaker, we have decided not to even get into the lodge business. The fact is that I do not think it is the role of government to get into this sort of thing. And as I said if the tenders are high enough they will be accepted. We are not going to give those lodges they way they are, valuable. They do serve a very useful function.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They do.

PREMIER MOORES: Having said that, Sir, I think it would have to be any arrangement done with those lodges or others, there will always have to be accommodation in the Province for visiting guests from outside, which the hon. member well knows we have a great many of, and which they are very beneficial to entertain.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

HON. W. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the indulgence of the House by leave to revert to Notices of Motion. I had intended to move a resolution relative to the Labrador Linerboard Limited debate, that it is not the intention of government to call the debate today or tomorrow. But we will do it when the Opposition is ready. I was speaking with the Leader of the Opposition this morning and we have agreed to have a briefing session on it and an answer/question period

MR. DOODY:

sort of thing. But I think it is imperative that the resolution does get on the Order Paper. And if I have leave of the House I would like to introduce it.

HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. DOODY: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand it is agreed that the hon. gentleman has leave to give notice of motion.

MR. DOODY: To move: WHEREAS the Labrador Linerboard Limited, a Crown company, has operated the Linerboard Mill at Stephenville since 1973 pursuant to The Stephenville Linerboard Mill (Agreement) Act of 1972; AND WHEREAS Labrador Linerboard Limited has suffered serious financial losses in each year of operation, which loss in 1976- 77 amounted to \$40,900,000; AND WHEREAS a review of the marketing and financial outlook of the Company made by the Province and an Advisory Board of experienced businessmen has concluded that further substantial financial losses will be incurred in future years of operation; AND WHEREAS Government has decided to phase out the operations of the Linerboard Mill at Stephenville; NOW BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House debate the closing of the Linerboard Mill so that government may have the opinions and assistance of Hon Members in its efforts to assist all persons involved in the operations of the Linerboard Mill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What about these things yesterday the minister was going to have distributed to all of us.

MR. DOODY: I sent them up to the Opposition office this morning.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes we have them.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Order (2), Committee of the Supply. The motion is that I now leave the Chair.

MR. PECKFORD: We got fifty minutes to go on Executive Council.

Right, remember? We will go right back to Health.

MR. DOODY: We will go back to Health.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it the other day they were in Health, but Executive Council was put over until - we have fifty minutes left to do regarding Planning and Priorities, Intergovernmental Affairs and the Premier's Office specifically I understand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I am informed that there are forty minutes left.

PREMIER MOORES: Forty minutes, fifty, well either way,

Mr. Chairman, we will accept your decision.

The fact is, Sir, that there is a great deal that can be said about the Planning and Priorities Committee. I do not want to speak too long because I would rather hear what the members opposite would like to know specifically about the various votes in the department. The fact is that contrary to a lot of debate that has been held regarding the validity of even Treasury Board as well as Intergovernmental Affairs and as well as Planning and Priorities, I would like to deal briefly with the Planning and Priorities branch first.

The fact is, Sir, that that -

MR. DOODY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder could we have a little order without the precincts of the House. I am finding it very difficult to follow the hon. Premier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I would ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to take the appropriate action.

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, the Planning and Priorities Secretariat, the function of it may not be understood

PREMIER MOORES:

by everybody, but the actual function of that secretariat is to provide the services to the resource departments of government, the social departments of government as well as to Cabinet as a whole, particularly in major decisions and in areas of major importance. There are some excellent people in that particular secretariat who do, in fact, do a great deal of research, a great deal of communications with other interested parties, like other governments and so on as well and prepare very well researched papers. Mr. Dave Mercer who the Leader of the Opposition well knows and Mr. David Vardy who is there at present, these people have done a tremendous amount of work in accumulating various information and providing various advice to government.

Some examples, Mr. Chairman, of the type of work they do, they prepare in co-operation with Intergovernmental Affairs and line departments for various submissions to DREE for potential subsidiary agreements. The work has been completed for instance this year in the areas of tourism, agriculture, forestry, fisheries, Labrador development, infrastructure and initiatives in the St. John's urban region and in the Corner Brook harbour development. They also are planning for co-operative fishing arrangements in the future fisheries development, and in this regard they have worked very closely with the Department of Fisheries. They have - Mr. Vardy particularly has travelled to Europe with the Fisheries Department, the fisheries officials, and to Ottawa with me and the minister, and has been once again very helpful particularly in areas that may not be directly involved in fishery. For instance in the tariff negotiations that Canada is presently holding with European countries, the Gatt negotiations, and the negotiations that are going to be required so that Canada can negotiate, hopefully, the tariffs for fish lower than is the case. For instance in Europe a lot of members may not know

PREMIER MOORES:

that the tariff is fifteen per cent on fish from all over the world. The fact is that Norway and Iceland both have negotiated a three per cent preferential tariff and this was done bilaterally without going through the Gatt procedure, and I would suggest, Sir, that if the fisheries stay in the agricultural end of the Gatt negotiations we will not be getting the attention that we obviously needed to get now in our present circumstances, and this secretariat has been working hand in glove with the Federal Department of Industry Trade and Commerce to try to achieve our objectives in this area.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That fifteen per cent that is enclosed by all the ECG -

PREMIER MOORES: EEC countries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - countries against all others.

PREMIER MOORES: All other countries with the exception of Norway and Iceland who have preferential treatment, and the reason they have preferential treatment, of course, was because there were certain fishing rights allowed in both their waters



PREMIER MOORES: and that is why they had preferential rate for their fish going in. I would suggest the case is exactly the same with Canada now where there is some negotiation going on as to how fast they can be phased out. In Iceland, of course, they were phased out but the preferential tariff still remains. And I suggest we are in the same position in Canada today as Norway and Iceland were four or five years ago when they did the same thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And they have a three per cent.

PREMIER MOORES: They have a three per cent tariff on cooked and on frozen fish which, as the hon. member for Fortune (Mr. J. Winsor) well knows, the reduced tariff on cooked fish could make a great deal of difference in reprocessing in this Province.

The Secretary and Planning Priorities also review. They are now doing a review of major social policy issues, including the federal-provincial social security system, the Health Manpower Planning, extended care nursing facilities, unified family courts and wage garnishments. They are also in preparation of the Province's job creation programme, co-ordinating the implementation of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Municipal Government, the Henley Commission. All these sorts of reports that come to government have to be analyzed, they have to be put before government in a meaningful manner and this department is doing it. For instance right now the participation in the Federal-Provincial Manpower Needs Committee and technical sub-committee to develop comprehensive manpower policies and programmes, manpower inventories and training programmes.

In this regard when I was in Ottawa last week one of the main reasons for going, of course, was to establish priorities that both Ottawa and ourselves agreed should be done. We got a great deal, I think it is \$1.2 billion

PREMIER MOORES: of federal money coming into this Province each year in one form or another, salaries or whatever, and with this amount of money coming into the Province there is a great deal of it coming in as part of an umbrella policy, a policy that goes for all of Canada in make work. It is just that make work, not make work with any end objective in mind. For instance there are a great many make work projects that could be done in this Province through different agencies to develop a project that will aid and abet further development in the future.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not want to interrupt the Premier's train of thought, would he allow me? This \$1.2 billion coming into Newfoundland from Ottawa, is that alleged to be the grand total sum of Canadian Federal Government money coming into the Province or is it only some of it? Is that the total sum that comes into Newfoundland out of the Treasury of Canada?

PREMIER MOORES: That is basically the total sum, Mr. Speaker, that includes equalization, and it includes salaries for federal civil servants, the unemployment insurance benefits, cost-shared programmes, DREE. There may be one or two programmes missing in that but certainly the major bulk of what we are talking about is in that figure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And what period? What year?

PREMIER MOORES: Well that is forecast for 1977.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Current year.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$1.2 billion?

PREMIER MOORES: \$1.2 billion which is a large expenditure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It has got to be more than that.

PREMIER MOORES: No. That is the figure that we were given and that Ottawa and ourselves agree with. But I can get those figures and gladly submit them for the scrutiny of -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Includes the armed forces, the airports, CNR, CNT.

PREMIER MOORES: It includes the CNR and the CNT but it does not include I do not think the armed forces because I did not think we had that many here.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Oh yes. There is a fairly large number in Gander.

PREMIER MOORES: Is it? - nor the airport operations. But I could certainly get the list for the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) -

MR. SMALLWOOD: It would be fascinating.

PREMIER MOORES: - and let him take a look at exactly what is involved in it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But as the hon. the Premier was such a staunch Confederate he would be just as proud and happy to get good figures as I would be.

PREMIER MOORES: Well not only that, Mr. Speaker, but I am not at all reluctant to seeing the figure doubled either -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes quite.

PREMIER MOORES: - preferably not on paper but rather in fact. I think it would be very helpful to the Province at this stage. But, Sir, the fact is that the Planning and Priorities Committee, their basic job is to analyze the various line departments, the programmes that are coming forward, to do research for Cabinet presentations, to do research for programmes that go before federal government which Intergovernmental Affairs are presently looking after. In the area of Intergovernmental Affairs, of course, there is also a great deal of work being done by that organization.

Now I think probably there is more actual contact between governments, and I am talking provincial governments as well as the federal-provincial governments now than ever before. We have a great deal of co-operation in the area of energy in Mines and Energy for instance as a result of meetings in the Atlantic region. We also have continuous contact with provinces like Alberta. We obviously have to have continuous contacts with provinces like Quebec, which have an effect on our energy development. Equally with the fisheries

PREMIER MOOPES: development and the installation of the 200 mile limit, we obviously have intense negotiations with the Federal Government. At that stage, of course, you start dealing also with possible foreign governments in certain cases where in countries like Portugal government control is becoming more the subject of the day or more the circumstance of the day, there also has to be contact here. Equally in the federal relationships, of course, if we are going to have meaningful programmes in the future the role of Inter governmental affairs is one that has to be carried out. Equally in these various headings we have here now, we have, for instance, the Labrador Resources Advisory Council. A lot of people may not think that is an important body that has been established, certainly they have been in many cases very critical of government, and I think in many cases very deservedly so. I, also think that particular council has made a tremendous step in the right direction of establishing the genuine needs of Labrador, on the coast of Labrador particularly.

I think you have a situation with the Advisory Council whereby, for the first time people from community to community are actually getting together and talking and saying the things that one would expect them to say. They are finding out what their problems are, and they are finding out that all their problems are not necessarily the same. They are certainly finding out that all the solutions are not blanket solutions but they are individual solutions and community solutions and some regional solutions. But what they have done, Sir, is bring a further emphasis to the people of the coast. They have had, I think, improved communications. They have certainly improved the articulation of their positions. It is manned by men and women who are concerned and dedicated. They were in here just a few weeks ago. They have done a tremendous amount of work. They speak to government representing the feelings of the people

PREMIER MOOPES: in the Labrador communities on all resource issues, issues such as the fisheries, forestry, oil and gas, uranium, and they, Sir, as well as passing on their feelings to government are also in the learning process themselves. And because of this communication back and forth, I think, it is working very, very well. Communities are aware of the use of the resources and the good and the bad effects that come from the development of these resources. The environmentalists are not just running roughshod over the communities but neither are the industrialists. There is a happy mix coming from really what are a very well balanced group that are very, as I say, articulate and very forceful on occasion, and in many ways not very complimentary to government. But, I think any government needs groups like this because I think they, in the end analysis, do a great deal to help further the development of the province and particularly the area of the province they themselves represent.

Mr. Speaker, I have been going here for twenty minutes or fifteen and there are a great many grants that are given to the institute for research and public policy which is a federal financed and very partially financed organization by the Federal Government, but I think the best thing for me to do Sir, is to sit down and hear what the hon. members opposite have to say and try to reply to their specific questions when they are finished.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Chairman, if I did not hear it with my own ears I would not believe it. It is absolutely amazing Sir, it is fantastic, I never cease to be amazed at the Hon. the Premier. The way that the Hon. the Premier can make things sound so plausible. And you believe him when you know you should not be believing him. That is probably the key to the Hon. the Premier's success, Sir. It is all malarkey. We were talking about GATT and tariffs and the Labrador resources Advisory Council, all written out probably by the Planning and Priorities Secretariat, given to the Premier to bring into the House to read. It is probably the first time the Hon. the Premier read it. Well,

MR. NEARY: maybe it is not, maybe I am wrong there but certainly, Sir, it is not a composition of the Hon. the Premier himself. It is all balderdash, Sir. Most of this vote Executive Council is a waste of the taxpayers money.

PREMIER MOORES: Give me a buck will you?

MR. NEARY: Give the Hon. the Premier a buck?

PREMIER MOORES: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we heard yesterday about the Treasury Board secretariat. We know how powerful they are. They are the real decision makers in this Province not the elected representatives of the people as I said yesterday. Planning and Priority Secretariat has shown us nothing in this Hon. House.

MR. NEARY: Nobody,- none of us understand, Sir, what their jobs really are. We are spending \$693,000 on Planning and Priority Secretariat, for what? We have not seen any results of it. Where are our planning and priorities? The whole economy is collapsing, the roof is caving in, we have record unemployment, the construction industry is ready to fold up and here we are with this Planning and Priority Secretariat, supposed to be advising the government, telling the government what to do. Well they do not have a very good track record over the past five years since this administration took over. What about the elected representatives? What decisions are they making or are they leaving it all up to this crowd of academics? Planning and Priority Secretariat down writing their little papers and writing their thesis and their compositions, passing little notes around to one another, memos back and forth to one another.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, the hon. the Premier can make it all sound so plausible. For a while there he almost had me converted. I was beginning to believe what the hon. the Premier was saying. I have seen the hon. the Premier so many times take to the television in crisis situations and make things sound so plausible and people sitting out there believing it and saying, Yes, no that is not true. I know it is not true but I believe the Premier because he is saying it and he sounds so sincere and he looks so nice and the Colgate smile. Mr. Chairman, why does not the hon. the Premier and the administration face up to reality, face up to the facts of life, wipe out the half of this Executive Council vote and save the taxpayers about \$2 million? All it is doing, Sir, is it is insulating the elected representative, it is insulating the Premier's office and the ministers from the ordinary rank and file people of this Province. That is all it is doing. It is not setting planning and priorities in this Province. There are no priorities. There is no planning. This administration

MR. NEARY: is flying by the seat of its pants. The only planning and priorities they have is in the Premier's back pocket or when there is an election on and out comes an envelope with a little note scribbled on it, "We are going to pave the Loop Road." That is the only planning and priority, Sir, that we have in this Province at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. the Premier could stand in his place and show me one constructive idea that has emanated from this Planning and Priority Secretariat then, Sir, I might be sold on the idea of having it. But, Mr. Chairman, we all know even though the hon. the Premier just told us how important all these groups are, we all know, Sir, that this administration has not produced one idea since it came into office in 1972. There has not been one development in this Province since this administration took over. That is your planning and priorities. Not one. How many mines have been opened? How many new industries have been created? We know how many have been shut down. This is the shut-her-down government. We know how many are shut down but how many have been created? You can criticize the former administration all you like but one thing you have to say about the member for Twillingate commonly known in this Province as 'Joey' there was always that carrot dangling there, that ray of hope was always there for the people of this Province.

MR. MURPHY: A very expensive carrot.

MR. NEARY: Well, \$700 million was the debt of this Province after twenty-three years and now it is \$2.5 billion. Tripled, tripled since the PC administration took over. Is that your planning and priorities?

MR. MURPHY: Please be honest with yourself.

MR. NEARY: I am being honest, Sir, with myself and I am being honest with the people of this Province. \$2.5 billion, the debt has gone from \$700 million over a five year period to \$2.5 billion



MR. NEARY: and not a thing to show for it. I would not mind if there was something to show for it. We have record unemployment. Where are the plans of the Planning and Priority Secretariat, the young people, the fifty per cent of young people in this Province between the age of eighteen and twenty-five who are unemployed at the present time who cannot find jobs?

Mr. Neary.

What plans do the Planning and Priorities Secretariat have for these young people? Fifty per cent of our unemployed today are young people between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five who cannot find jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the hon.

Premier probably does not like to hear this but the truth hurts sometimes. The truth hurts, Sir, and we have in this hon. House - I know I have myself tried to steer the hon. Premier in the right direction, lead the hon. Premier into the light of doing some positive and something constructive. I put forward an idea on the establishment of a productivity council in this Province that has not seen the light of day. Was that fed into the Planning and Priorities Secretariat?

PREMIER MOORES: It is in there now.

MR. NEARY: Well if it is in there it will probably never come out unless the hon. Premier puts an acetylene torch to the rear of some of the members of that secretariat. Mr. Chairman, it is a waste of the taxpayers' money. And Intergovernmental Affairs is ten times worse. There is no justification for that at all in this world, none at all. The member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) was asked a couple of years ago, a few years ago to take a look at the establishment of an intergovernmental affairs department of which I assume the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) was going to be the first minister. The hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) came back and said, "No, we do not need it." We do not need it. But nevertheless the government went ahead foolhardy and established it to satisfy the ego of Mr. John C. Crosbie, the big shot, now out carrying his personal hatred and vendetta, carrying it on in Ottawa. That is why, Sir, that was established to add, to inflate the ego of the most expensive man ever elected to this House, who cost the taxpayers of this Province literally millions and millions of dollars

Mr. Neary.

through stupidity and gross errors in judgement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hundreds of millions.

MR. NEARY: Hundreds of millions of dollars. Bullied the hon. Premier and the Cabinet into making wrong decisions. I do not know if these things went through the Planning and Priorities Secretariat or not. But Intergovernmental Affairs should be wiped out as I said yesterday when the hon. Premier was not in his seat. It should be eliminated. There is no justification for having it. It does not justify its existence. It is costing \$525,000. It is costing over a half million dollars, that is the Intergovernmental Affairs Secretariat, costing over a half a million dollars. It should be abolished right off the bat. I do not mean the people should be laid off, they should be put at doing something productive. And I am sure that they themselves would not mind being put into a position where they can do an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. It is not the fault of the people who are in the Intergovernmental Affairs Secretariat that they are just down probably punching in time. It is not good enough, Sir, and I am not prepared to accept the Premier's explanation for these things even though he did make it sound so plausible and so wonderful and so important. I am not going to accept the explanation, Sir.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Premier a question. I have been trying to find out now for a year or so - I was told about a year ago, a year and-a-half ago that the government of this Province had a young lady stationed up in Ottawa -

AN HON. MEMBER: Name her?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I will name her, Miss Carlson was her name working for the Intergovernmental Affairs Secretariat. I have been

Mr. Neary.

trying to check it out between here, between the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs here and Ottawa, and I have not been able to get to first base. The Department of Intergovernmental Affairs here refused to give me the information. I do not know if it is correct or not.

PREMIER MOORES: You will get it.

MR. NEARY: But is it correct? Does the government have a permanent employee stationed in Ottawa? I would like to find out, Sir, and if so who is paying the expenses?

Mr. Chairman, most of these positions are redundant and the employees if they are at the retirement age they should be pensioned off and if they are not at retirement age they should be transferred to more productive employment. When I look back and see how the former Premier of this Province ran his office, and she blocked to the doors all day long, you could hardly get in there, there were so many people there, millionaires, paupers alike, sometimes sitting on the floor, and everyone of them, if they could wait long enough, would get to see the Premier of this Province, would get to see the Chief Executive Officer, the First Minister of the Land, but not today, Sir. If you come up in the elevator today not a soul to be seen. If anybody comes in can they get to see the hon. Premier or will they be pawned off on one of these flunkies. Can anybody come in today, make an appointment, come in to see the Premier of this Province? Well, I want the Premier to tell me because I know people who have been sidetracked and pawned off on the flunkies down on the eighth floor. The whole thing, Sir, is designed to insulate the Premier's office and the ministers and the elected representatives, to insulate them from the ordinary people. They are afraid that they might be contaminated by the ordinary people of this Province. And so, Mr. Chairman, there is no justification for - there is justification for some of this vote. The Premier's office probably could be cut down substantially. The Executive Council office and Cabinet Secretariat - I am not so sure about that one.

MR. NEARY:

Treasury Board Secretariat is becoming a monster. Planning and Priorities Secretariat, wipe it out, and let the ministers, the ones who are supposed to have the responsibility of setting the priorities and doing the planning in this Province, the elected representatives of the people, let them make the plans for the development of this Province and the plans for the government to carry on over the next two or three or four or five years. They have got enough expertise in their own departments. There is duplication here, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Finance has all the expertise he needs in his own department. He does not need to go to Planning and Priorities. If he did all he would draw is a blank anyway.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that none of us will be conned into the explanation that the Premier has given us in his introductory remarks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, before the Premier speaks would you allow me a moment? I am in partial agreement with what has just been said by the hon. member, but only partial. The fact is as Churchill once said that the Premier—he used the words Prime Minister. It means the same thing "The Premier is the source and arbiter of public policy." The source is from him that it comes and he decides the source and arbiter of public policy. Now this does not mean dictatorship. This does not mean that the Premier solely by himself without advice, without help, without guidance, without information, acting solely and exclusively on his own formulates policy and makes all decisions. It does not mean that. If it meant that he would not need a Cabinet. If it meant that he would not need a House of Assembly. If it meant that he might consult with a few cronies and that would be the government of the Province or of a country. It is not like that. That is not what Churchill meant.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, excuse me, there is a terrible noise going on, and we cannot hear what the hon. member is saying or if any member speaks on any side of the House surely they should be quiet.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am under the disadvantage. I do not know how much is left for this department. How much time is left?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The questions will cease at 4:48.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Sir, are we operating now under the old rules or the new rules. My understanding was that the new rules ended as of eleven o'clock last night. There was no motion. There was no leave of the House this afternoon to operate under the new rules. So I would assume, Sir, we are operating now under the old rules.

MR. PECKFORD: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PECKFORD: As I understood it we are operating under the hours allocated for the departments but we were not operating as it relates to when the House is going to sit or when it is not going to sit. So my understanding is that when we started today in committee we are operating under the allocation of hours to the various departments of government, as was agreed to, but there has been no agreement as it relates to when the House will sit.

AN HON. MEMBER: Okay. All right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well that means that we have fifteen minutes but then the Premier is going to speak and there may be other hon. members who wish to say a word.

MR. NOLAN: So you cannot - the time is the time, simple as that - cut off.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said we have fifteen minutes for everybody who is going to speak from this moment on until the vote is taken and the Premier is going to speak. What I wanted to say is this that it is perfectly right for a Premier to have a Cabinet and to seek their advice and to seek their guidance and to seek their concurrence because he will not have a Cabinet very long if he does not do that. It is perfectly right for a Premier to have a civil service because the Cabinet cannot carry out the governing of the Province. They can only decide what the policy shall be but the carrying out of policy takes thousands of men and women in the civil service. To have a body such as the planning and priorities committee - is it? - or board, is very sensible. I do not see anything wrong with it. Their job I take it is to do research, mainly to do research. A busy Premier and busy ministers do not have that much time that they can do the research so they have a staff of men perhaps some women to do it. The staff may be too big, I think I could go along with the hon. gentleman who just spoke on that. I think it is getting to be a bit too rich for our blood. I think that the economy that is so

MR. SMALLWOOD: badly needed in the government might very well be applied to that particular board. If it is costing \$500,000 or \$600,000 a year and a staff of how many? How many are in that planning and -

MR. NEARY: Oh my God, I do not know. Look it up for him 'Tom'.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A large number of men, and some of them were my choice I may say, some of them I chose. some of them I caused to be appointed to the Treasury Board, that group. We did not have a planning and priorities board per se as such. We had planning but it was not done by any particular board. I have to agree with the Premier's policy of -

MR. NEARY: Treasury board is thirty-seven.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Treasury board is thirty-seven. We had - what would we have had? The member for Conception Bay South was I think a member of it, how many? Four or five.

MR. NOLAN: Four or five, yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Four or five and there are what, thirty-seven now? It sounds a bit extravagant. Perhaps twenty -

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order. Just for clarification if I may? I do not know if the hon. member for Twillingate has understood the time that is remaining under Executive Council or not. I heard the Chairman say that it was 4:48 which would mean -

MR. SMALLWOOD: 4:49 he said.

MR. PECKFORD: You understand that it is 4:48 because I understood the hon. Premier wanted to reply.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, exactly and I was going to take five or eight minutes because - I do not know how many I have taken.

PREMIER MOORES: Go ahead.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is an important subject and really all I want to say is that it is wrong to object to the existence of such a body, but I think it is right to object to having a body so big and so expensive in Newfoundland today that this programme of economy which is so desperately needed ought to



Mr. Smallwood. include a reduction, perhaps the abolition of the Intergovernmental Board or reduce it to two or three or one or two and reduce the Planning and Priorities Board substantially, not abolish it because I think they should feel the pinch of an economy drive perhaps even more than some and as much almost as any.

So I would like to hear what the Premier has to say.  
I think he has gone too heavily. He has

MR. SMALLWOOD: twenty people in his own department, I had five or six, I think, six or seven. He has twenty something odd - no, what is it for Planning? What did you say? How many?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Thirty seven.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the Planning and Priorities. Then the Treasury Board is, how many? Now you are talking, you see, the Premier's office twenty; and thirty-seven -

MR. ROBERTS: About eighty people altogether.

MR. SMALLWOOD: About eighty people. Now that is a lot of people, and there are some brainy people there amongst them. Some of them are former academics. I do not blame them for that. I do not condemn them for that. It is rather too elaborate. It is rather the trappings of an elephant on the back of a mouse, which at the moment is a little bit - what is the word when you need to take liver?

AN HON. MEMBER: I do not know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Anaemic. It is a bit rich for a mouse, it is a bit anaemic just now. I would suggest to the Premier that he might consider that as part of a much more far-flung and sweeping programme of economy in Newfoundland, because it is not enough to economize on capital account, that is not enough. It is not enough to reduce the terrible borrowing spasm of the last twenty-eight years. It is also necessary to economize on current account, and this a very heavy item, nearly eighty people in those three boards.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, in the limited time left I will try to do the best I can to answer the various people who spoke. First of all the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood): As he says, the Cabinet is basically one of a role of ministers giving advice and then decisions being made on that cumulative advice as

PREMIER MOORES: best as the first minister sees it.

I might also say that I guess in any cabinet, in any government it is very difficult sometimes for your colleagues, as the hon. member will well appreciate, in Cabinet to realize they are sometimes not administrators as opposed to policy makers. I think this is very important at this stage that if policy making is to be the chief criteria of Cabinet, the resource and the research that has to go into the sort of effort that Planning and Priorities is doing, is the sort of information that should be coming forward so that policy is evolved as opposed to administrative detail.

The Planning and Priorities principle is, as he said, sensible. The fact is, not do they just do research, Sir, but they co-ordinate a lot between departments, particularly now with the departments broken down into groups of their own. There are twenty-eight people in Planning and Priorities. For instance, there are four in the executive branch including one executive director, two secretaries and one post is vacant at the present time. It is allowed for, it is assistant director.

The economic and resource policy where fourteen and most of the people are; this includes all the departments such as Fisheries, Tourism, Forestry and Agriculture, Mines and Energy, with offshore oil and gas today the potential of hydro and all the rest of it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But do they not also have their own specialists and experts?

PREMIER MOORES: They do have some but basically when it comes in neighbouring and normally very narrow papers - and I will take that further and explain that when we are talking

PREMIER MOORES: about the 200 mile limit today for instance, it is not just the Minister of Fisheries and his department. Because when we talk about this we are talking about possible boat construction, which would include Industrial Development, we are talking about tariff negotiations which are Industrial Development, if you like, but certainly not something they have been very used to. You are talking about Municipal Affairs and Housing for future industrial parks so that they can be developed. You are talking about Manpower and Industrial Relations for training whether it be crude training or whether it be onshore training for food technologists and this sort of thing, and equally education, whether it is for a polytechnical school and so on.

So when you get all these various areas of departments involved, if you are waiting for them to sort it out themselves, I think the hon. member well knows, we will wait a long while because they are very difficult to get together. But once you have a team together to pull it together, then this makes it a lot easier in some of these decisions that are brought over a period of -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Agreed! Absolutely. Absolutely. But are we not going a little too rich?

PREMIER MOORES: Well we have twenty-eight people in total; fourteen with that responsibility in resource, seven in the programme and development division and three in the social policy area. So when you take the whole role of government, twenty-eight people, and you spread them down between secretaries, research people and so on, twenty-eight people is not a great many people when you take secretaries, messengers and everybody else that really do co-ordinate between the line departments and the government - I mean, there may be room for one or two reductions there and certainly if there is it will be

PREMIER MOORES: done.

AN HON. MEMBER: There are 28,000 public servants.

PREMIER MOORES: That is right, there are 28 people  
doing this much while there are 29,000 in the public

PREMIER MOORES: service I suggest there are a great many areas in the public service that could do with reduction probably a lot easier than the area we are talking about here.

Equally the Intergovernmental Affairs Department -

MR. NEARY: That is not a good argument.

PREMIER MOORES: No, well I am just using it for comparative purposes. The Intergovernmental Affairs Division, we say there is a lot of people in that particular division, I forget the exact figure, I have got it here. There are twenty-three in our Intergovernmental Affairs Division and out of that twenty-three you must realize that most provinces today have full departments of Intergovernmental Affairs, they are putting such credence on it and certainly the number of people in Ottawa dealing with intergovernmental affairs naturally is much, much larger. So twenty-three people to handle the preparation of DREE agreements, which they do, they do all the preparation and the delivery and the follow through of DREE agreements which is pretty critical and they are the department naturally, Intergovernmental Affairs to co-ordinate that because each department just cannot develop their own approach to it.

The answer to one specific question that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) asked me about Miss Carlson, the fact is that she and other people as well have gone to various central agencies that affect all governments. In this case it was the major Secretariat in Canada which was federally orientated but all the Province contribute. I think it is \$5,000 a year we contribute. That has nothing to do with Miss Carlson. What happens here is they ask for representation from all provinces to serve on the Secretariat. The fact is that the Province pays a salary and is fully reimbursed for the whole cost from the federal government and from the Secretariat itself.

MR. NEARY: We pay \$5,000 and they pay \$5,000.

PREMIER MOORES: No. No. We pay \$5,000 towards the Secretariat,

PREMIER MOORES: irrespective if anyone is there or not. But they ask for representation from the Province to serve on the secretariats.

MR. NEARY: So in other words she is there as she was recommended by the Province.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes. She is no longer there as a matter of fact, but when she was there she was -

MR. NEARY: Well who is there noow?

MR. DCODY: Nobody.

PREMIER MOORES: Nobody at the present time, we will have to get somebody to go there.

The fact is, Sir, that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is—he said he is very skeptical but he should not be. He should be more trusting. He should be not as suspicious as he is all the time. I know that he has the fire in his gut and he has the flame in his eye but even with that I know that there are moments when he has doubts about - You know when someone is sincere I am sure he can accept it and realize how difficult it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Time is up.

MR. SIMMONS: Forty seconds.

PREMIER MOORES: Forty seconds, he said none. Okay. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) says I have got forty seconds and you say I have none, which is it, Sir?

MR. SIMMONS: Thirty now. Twenty nine.

PREMIER MOORES: Well, Sir, apparently the member is going to have a count down because actually this - you know you could go on for a great deal of time but I hope I have answered those few questions.

On motion, item three - Executive Council, carried.

Heading X - Health.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, before getting into a few remarks on Health perhaps I might be permitted to make an observation that I think the consideration of the estimates seem to be going much better this year than last year. Probably this is due to the fact that there is a certain definite time allotted to each heading so that people interested in the various headings can wait until that heading comes up. But also I think the fact that twenty minutes is allotted means that there are many more people who can have their say on it and I am sure that all hon. members have considerable interest in some item of the estimates anyway.

Mr. Chairman, in considering Health I think it is important that we recall some basic fundamentals and certainly one of the fundamental things about the Department of Health is that it spends now something over \$200 million, and I think that is a very important basic fundamental.

I think another important thing to consider is what are the functions of the Department of Health and I might just read out what is written in the estimates. It says here, "The Department of Health is responsible for the provision of public health services geared to the diagnosis and



Dr. Collins

prevention of disease and the promotion of good health. Functions include operation of hospitals, both by boards and by the department and the provision of medical nursing and health services. So that is one way of looking at the functions of the Department of Health. Another way that I consider myself perhaps a bit clearer is to say that firstly, the Department of Health provides some health services directly. For instance it provides certain public health services; it provides vital statistic services; it provides central supply, and certain other services. Now these are done directly by the department itself. In addition to these, it arranges for others to supply some services. In actual fact most of the health services in the Province are not supplied directly by the Department of Health but supplied by others, for instance, by the hospitals and, of course, all medical services are supplied by physicians. No one can supply medical services under the law except physicians. For instance hospitals do not supply medical services. Universities do not supply medical services. Departments of Health do not supply medical services. Only physicians under the law can actually supply medical services, and dental services also. These are arranged for by the Department of Health. And the fourth function is that the Department of Health has to fund the health responsibilities that it has in the Province, and it has to fund just about all the health responsibilities whether direct or delegated. And one presumes that these are funded on a priority basis.

Now to carry out all this work the Department of Health, of course, has to effect a certain organization. It has to have a certain method of organization or it would not be able to function at all or it certainly would not be able to function efficiently. And its organization must be related to two things;

Dr. Collins.

it must be related firstly to the services which need to be carried out; and secondly, its organization must be related to the circumstances that pertain at the particular time. In other words the organization of the Department of Health cannot be a static thing, because circumstances change and in actual fact functions that should be carried out by the Department of Health change. So the organization of the Department of Health has to be a dynamic thing. It has to be changeable; it has to be adaptable. It seems to me that when we consider the estimates, what we are doing is we are asking, Is the organization of the Department of Health appropriate at this point in time considering what it has to do and what means it has at its disposal.

So I think it is worth-while therefore to have a look at the organization of the Department of Health. Now if we go back a bit we realize that when the Province, when Newfoundland and Labrador first became a Province it received its basic health organization from the Commission of Government. Prior to Commission of Government there was very little organization of health services in this Province. There were some, but they were very rudimentary and one of the -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Prior to ?

DR. COLLINS: Prior to the Commission of Government.

- and one of the things that the Commission of Government did leave us with was a basic organization of health services.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Dr. Mosdell and Sir John Puddester.

DR. COLLINS: These were the men of that era.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Dr. James McGrath and Dr. Len Miller.

DR. COLLINS: Dr. Len Miller being Dr. James McGrath 's boss in those days.

The organization that the Commission of Government did leave us with was the cottage health service which was spread

Dr. Collins.

throughout the Province and despite the fact that later it became outmoded that does not in any way detract from its great benefit when it was brought in and for many years after it was brought in. Commission of Government left us with a provincial base hospital, the General Hospital which is still to some extent the base hospital of the Province. And other things, the private hospitals, were from the Commission of Government era even if the Commission of Government were not actually responsible, totally, for their evolution. The T.B. control and sanatoria

DR. COLLINS:

base mental hospital dates from the Commission of Government era. Public health nursing services dates from that era, infectious disease control and so on and so forth. Now since then, as I say, it is a dynamic situation - there have been new elements added to that basic complexion of things. And I might just list these because I think they do clarify, at least they clarify in my mind what the Department of Health has on its plate. The first thing that came about, I think, of importance was the influx of specialists. This was shortly after the war. Prior to that time most medical personnel in the Province were of a general nature; their training was general, their interests were general, and their capabilities were general. But after the war like many other places there was enough sweep in specialist training and in the number of specialists that came to this Province. For instance, for the first time we acquired neurosurgeons. For the first time we acquired dermatologists. In my own specialty, for the first time we acquired pediatricians and so on. And these people necessarily -

MR. ROBERTS: When certification came in.

DR. COLLINS: Certification came in at the same time. One had to be, except for the grandfather clause, one had to be a certified specialist who practiced as a specialist. One had to take special exams and so on and so forth. And when these new specialists came into the Province they required or they gave rise to the need for new facilities and for new ancillary personnel. And this, of course, had an influence on the organization of the Department of Health. The second new element was hospital insurance which I think came in in the early sixties or sometime in the first half of the sixties. And this, of course, also required new organizational methods in the Department of Health.

The next thing was the health insurance schemes. The Province of Newfoundland has some claim, a considerable claim actually, to be

DR. COLLINS:

considered one of the initiators of health insurance, that is public health insurance. The Childrens' Health Service came into effect in Newfoundland, it was either in 1956 or 1957, I believe 1957. And, of course, as we all will remember more recently the medicare scheme, MCP came into effect in 1969. These public health schemes, they gave rise to changes within the organization of the Department of Health. Particularly they had to give rise to mechanisms for the assessment of claims from people supplying health services.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is this by the government, medical and dental training?

DR. COLLINS: Yes, I am not being complete in this listing. But certainly that would be another thing that would have effected the organization of the Department of Health. The next thing that I think is important and it has not anything directly to do with Health and that is the improved road communication in the Province, especially since the Trans-Canada Highway in 1965. This made many more people - or at least made facilities accessible to many more people throughout the Province and had a great deal of influence on how the Department of Health organized itself and that is still the case.

Following this we had a broadening of the base hospital facilities in the Province. We had a specialist hospital arise, the childrens' hospital, and we had the enlargement and the renovation, the expansion of the St. John's private hospitals. Prior to that they were essentially city hospitals and to some extent maternity hospitals. But from about 1966, 1967 onwards they took up the role as did the Janeway Hospital of being part of the base hospital facility for the rest of the Province. The next item I have here is the regional hospital concept from about 1969 onwards. And at the same time as the regional hospitals, that is major hospitals throughout other areas of the Province other than the base St. John's area, the evolution

DR. COLLINS: of these hospitals. This was also coincident with an increasing supply of trained nurses. For the first time Newfoundland had sufficient, if not a surplus of graduate nursing staff whereas prior to that time, prior to about the 1969-70 period nurses were a scarce resource. Coming to more recent times the Memorial University Medical School beginning, I believe it was in 1970, this had a great influence on health services in the Province and necessarily on the organization of the Department of Health and this of course is now being associated with an abundant supply of physicians and other health personnel. Again this is a great change. Up to this recent era the supply of health personnel in the Province was meagre to say the least. At about the same time the integration of mental health care with general hospital and general health care became a reality. Prior to this mental health tended to be off to itself, quite divorced from health care, generally but now this large area of health concern is being integrated with the general health care concerns of the Province and again this **must** have an influence on the organization of the Department of Health if it is to discharge responsibilities.

If we look at the current situation we can see how this whole trend is accelerating. Currently we have the Health Sciences Complex going up. This essentially is another addition to the base hospital facility. That is the central area, the St. John's area which has always and, I suspect, for a long time to come will supply certain base facilities for the rest of the Province. We have now specialists for the first time outside the base area and we have salaried specialists. We have unionization of nurses and of non-professional hospital personnel. We have a new concept in prenatal care and in pregnancy prevention. These influences are there. Certain aspects of them are clearly advantageous other aspects are not as advantageous in my view. We have the sub-regional hospital programme. That is hospitals such as the Carbonear Hospital, the proposed hospital in Clarenville and the

DR. COLLINS: proposed hospital on the Burin Peninsula. Whether one calls them regional hospitals or not is a little uncertain but I do not think that they will have the same range of facilities that the major regional hospitals such as Grand Falls and Corner Brook and St. Anthony will have.

And the final one I do have listed here is the change in federal health funding and the need to redirect provincial funds away from social services more towards developmental services. Now all these things I have listed these are all new elements that have been laid on top of the basic health organization that we inherited from the cottage hospital system and they must therefore have an influence on how the Department of Health is organized, if it has discharged its responsibilities. If we look at the particular problems or at least the major problems, in my view, that the Department of Health now has to face are one, the increased local demand for health services. That is at this point in time most areas of the Province want to see a certain modicum or at least a certain range of health services within their immediate area. They are no longer content to have the health services somewhere in the Province and they may take advantage of them as they possibly can. This is no longer considered satisfactory. I do not think all local areas demand the full range of services but there is an increasing demand for an increased range of services available locally.

The second big problem which I am sure is nothing new to this House are increased costs of health care and just

DR. COLLINS: one small figure might point this out if my reading of the 1965-66 budget is correct. For instance at Memorial University to train one medical student for one year cost, depending how you look at it, cost between \$21,000 and \$26,000. That is for one student for one year. Take a student therefore, a medical student who has to go through a five year course, we are looking at something over \$100,000 for direct training costs that are the responsibility of the province. That is what the province has to pay out. Whether there are additional expenses, and there almost certainly are that are the individual's responsibility is another matter but the province itself is having to contribute something like a \$100,000 or more to each student who completes medical studies. That is as I say just an example of the increased health cost.

MR. MURPHY: You said 1965-1966 did you mean that?

DR. COLLINS: 1965-1966 - no. I am sorry. 1975-1976 not 1977.

MR. MURPHY: It will be in Hansard as 1965-1966.

DR. COLLINS: Right, 1975.

And then the final problem I see looming large is the professional health worker and non-professional health worker, confusion and unrest, which is quite evident in the Province today. So these three areas demand attention by whatever organization the Department of Health has available to deal with them.

Now I think the question naturally arises, Has the organization of the Department of Health kept pace with all these changes, and it is appropriate, is the organization there appropriate to the present problems?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's time is just about up.

DR. COLLINS: I do not have the time to go into all this now. I might have some time later on, but I think that it seems to me that this is what we are looking at when we are talking about the estimates of the department of Health. What is the organization of the Department of Health now and is it appropriate to deal with the problems and the new aspects of health in the Province?



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

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I am not intending to make a very long speech. There are just a couple of points that I want to bring to the Committee's attention, and I hope that we will be able to get some answers from the Minister of Health pertaining to the two points that I am going to relate to.

Mr. Chairman, the first point is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, I hate to interrupt -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MURPHY: - but it is very difficult - we are trying to look at the speaker. I mean I do not mind if anybody wants to have a chat, but it is very difficult in justice to the speaker to hear him and perhaps to see him, because I have not seen him in a few days.

MR. POWE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The first point, Mr. Chairman, that I wanted to make was this, is that in certain areas where we have had a new regional hospital built, such as in Carbonear, there is some concern, for example, voiced by the people of Old Perlican and surrounding communities over the fate of the cottage hospital in that particular community. Now I would expect that the same situation exists in other parts of our Province where we have had new regional hospitals built and obviously where we will be having new hospitals built some time in the future. We do not have that immediate problem in Clarenville or Marystown at the present time, because we still have a delay, of course, in the construction of these two hospitals because of the fiscal restraints that we have in the Province at the present time. But I am sure that when the time does roll around for the building of these hospitals that there will be concern voiced by the citizens of communities and surrounding communities where you have cottage hospitals. And what

Mr. Powe.

I would like to ask the minister, through the Committee,  
Mr. Chairman, is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. POWE: - what is the fate of these cottage  
hospitals? You know what is going to happen to them exactly?  
Will they be used as diagnostic centres for the new and  
larger regional hospitals that will be built? Or will they  
be closed altogether, shut down, because they are too expensive  
and too old and too decrepit to maintain or does that vary from  
one part of the Province to the other? Will they be used  
as convalescent centres, for people who have had major  
surgery or what have you in the larger central hospitals? Will  
they be used as diagnostic or admission centres or possibly even  
for senior citizens' homes for

Mr. Rowe.

those senior citizens who are unfortunate enough to be confined to bed and need nursing care and this sort of a thing. I wonder if the minister when he gets up to reply to some of the questions that have been put to him would indicate to the Committee, Mr. Chairman, what thought is being given to the fate of the cottage hospitals when these new hospitals are being built? Because now that we have a delay, you know, we can get up and criticize the administration for not going on with the building of these new hospitals, the administration has been criticized before. We have had this news now for a number of years. The people will have to react accordingly. There is no need for me to try to convince anybody or make politics out of these announcements of delay in the building of some of these new hospitals. But it provides an excellent opportunity for the Department of Health and the officials to sit down and really figure out the best possible use for these cottage hospitals once the new regional hospitals are built, because, you know, in a place like Old Perlican, there is concern by the people of Old Perlican and its surrounding communities because they think that the place is just going to plain close up. And I think that very good use can be made of these buildings. So I would just simply ask the minister if he would be kind enough to inform the Committee at the appropriate time as to the possible fate or the thought that has been given to the fate of these cottage hospitals by his department a little later on.

MR. MURPHY: Do you have any idea of how many cottage hospitals are going to close up?

MR. ROWE: No. The real reason I am asking that is because of one particular hospital namely the cottage hospital in Old Perlican. And there was the hospital, of course, in Flowers Cove which now I think they are thinking of enlarging and converting to a health clinic with more diagnostic services.

MR. MURPHY: Is Markland one, too? The one at Markland is that one?

MR. ROWE: The one in Markland. And I am not the health spokesman.

MR. MURPHY: I was just wondering if that was in the hon. member's district. It is not, is it?

MR. ROWE: No, it is not.

MR. MURPHY: No, it is Bellevue.

MR. ROWE: That is in Bellevue district.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, okay.

MR. ROWE: That is right.

But I just refer simply to the fact that there are obviously other areas of the Province with cottage hospitals who have the same concern. The second point, Mr. Chairman, that I wanted to make was this, is that, you know, probably one of the best ways of taking care of medical problems is the preventive side of medicine, the preventive side of medicine. And I want to relate just briefly to what influence the Department of Health has on the Department of Education as to what is taught in the high schools or the primary schools or the elementary schools, in the schools period, to make our students, our young people more knowledgeable over certain diseases and abuses of our own bodies that would prevent sickness and disease in these youth at a later date. Dr. Mathias the government health - what is his title? - the government medical health officer, Dr. Mathias some time back mentioned, for example, the fact that venereal disease in Canada and in Newfoundland is becoming of epidemic proportions now, and he classified it as a major social disease. The question that I am really asking is a double-barrelled one. It is this: What is the Department of Health doing to encourage the Department of Education to bring to the attention of the students - now

Mr. Rowe.

I know that there are pamphlets in the office, in the guidance counsellor's office and this sort of thing, I know that in biology courses there is a little chapter and a few paragraphs on the human anatomy and you can get into this type of thing, but it is only our really excellent and well-meaning teachers who are knowledgeable in this particular area who can really educate the youth of our schools in the area of venereal disease, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, tobacco abuse, the physical fitness of our own body, abuse of our own body through lack of exercise, and improper diets and this sort of a thing. And I would think, Sir, that the time has come now for the Department of Health to not only try to

Mr. F. Rowe:

influence the Department of Education with respect to what is being taught our students in the area of venereal disease, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, tobacco, you know, health education in other words, so that we are really entering into the realm of preventative medicine at a very early age. I just would like to know if the Department of Health is making a concerted effort to influence the Department of Education in that particular direction.

And there is a second point, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to raise and that is this, in view of the fact that Dr. Mathias has indicated publicly that venereal disease is reaching epidemic proportions in this Province - I think, that is a fairly accurate resumé of what he had to say - and we certainly know that alcoholism is a definite problem amongst our adults, and it has been becoming an increasing problem with our teenagers and even below the teenage age. And since we know that there are soft drugs and hard drugs that are not separated in accessibility, I fail to understand how something like marijuana and the harder drugs, can be put in the same category, and a person get a criminal record for the possession of a half an ounce of marijuana and he can still get only a criminal record for carrying some very, hard drugs. There seems to be something strange and wrong there. I think that our youth should be educated in all aspects of hard and soft drugs, alcohol, venereal disease, care of body and this sort of a thing. And I would ask the minister the question is there anyway in the world of doing in the schools what was done for TB a number of years ago, that was done in the schools and in the University? I think, the hon. member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) is anticipating my question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE: Now look! There goes the savoury farmer from - I do not know what the difference is between savoury - anyway for all I know he may have some of it growing up there himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROWE: But let us not get down to cheap, stupid politics here because I am trying to raise a very serious question, and here is the question that I am going to raise: Is there anyway medically and technically to do in the schools and in the universities and the vocational schools what was done to try to trace down TB during a certain period of our history? In other words is there anyway of detecting on a mass scale those people who may have, in fact, have V.D., and in fact do not want to disclose it, or have it and do not know that they have it, is there -

AN HON. MEMBER: It depends on when who you are.

MR. ROWE: I am asking the question. - is there anyway of finding out whether an individual is addicted to a drug? Is there anyway to find out whether people are addicted to alcohol on a mass scale?

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. ROWE: Now the hon. gentlemen might think it is funny opposite, but I happened to have the experience of teaching in a high school for four years and in the university for seven years and I have seen students who were in deep, deep trouble, their whole career, their whole education was in deep, deep trouble because of the very thing that I am talking about, because of the very thing that I am talking about, Mr. Chairman, and the basic problem was that they would be quite willing to be examined in certain areas such as venereal disease, the possibility of really being hooked on drugs, the possibility of really being hooked on alcohol, really hooked, they would be quite willing to subject themselves to a doctor's examination providing there was strict confidentiality involved.

So what I am really asking the minister is - and this is a very serious problem - has the minister or his officials given any consideration or is it technically possible to do, to test, to examine students

MR. ROWE: for these types of problems as was done for

TB with the use of X-ray, the X ray machine a number of years ago. And lest a few hon. members like the member for St. John's North try to get a dart in there about marijuana or some foolish thing, let me just point out that I would only even suggest or ask such a question provided that there is strictest confidentiality between the students and the doctor or the medical person in this particular case. But it is a growing social medical problem and it is no longer just the isolated individual case. It is a very serious problem. I have seen students bomb out of university and I seen them bombing out of high school because of these little - I call them medical diseases, social medical diseases that we have in our society today. I think it is the government's responsibility, the legislators responsibility to have the boldness to tackle the heart of the problem. And the only way that you can tackle the heart of the problem is by identifying the individuals concerned and helping them out on a confidential basis.

MR. CARTER: That is a problem for Justice.

MR. ROWE: I beg your pardon. Now that is precisely the reason why, Mr. Chairman. I am glad the member for St. John's North mentioned that. It is a problem for Justice. Well I would submit, Sir, that if our educational system and our health system could handle this problem we would never have a Justice problem. It would not reach proportions where you would have - it would not be a legal problem or a problem that the police have to get involved in in this kind of a thing.

MR. CARTER: It is all three departments really.

MR. ROWE: Yes but I would like to keep away from the Justice of it because I think this - you know it is sad that the only way we are hitting these offenders - whether drug offenders or alcoholic offenders, is through the courts. It is too bad it reaches



MR. ROWE: that level and I am saying that it is really a medical problem that can be taken care of at the preventative stage by close co-operation between two departments of the government, the Department of Health and the Department of Education. So I just toss that out to the Minister of Health as , I hope a constructive suggestion or, in fact, it is a question — — comment or suggestion. So these are the two points that I would make, Mr. Chairman, and I thank you for the time.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, do you want to call it 5:30 P.M.?

MR. SIMMONS: Call it 5:30 P.M.?

MR. PECKFORD: I am agreeable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, call it 5:30 P.M.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, that being the case I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have passed items of expenditure under Item III - Executive Council, all items without amendment and have made progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of Supply reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have passed expenditures under Head III and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion Committee ordered to sit again presently.

I understand that we will now call it six o'clock.

I, therefore, leave the Chair until eight o'clock this evening.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MAY 3, 1977

MAY 3 1977

#5

Asked By: Honourable Member for La Poile  
Directed to: Honourable Minister of Mines and Energy

---

QUESTION:

1. How many new homes that were constructed in the calendar years 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975 and 1976 are heated electrically;
2. What standards of insulation were established as a prerequisite to the building of such homes; and
3. What heat loss studies were done following erection of these homes to ensure the effectiveness of such insulation?

ANSWER:

Information regarding the construction of electrically heated homes, the standards of insulation established and subsequent heat loss studies should be obtained from the records of Newfoundland Light and Power Company Limited and/or The Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

#25  
MAY 3 1977

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Mines & Energy in reply to a Question put forward by F. Rowe (Trinity-Bay De Verde).

QUESTION: The number of mining companies that the present Administration has been successful in convincing to refine and reprocess ore within the Province in order to create new jobs for our people since October 1971.

ANSWER: One of the elements of Government's mineral policy is to encourage the extent and degree of mineral processing within the Province. Toward that objective, we have provided for a processing allowance, as an incentive, under the Mining and Mineral Rights Tax Act which went into effect on January 1, 1975. To date there has been no significant increase in further processing activity as a result of the measures taken and efforts expended.

Lack of development in this regard is perhaps not surprising in view of the fact that most of the other provincial governments and the federal government have shared the same experience. The same factors which frequently place us at a disadvantage with respect to other industrial activities also affect mineral processing.

Further processing will continue to be an objective of our mineral policy. It is our intention to make sure that no opportunity is missed and we believe that all Departments involved are doing their best to further our aims in this regard.

F. WHITE (LEWISPORTE) TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY TO LAY UPON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION.

(1) THE NUMBER OF OUT OF ST. JOHN'S TRIPS TAKEN WITHIN THE FISCAL YEAR 1975-76 WHICH WERE PAID FOR BY THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT, THE DESTINATION OF EACH, MODE OF TRANSPORTATION USED AND COST OF EACH TRIP TAKEN.

During the fiscal year 1975-76 eleven (11) out of St. John's trips were taken as follows:

<u>Destination</u>	<u>Mode of Transportation</u>	<u>Cost</u>
1) Ottawa - Toronto (April, '75)	Air	\$ 688.50
2) Halifax (May, '75)	Air	225.32
3) Montreal (May, '75)	Air	508.65
4) Goose Bay (July, '75)	Air	235.03
5) Deer Lake (July, '75)	Air	187.35
6) Quebec City (Aug., '75)	Air	710.01
7) Toronto-Ottawa-Montreal (Sept.'75)	Air	685.14
8) Gander-London, Eng.-Montreal (Nov.'75)	Air	1,566.95
9) Ottawa - Toronto (Dec., '75)	Air	365.91
10) Ottawa (March, '76)	Private Jet	108.00
11) Quebec City (March, '76)	Private Jet	65.00

1217

Asked by: Honourable Member for La Poile

Directed to: Honourable Minister of Mines and Energy

---

QUESTION:

To ask the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Energy to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- a) Cost of operation of Churchill Falls Corporation office Montreal, Quebec for the calendar years 1974 and 1975?
- b) Total number of employees in this office (list of classification and salary of each job)?
- c) When will CFLCo office be moved to St. John's?
- d) How many of the present staff in the Montreal office will be transferred to St. John's?

ANSWER:

- a) Details are available in CFLCo accounting records.
- b) Number of employees based in Montreal as at December 31, 1976 approximately 63. Details of classification and salary are available in CFLCo payroll records.
- c) The CFLCo office move to St. John's is planned to be carried out in stages. Transfers are currently expected to start in May and finish by July, 1977.
- d) Four of the present CFLCo Montreal staff have indicated a willingness to move to St. John's.

Asked by: Honourable Member for La Poile  
Directed to: Honourable Minister of Mines and Energy

# 115  
L.P.R. 13/11/77  
Feb 15/77

QUESTION:

To ask the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Energy to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

1. Names of members of the Board of Directors, Churchill Falls Corporation;
2. number of meetings held in the calendar year 1976, this year to date;
3. remuneration or expenses paid to members of the Board;
4. travelling expenses in current fiscal year;
5. provinces and countries visited by members of the Board?

ANSWER:

1. The following are currently directors of CFLCo:

Messrs. J.W. Beaver; F.J. Aylward, Q.C.; R.A. Boyd;  
Dr. A.A. Bruneau; Paul Dozois; P.J. Gardiner;  
Roland Giroux; J.J. Greene, Q.C.; D.J. Groom;  
Dr. J.M. Hambley; R.T. Martin; and W.S. Read.

2. CLFCo Board meetings held:	1976	1977 to March 11th
Board	6	2
Executive Committee of the Board	2	-
	8	2

3. Remuneration of CFLCo directors in 1976 - \$57,000.
4. Details of directors travel expenses are available from CFLCo accounting records.
5. The CLFCo Board of Directors holds its meetings in Canada at Montreal, St. John's, and Churchill Falls.

1-5  
Nov 3 1977

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Mines & Energy in reply to a Question put forward by Mr. Steve Heary (LaPoile).

## QUESTION:

- (a) List name of individual, firm or organization to whom a grant of \$5,000 was made, as reported on pages 85 and 86 of The Auditor General's Report for the financial year ended 31 March, 1976.
- (b) List all services, activities and projects for which payment was made from Subhead 1102-02-03 to above individual, firm or organization.

## ANSWER:

- (a) A grant of \$5,000 was made to :

Canadian Arctic Resources Committee  
46 Elgin Street,  
Room 20,  
Ottawa, Ontario K1P5K6

- (b) The grant was made to the CARC to assist in financing its 1975 activities.

The CARC is an independent citizens' organization concerned about the future of Canada's North. It has a field worker program which is providing highly qualified personnel to assist northern native peoples in adapting to the changes which confront them daily.



MAY 3 1977

#4

MR. NEARY (LaPoile) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:-

- (a) What is the total cost of the swine vaccine program in Newfoundland and Labrador?
- (b) Number of persons vaccinated.
- (c) (i) Amount of serum purchased and not used.  
(ii) Value of serum presently on hand.

ANSWER:

- (a) The cost of the Influenza Vaccination Program is \$150,000.
- (b) The number of persons vaccinated was 11,124.
- (c) (i) The amount of monovalent vaccine received was 65,000 doses. None of this material was used due to reports of complications associated with its use. 44,000 doses of bivalent vaccine were received. Of this, 12,000 doses (approximately) were used.

(ii) Value of vaccine not utilized to date  
is \$109,700.

1977

MR. NEARY (LaPoile) To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) What is the total number of abortions or hysterotomies performed in the Province in the calendar years 1974, 1975 and 1976?
- (b) What number of these abortions or hysterotomies were performed in each of the following hospitals for these years?

St. Clares Mercy Hospital  
Grace General Hospital  
St. John's General Hospital

- (c) Reason pregnancy terminated
  - (i) matter of life or death of the patient
  - (ii) patient emotionally disturbed
  - (iii) rape
  - (iv) drugs
  - (v) other
- (d) What has been the cost of these abortions or hysterotomies to the taxpayers of this Province through M.C.P. and what proportion of the cost went to
  - (i) specialists (gynecologists, obstetricians, etc.)
  - (ii) cost of surgeons and (iii) cost of special medication and other incidental expenses?

ANSWER

- (a) Number of therapeutic abortions.

1974	157
1975	149
1976	411

(b) Number of therapeutic abortions by hospital

	<u>St. Clare's</u>	<u>Grace</u>	<u>General</u>
1974	-	-	140
1975	-	-	130
1976	-	-	386

(c) (This part of the question cannot be answered from information on file. Reason for termination of pregnancy is not required on the therapeutic abortion report).

(d) (i) Payments by M.C.P. to specialists

1974	\$17,482
1975	16,875
1976	23,017

(ii) Payments to surgeons

1974	\$135
1975	270
1976	202

(iii) Cost of medications and other incidental expenses (all inclusive hospital costs based on per diem rates)

1974	\$36,000
1975	39,450
1976	84,200

MAY 3 1977

313

Mr. Heary (LaPoile) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

1. What is the total cost of construction of the Carbonear Hospital?
2. What is the cost to date of equipping the Carbonear Hospital?

ANSWER:

1. Including equipment - \$13,963,000.
2. Equipment cost - \$1,555,000.

#235

MAY 3 1977

MR. NEARY (LaPoile) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

1. Did Central Supply dispose of a large quantity of chinaware (plates, cups, saucers, milk jugs, sugar bowls, etc.) by destroying it at Robin Hood Bay dump in the year 1975?
2. If chinaware was dumped and buried by bulldozers, state reason.
3. Why was this chinaware not distributed to the poor of the Province if Government had no use for it?

ANSWER

1. A quantity of crockeryware, which had no book value, was destroyed in 1975.
2. Items were either damaged and unuseable or stocks of odd patterns no longer used by institutions.
3. It is the policy of the Department that crested chinaware is not to be distributed to needy residents of the Province. We contend that crested items in the possession of the public could be of embarrassment to them.

MAY 3 1977

# 236

MR. NEARY (LaPoile) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

1. Did Central Supply sell or give free of charge any used furniture returned from Government Institutions and doctors' residences to any of its employees during the years 1974, 1975 and 1976?
2. If so, please specify names of recipients of such furniture.

ANSWER:

1. No.
2. Not applicable.

1975, 1973  
# 237

MR. NEARY (LaPoile) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information;

1. How many nurses' uniforms were disposed of at Robin Hood Bay dump in the year 1975 by Central Supply, Pleasantville?
2. Why were these uniforms destroyed?

ANSWER:

1. 340.
2. The uniforms were destroyed because they had been in stock for over twenty years. They were large sizes, shop worn, obsolete, and had lost their tensile strength.



PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
8:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.  
TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1977

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move that when the House rises tomorrow, Wednesday at six o'clock it reconvene on Thursday at 10:00 A.M. In putting this motion I do it because we have had some difficulty in the last number of days in reaching a consensus as it relates to the amendments to the Standing Orders that were composed some time ago and because we have been unable to have in the Chamber at any one time the two-thirds majority required to pass the amendments. I understand, Sir, that there are a number of precedents for such a motion and that there is authority in May to permit this motion to be used at this time and -

MR. ROBERTS: Can the hon. gentleman cite the authority in May?

MR. PECKFORD: I do not have it off the top of my head but I think there is a section in May which -

MR. ROBERTS: I looked in May and could not find anything on it.

MR. PECKFORD: I see. And also that there are a number of precedents in the past in this hon. House to indicate same so I therefore move that the House on its rising tomorrow, Wednesday, reconvene at Thursday at 10:00 A.M.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I think we should explain for the benefit of hon. gentlemen. This is really by way of a test case which has been prepared on this motion because I guess the truth of it is that the government are not able to carry into effect their desire, with which we concur unhappily or unwillingly but with which we do concur, their desire to change the hours of sitting of the House. And as the gentleman who has just spoken, the Minister of Mines and Energy,

MR. ROBERTS: has explained, it has been agreed that the motion will be moved and that there will be arguments made and then Your Honour will rule and at least we will know where we are because I think the simple truth of it is, and let it be said, that nobody is quite certain how we go about setting the hours of the House in these circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that the motion made by the hon. gentleman, the minister, is not in order unless it is a matter of which notice is given and debated and then put to a vote and carried by two-thirds. In other words it is not in order as a normal adjournment motion.

Now, Sir, let me begin by saying with respect to May, which came out in February, not in June, but with respect to May, the nineteenth volume, I have looked through it and I have read what seemed to be the relevant sections, I cannot find anything that is applicable. If the minister knows of a section or a citation I would be very grateful if he could let us have it.

MR. DOODY: The 24th. of May is the Queen's birthday.

MR. ROBERTS: The 24th. of May is the Queen's birthday/ and if we do not get a holiday we will all run away.

AN HON. MEMBER: By the 24th - we might thirty-three -

Mr. Roberts:

but, Mr. Speaker, with all deference to the minister, it is not quite enough to say that May has something on it, and then, you know, leave it at that. The current volume of May has in it 1,132 pages, and there are a great number of things in May.

MR. MURPHY: Page 734.

MR. ROBERTS: Page 734, is it?

MR. MURPHY: It sounded a good number. I just wondered what was on it.

MR. ROBERTS: I will read page 734 for the benefit of the minister then, because I am sure he has not hitherto had much chance to read it. It has to do with grants proposed by ministers.

MR. MURPHY: That is not of very much interest.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister will be interested in this. "The proposal of a motion for the grant of supply must be made by a minister." In other words, the hon. gentleman would have to get one of his colleagues to help him when the time comes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the matter is a serious one. I submit that the question of this motion has to be looked at in the context of the Standing Orders and the context of the practices of this House. First of all, Sir, I do not think there is any doubt that an adjournment motion is in order without notice, without debate and may be adopted by a simple majority. And if this motion is the same as an adjournment motion then it obviously falls that it is in order without debate, without notice, and it can be adopted by a simple majority. Now is it the same as an adjournment? Well first of all, let us look at the adjournment motion. We have a Standing Order on it, it is Standing Order (22), it says "The adjournment may be moved at any time." Secondly, we have the precedents of the House which show any number of adjournment motions and in making an adjournment motion, the other side of it that the House do not now adjourn or do not adjourn at eleven o'clock, is equally in order and our precedents are that we can suspend the eleven o'clock rule at any time, and we can sit late, and we frequently

Mr. Roberts:

have. We on occasion have sat all night in this House. We had one sitting, I think, which lasted for a total of twenty-seven hours from three o'clock in the afternoon until six o'clock the next afternoon without respite, without intermission.

Then we can go to Beauchesne which says that Standing Order (32) of the Canadian House, and I think this is the same in the new Standing Orders that all other motions including adjournment motions shall be decided without debate or amendment. An adjournment motion is not debatable. An adjournment motion may be put without notice. An adjournment motion may be put and carried by a simple majority of the House.

That then leaves the question, Mr. Speaker, whether this is comparable to an adjournment motion or not? And I say that it is not. First of all, Mr. Speaker, the Standing Orders with respect to the time of the sitting of the House are substantially different than the Standing Orders with respect to the time of adjournment of the House. The Standing Orders which set the time for the meeting of the House is Standing Order (2), which says in the operative part "The time for the meeting of the House is at three o'clock in the afternoon of each sitting day." If Your Honour looks at the Standing Orders which govern the adjournment of the House Your Honour will find that they are couched in very different language, it says, I do not need to refer to them all, but Standing Order (7), and Standing Order (8) are the relevant Standing Orders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the present Premier and the former Premier could carry their conversation on a little more quietly, I hesitate to interrupt either of them, I am sure it is important.

MR. MURPHY: Is there any chance of a third Premier getting it in on this?

MR. ROBERTS: You will have to ask all of my colleagues here all of whom are prespective - what was it Napoleon said "Every corporal in his army carries a field Marshall's baton knapsack." We have

MR. ROBERTS:

an awful lot of knapsacks over here, and more batons.

MR. DOODY: Heirs presumptive, heirs apparent.

MR. ROBERTS: Say that was used to be used in the old days, Sir, heirs presumptive, and heirs apparent.

MR. FLIGHT: There are none over there.

MR. ROBERTS: And then they are just heirs as in the case of the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to make an argument on what I consider to be a very important point, and if I could carry on with it, I think, it would speed the business of the House.

The Standing Orders which govern the adjournment of the House are differently worded than the Standing Orders which governs the time of the meeting of the House. The Standing Orders which governs the adjournment of the House is Standing Order (7), Standing Order (8) and Standing Order (22). Standing Order (22) as I recall it, I referred to it earlier, says that "A motion to adjourn shall always be in order."

So I think there is a qualitative difference between the adjournment motion, the adjournment of the House, and the meeting of the House. And I think that

Mr. Roberts.

is reflected, Mr. Speaker, in the majority and in the means necessary to change the time. The adjournment can be achieved any time by a majority of the House. But I submit that the meeting of the House is a matter that is set by Standing Orders. Standing Orders can be changed only upon notice, upon a motion notice of which has been given, a motion which is debatable, and a motion which is adopted by two-thirds of the members of the House. And, of course, the House of Assembly Act, Section 5, is the operative one, the operative power here and that cannot be changed by any rule of this House; it cannot be changed by any resolution of this House. It can only be changed by an amendment adopted by this House. I would think even unanimous consent cannot waive the force of Statute Law in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister referred to precedents. I again would invite him to cite them. I am aware of a number of precedents whereby the Government House Leader in moving the adjournment or at the time of the adjournment has said that the House adjourns until ten o'clock in the morning and that has been carried, but it has never been contested. And I would submit that whatever those precedents prove, they do not prove that the matter has been done other than with unanimous consent, because if the House Leader moves a motion, and there is no voice raised against it, I think we can assume or presume unanimous consent. So that brings us down to the fact that first of all the motion to adjourn is qualitatively different than the motion to set the hours of the House. The motion to adjourn can be achieved without debate, without notice, and by a simple majority. The motion to set the hours of the meeting of the House is a motion to amend the Standing Orders. The Standing Orders are very specific. Standing Order 2 is that the time for the meeting of the House is at three o'clock in the afternoon of each

Mr. Roberts.

sitting day, and that I submit, Sir, can be amended only or can be changed only by an amendment to the Standing Orders or by unanimous consent. If there is unanimous consent, there is no question. But if it takes an amendment to the Standing Orders, then that can only be achieved by notice being given, by the matter being debated - not necessarily at length, but by being debated and then in turn by it being adopted by two-thirds of the members of the House, not two-thirds of those present in voting but two-thirds of the members. And given a House of fifty-one members as we have, that means thirty-four members must vote in favour of the change before it can be effective.

I would end by simply saying that as I understand the practice and procedure of the Canadian House of Commons which is the next reference up from our own practices and precedents, the practice at Ottawa is comparable. Standing Order 32 in Beauchesne - I assume it is the same in the current Standing Orders of the House of Commons, but I do not have a Standing Orders of the Federal House here, and I cannot refer to it, but I assume this particular rule has not changed, the number may have changed. But it says that the following motions are debatable and it goes: "Such other motion made upon routine proceedings as may be required for the observance of the proprieties of the House, the maintenance of its authority, the appointment or conduct of its officers, the fixing of its sitting days or the times of its meeting or adjournment - the fixing of its sitting days or the times of its meeting or adjournment." That is a debatable motion. And I submit, Sir, that our practice is the same. We have often met at times other than that specified in the Standing Orders, but I submit that each time we have done it, it has been by a form of unanimous consent. To my knowledge there has been



Mr. Roberts.

no voice raised. There has been no argument made. There has been no division taken on the issue.

So the hon. gentleman's motion is in order if it is taken as a Notice of Motion at the time for the giving of Notices of Motion, and then if it is debated and adopted by two-thirds of the House we are able to change the time at which we meet by that procedure. But I submit, Sir, it is not in order in the way in which it has been moved now. I submit we cannot change the times at which this House is to meet at the beginning of each day by a motion made without notice, by a motion that is not debatable and by a motion that can be adopted by a majority. We can adjourn by a motion with those characteristics, but we cannot set the time of meeting. The time of meeting is set by the Standing Orders, Sir. And only a change in the Standing Orders can change the time of meeting. The time of adjournment is set by the Standing Orders, but the Standing Orders also provide - and this is, I think, the crux of the argument, Sir - the Standing Orders also provide a means by which adjournment may come at a time other than that specified in the Standing Orders.

MR. ROBERTS: and I think therefore that the matter is qualitatively different, the two motions, the one to adjourn the other to meet are qualitatively different. The adjournment motion can be done without notice, can be done without debate and can be carried by a majority. The motion to meet must require notice - the notice to meet requires or permits debate and it requires that two-thirds affirmative support by the members of the House. In other words thirty-four members. So accordingly I submit that the motion is out of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I must say that I completely agree with the case that has been presented by the Leader of the Opposition. It is a very valid case. The Government House Leader merely got up and made a motion referred to May - did not even quote the section of May to which the hon. gentleman referred. And I would submit to Your Honour that all the Government House Leader is doing is just trying his luck again. Really there is no justification, no authority for expecting such a motion to be in order or to be passed in this hon House. The hon. gentleman is just testing the water - trying his luck again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman outside the House the other day, yesterday, last night, said that I was the obstruction, that I was preaching about extending the hours of meeting in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must remind the hon. gentleman the requirement to keep his remarks specifically to the point of order and that is whether the motion made by the acting Government House Leader is in order.

MR. NEARY: If the Government House Leader had made a motion that this House meet five days a week from nine o'clock in the morning until six o'clock at night I would have no hesitation at all to give my consent. None at all. Five days a week from nine

MR. NEARY: until six. But I think, Sir, it is going a little bit too far, it is too hard on the staff, it is too hard on the news media, it is too hard on the members of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: On the news media?

MR. NEARY: On the news media to expect the House to meet from ten o'clock in the morning until eleven o'clock at night three days a week. Mr. Speaker, we are not doing justice to our job, Sir. The staff cannot cope with it and certainly as the hon. member for Twillingate indicated the other day the media is suppose to be the eyes and the ears of this House. That is how the information gets out to the public. So you get thirty seconds - one minute, two minutes on radio and television and a little bit of space in the newspaper for a nine hour session of the House.

MR. MURPHY: Fifteen seconds is the most we get.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I am the stumbling block, Sir, I just want to point out to the Government House Leader that I am prepared to work five days a week. I am prepared to work on weekends if necessary, from nine until six and I am sure, Sir, if the minister put that kind of a motion before the House he would have no problem at all in getting unanimous consent. Because I am sure that the hon. gentleman's own members do not agree with working from ten o'clock in the morning until eleven at night.

MR. SPEAKER: Now if there are no further arguments on the point. I thank hon. members for their views. It is a matter which I have previously given some thought having some premanition that this might come up and I now will bear in mind arguments put forth by hon. members and review the authorities and endeavour to answer a few points which in my own mind are not at this moment sure, and give a ruling as early as possible. I would hope to do that later this evening. The motion is that I now leave the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Heading X - Department of Health.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, we must be getting fairly close to the end of the time that has been allotted, could Your Honour tell us how much time the Committee -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, oh, I am sorry. I understood it to be said that we had one minute in which case it would be very short indeed. I understand we will know in a moment or so how much time we have. Well, Mr. Chairman -

MR. YOUNG: One hour and twenty minutes.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) is saying we have an hour and twenty minutes left to debate the estimates. That is his guesstimate or is that the official word from the - We will sort of have a brief pause while we - What we need is a clock like a hockey game you know that goes down.

MR. MURPHY: The Hockey game is started hurry on now until we get it over with.

MR. FLIGHT: Two hours to go.

MR. ROBERTS: What was that 'Ank', Sir?

MR. MURPHY: I said talking about the hockey game do not be too long now it is started.

MR. ROBERTS: I say there is a great movie on the TV too, Casino Royale was on at 7:30 when I was leaving home.

MR. FLIGHT: We are getting gypped on these hours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Leader of the Opposition wishes to continue we will -

MR. ROBERTS: All right. Well, Mr. Chairman, I spoke briefly in the Committee last night and I will not be any longer tonight but there are a number of specific points to which I would like the minister to address himself assuming he ever enters into this debate again and the minister has been conspicuous by his absence from the debate. I know that there are members on this side

MR. ROBERTS: who are anxious to get into the debate and have got in it, and I think there have been some admirable speeches made by members on this side of the House. Some, I may add, on the other side as well.

The minister has asked some of his colleagues to come to his rescue and they have, but we have not heard from the minister. So, last evening when I spoke I talked a little about some of the programmes and perhaps now I could touch upon some of the specific facilities that I would like the minister to tell us a little about. And in no particular order, but in the order as they came to me when I jotted down these notes, I would like him to tell us what is involved in the Flowers Cove area this year in the public health centre. There is the matter of I believe it is \$250,000 in the estimates for community clinics. It is \$250,00, subhead 1013-04-06. Last year the minister told us that Trepassey was first and that Flowers Cove was second, Trepassey I am happy to say has now been provided with a fine new public health centre. I hope it is Flowers Cove's turn this year.

Then I would like for the minister to tell us where we are with the Optometrists Act. This has been in the work since I was Minister of Health and that was five years ago. When I left office as minister it was about in the shape where it could be brought to the Cabinet for one or two points of policy to be decided upon. And surely in five years, and we have had three ministers of Health, Dr. Rowe and the gentleman from Kilbride (Mr. Wells), and now the gentleman from Gander (Mr. H. Collins) have filled the office with varying degrees of distinction, surely it is time the Optometrists Act surfaced and my question is simply where is it, when are we going to see it?

Equally, Sir, our old friend, the Denturist Act, the session is now well advanced, we are getting

MR. ROBERTS: to the point where we might have what could be called the short strokes. The government are trying to rush the House to its conclusion, but the minister is pledged to bring in legislation this session to legalize denturists, where is it? When do we expect to get it?

I would like him to talk a little about the report of Dr. Selikoff but I hope he could be a little more moderate than the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) who gave us a display of bad temper in the public prints the other day, a display of bad temper which in my view was unwarranted and also unnecessary.

MR. MORGAN: Warranted.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I think it was unwarranted. The hon. gentleman may feel it is warranted. When we come to the transportation estimates, and I am delighted we will get a bite at them this year, I would be very happy to joust or juiced, as the hon. member may prefer, with him on that question. But my question for the Minister of Health is not really one affecting roads. My question is the whole question of Dr. Selikoff's report, or the report by the Mount Sinai team on the possible health hazards in Baie Verte arising from the asbestos mine there. I know the minister has not as yet got it because my friend from Baie Verte - White Bay is very keen, very much follows up on this and I know the report has not as yet been submitted but I understand it is due imminently. Perhaps the minister could tell us what if any information

Mr. Roberts.

he has about when he might expect to get it and what attitude and what action the government are going to take? I would like for him to say a word or two - perhaps he could straighten out for us the question of the nursing station at Englee. And if Mary Queen of Scots had Calais written on her heart when she died the minister might perhaps have Englee written on his.

MR. COLLINS: I was there at one time. They have got a lot of facilities there.

MR. ROBERTS: Well if the minister was there once then - we pause for the commercial. There is an hour and fifteen minutes remaining in the Health estimates so the minister will have lots of opportunity to speak I am happy to say.

I am very glad the minister was in Englee once. I would hope that he will be back again.

MR. MORGAN: : A CNT foreman.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the minister was a CNT foreman, and that is what enabled him to travel. As always the public paid.

MR. NOLAN: Did you say CNT?

MR. ROBERTS: CNT.

MR. NEARY: One letter left out.

MR. MORGAN: He worked there.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister worked there. Oh, yes, he worked there. I think at times he worked very hard. Anyway that is beside the point.

MR. COLLINS: The first place I worked was Englee.

MR. ROBERTS: Was Englee. I am very glad of that. That was the minister's good fortune. I wish I could say it was Englee's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the Englee matter is quite a serious one, and although it is no longer in my constituency thanks to the gerrymandering of a couple of years ago, I think in the absence of my friend

Mr. Roberts.

and colleague from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) I might be permitted a word or two about it. The Englee station has working out of it I am told a nurse. It is not manned or womaned, whatever the phrase is, as a regular nursing station. Indeed it was before my time. So it is at least eleven or twelve years since there has been a station nurse living and working full-time at the Englee station. But there has been a nurse there who comes two or three days a week and holds clinic and also a doctor or perhaps the doctor from Roddickton comes down to Englee ten or twelve miles two or three times a week and holds clinic as well.

Now, Sir, there are persistent rumours floating about in Englee and Roddickton, and in the area generally - my friend from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) I know has been in touch with the minister, and I have also heard about it from the council and from friends of mine in the area, persistent rumours that the station at Englee will be closed. Now, Sir, the minister can answer this for us very straightforwardly because Englee is the only nursing station in Northern Newfoundland and Labrador which to my knowledge is owned by the government. All of the other nursing stations in the area are owned by the Grenfell Missions. They may have been paid for out of public funds, and since the Grenfell Mission is a public non-profit body, it does not really matter whether they own them or not, but in the case of Englee, the station is actually owned by the government. That means that it cannot be closed by the government and, of course, the money to operate it is supplied by the government. And I understand it is a separate item in the budget. It was in my time as Minister of Health, and I think it still is.

Now, there was a commitment made in about August of 1975 - and if the minister would like for me to go into the circumstances I will, but I think he is as familiar with them as I am - a commitment made that there would be a nurse stationed full-time at Englee. And the then Deputy Minister of Health, Mr. Tom Sellars sent out word, and



Mr. Roberts:

doubtless he was instructed to by his minister - sent out word that the salary unit had been approved. Well, Sir, I do not believe there was ever a full-time nurse there. I am told that there is now a nurse there half-time only, and the rumours in the area, as I have said, are that the situation is to be closed. So I would ask the minister to tell us definitively - he has had loads of time to look into it. My friend from Baie Verte-White Bay wrote to him at least a month and a half, two months ago, to raise the question and as of a day or so ago, the minister had not replied to my knowledge to the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout). Well now is the time and the place for him to reply.

I would like the minister, Mr. Chairman, to tell us about the closing of the 200 beds? How many actually have been closed? Would he tell us how many beds we have in Newfoundland and Labrador say tonight or say the 31st. March or the 30th. April, any convenient date, in 1977 as compared to the same date twelve months previously.

MR. COLLINS: How many closed?

MR. ROBERTS: How many beds we have in service now compared to how many we had twelve months previously. The minister may say 200 were closed but since some have been open it is awfully hard to judge unless we look at it the way I have suggested. How many beds were in service, say, on the 30th. April, 1977 and how many were in service on the 30th. April 1976? I do not know whether the minister has the information or not. But I understand from usually reliable sources that the Common Room is choc-a-block with the minister's officials. Apparently the whole Health Department has been brought up to buttress the minister. And I would hope that if the officials are listening, one of them would do the kindness to write out the answer to that question and have it sent into the minister so we can get the information. The government made

Mr. Roberts:

a great to-do about closing 200 beds, and I know some were closed. But I would like to know how many were closed? Where they were closed? And I would like to know how many, you know, beds we now have compared to how many we had twelve months ago?

Well, Mr. Chairman, that leaves me only one topic - I could go on obviously, but time is short and I know there are other members who want to go into it - but that leaves us only one topic that I wish to touch upon, and I am sorry the gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) is not here, oh he is here, I hope he comes into the Chamber because he will feature prominently in my few humble remarks, because I wish to say a few words about ministerial solidarity, a few words about responsibility to the Cabinet, and a few words about a little political courage, all of which applies to the gentleman for Grand Falls. I am not speaking of these words with reference to the Minister of Health.

AN HON. MEMBER: Especially courage.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, the minister told us in his opening statement that it was a year of progress, we opened, I think, his words were "We opened the hospital in Corner Brook, and we opened one in Twillingate, and we will shortly open - what other one are we going to open, Waterford? -

AN HON. MEMBER: They are going to close that down.

MR. ROBERTS: They have closed the Waterford.

In any event, the point I am making, they opened Twillingate and Carbonear that was it, Corner Brook and the Health Sciences Centre in due course will open. But the fact is, and I invite the minister to comment upon this if he dares, that the present government have built only one hospital project during their five years in office, and that is, Waterford.

MR. MORGAN: The first phase in Bonavista.

MR. ROBERTS: They have built the first phase of Bonavista, and they have made a complete fool of the Minister of Transportation, forced him to renege on his solemn word that phase two would be

Mr. Roberts:

carried out this year. And I would say to the Minister of Transportation that the House has been a very worth-while and pleasant place with the minister away from it the last day or so, and if he wants to get into the debate I would welcome it, in the meantime I would like to say a few things I wish to say. The fact remains that the present administration in five years in office have built only one new hospital project and that is the project, a very valuable and worth-while one, but the project to expand and replace some of the beds at the Waterford Hospital here in St. John's.

The hospital in Carbonear which they so proudly opened was begun by the much maligned previous administration, as was the vast extension to the Western Memorial Hospital at Corner Brook, as was the new hospital in Twillingate, as in turn was the vast new hospital being built at the Health Sciences Centre, or as the Health Sciences Centre here in St. John's. Now the Minister of Transportation said something I would like to hear it.

MR. MORGAN: Started by John Crosbie as the Minister of Health.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. John Crosbie has started many things for this Province, he started the doom of Come By Chance, he started the doom of Linerboard, and I am very happy to say -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: He started a lot of trouble.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: - you know, I am very happy to say that what little he did was more than the minister has ever done. And, you know -

MR. NEARY: Poor old John Crosbie.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh I am on something important I should not be distracted by the likes of the minister, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MORGAN: An hon. gentleman.

MR. FLIGHT: Close-down Crosbie.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the minister may be honourable - the minister if he considers himself honourable, Sir, I would agree with him.

Now as I have said, I wanted to say simply that the government have not built with the exception of Waterford any single new hospital project. Let us look at their record. Let us look at what they have done. Because I say that this government have practiced political deception of the highest order with respect to the whole field of health. And the Minister of Health may not have done it, but he had condoned it, and he is now responsible, in a ministerial sense, for it.

Back in 1975 when we were getting ourselves ready for the electoral process in this Province, the present government went down to Grand Bank and to Marystown and to Burin and to the Burin Peninsula area and said there will be a new hospital, and a great stage was erected out at Salt Pond in Burin. My friend from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Canning) referred to it in very firm and very strong terms the other night. Similarly out in Clarenville, and I know the gentleman from Trinity North (Mr. Brett) is as sick at heart as anybody else in this Province is about what went on because he participated in good faith in a ceremony with the Premier of the Province to turn the sod for the Clarenville Hospital, And out in Grand Falls we were treated as a spectacle of the Tory candidate who has now become the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) making solemn commitments. Well what happened? The election was in September. When did the hospital start? Did they start in September? No. October? No. November? No. Something strange happened in November they were deferred. Then they were deferred until the next budget. Along came the budget last March and they were deferred again until this year's budget. Then a few weeks ago 12,000 people on the Burin Peninsula signed petitions which came in, and the Minister of Health received those petitions

MR. ROBERTS: and the Minister of Health said "Well I do not know what is going to be done" I guess he could not say although he knew full well that nothing would be done on the Burin Peninsula hospital this year. And then when we get the Budget Speech last week - lo and behold! - the hospitals are deferred again. Now I say to the minister that he and his colleagues owe it to the people of these areas to tell them the truth and I do not think that has been done. I do not think this government, Sir, have any - they have the intention of building these hospitals - I do not think they have any ability to build these hospitals in the next two or three years. I think they should tell the people that and I challenge the Minister of Finance to tell me where he and his colleagues are going to find \$40 or \$50 or \$60 million of capital money in the next two or three years to build those three big hospitals.

MR. DOODY: \$70 million.

MR. ROBERTS: \$70 million is it? And I know that they are not going to be able to find it. They want to maybe, lets grant them that. But I think the Minister of Health owes it to this committee and owes it to the people of this Province to come clean and to tell the people if they can get these hospitals or not. Because to go on dangling, this deferment, to deferment, to deferment, is cruel. There is a need for the hospitals

AN HON. MEMBER: Apologize!

MR. ROBERTS: There is a need for the hospitals, we all grant that, but now whether they can be built or not -

MR. FLIGHT: Political decisions.

MR. ROBERTS: -whether they can be built or not is another story entirely.

MR. MORGAN: You were Minister of Health could -

MR. ROBERTS: I was the Minister of Health for two years and we started a hospital construction programme that is the only hospital

MR. ROBERTS: construction programme this government has ever seen and they have been in for five years.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: We have done more than you have done as Minister of Highways.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, let me come back now to the actual record of this government, because I will say there has been deception piled on deception. Last year in this committee the minister came before the House and when he was taken lightly to task about the Burin Hospital—because my friend from Burin—Placentia West in that day was, as he said, prepared to trust them — he has been twenty years in government, prepared to trust government, he had not realized what kind of an honourable crowd we now have—he was told there is \$680,000 in the estimates for the Burin Peninsular hospital and we will be doing the planning this year and we will be ready for tenders next year. And some of us dared to question that and said "Oh well there was several hundred thousand the year before and only \$66,000 was spent" Well what was the story last year? They asked for \$680,000 but only \$150,000 was spent, less that \$1 out of every four dollars. Another broken commitment, another case where an undertaking that was made was not kept.

Now we look at the Central Newfoundland hospital, \$700,000 was spent last year. We look at the Clarenville hospital, \$480,000 was promised in the estimates, that was what was estimated to be needed, and what was spent? \$180,000. So I say that this government are guilty of cruel deception. I say they ought to come clean and they ought to tell the people truthfully whether they can legitimately expect those hospitals to be built next year or not. And I say to the Minister of Finance that he must confirm — he must confirm if the Minister of Health says " Oh well we will start them next

MR. ROBERTS: year", because the Minister of Health tends to weasel and to squirm and to skate around the point. Well let him come to the point. I say the people on the Burin Peninsula and the people in Central Newfoundland and the people in the Clarenville area, the area to be served by the Clarenville hospital, have a right, have a right to know, a right to know whether the government will keep their word or whether this deferment, this cruel deferment of budget to budget, rising hopes to dash them down. Be honest.

AN HON. MEMBER: Your time is up.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I am told my twenty brief minutes have sped by. So I will have to try and catch Your Honour's eye a little later in this debate because I do want to say a few words about the spectacle of the gentleman from Grand Falls, denouncing his colleagues out in Central Newfoundland but not having the courage to stand and to say to the House and the Cabinet, "I leave this Cabinet, I cannot accept a major decision" And of all the spineless political acts I have ever heard, the act of that minister to go out in Central Newfoundland and bitterly denounce his colleagues is the lowest and most contemptible political act. It goes against all the conventions of Cabinet government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: You are either a minister or you are not a minister. And if you are a minister you support the decisions of the government. And the hon. gentleman from Grand Falls as long as he is in the Cabinet is party, fully, completely and utterly to the decision not to go ahead with the Grand Falls hospital this year and he can denounce it or he can say what he wants but he must be a man about it. And I invite him to come into this House tonight and say whether he supports it or not because if he does not support it he has no choice but to go the Premier and say "Premier accept my resignation from your Cabinet, Sir"

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Will all the hon. members -

MR. ROBERTS: Out in Central Newfoundland the minister is a hero, he thinks, because he bitterly denounces it - to use the phrase the news reports have used. Here in St. John's he is no man, he is a mouse. He is a meak, mild little soul. Well, Sir, he cannot have it both ways.

MR. MURPHY: Ten years ago you were -

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Chairman, I suspect my twenty minutes is up and I cannot ask for more time but I shall try again to catch Your Honour's eye because what I have said, Sir, I think goes to the heart of the system of government of this Province. If



MR. ROBERTS: ministers do not stand by the decision of the government, Sir, they are not much minister at all and there is not much Cabinet at all. And I say to the Minister of Health in closing, come clean and tell the truth. Tell the truth about these hospitals and then this Committee will vote the minister the money he needs to run the health systems and the health programmes in this Province this year. But end this cruel deception, end it! Do not be party to it any longer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is in full flight tonight, Sir, and I must say I have to agree with the hon. gentleman in his remarks concerning the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), the Minister of Rural Development.

MR. DOODY: I thought you were on the Roberts Memorial Hospital.

MR. NEARY: Well the Roberts Memorial Hospital is not open yet. It will be open I presume in due course.

Mr. Chairman, the most blatant example of political hypocrisy that I have ever seen in this Province was displayed by the member for Grand Falls in coming out and condemning his own colleagues, condemning the Cabinet of which the hon. gentleman is a member for not going ahead with the expansion -

MR. ROBERTS: And then staying in the Cabinet.

MR. NEARY: - to the hospital in Grand Falls and then staying in the Cabinet.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: I am having real difficulty as one member of the House in hearing what the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has to say.

MR. PECKFORD: Some gentlemen on the opposite side are interjecting and leading on the member for LaPoile, if I may say so, and it is completely out of order and I would ask for silence so that I can, as one hon. member, hear the remarks in debate that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) wants to put forward on these estimates.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order. Nobody ever accused anybody of leading on the member for LaPoile, as he would be the very first to agree. If members on this side wish to make suggestions to the member for LaPoile, as long as he does not object to it surely it is in order to do so.

It has gone on in the House for I guess hundreds of years and if our indignity or indignation I should say, if the indignity which the Minister of, what is he? - Rural Development, the spectacle, indignant spectacle he presents, if that indignation leads us to say things to the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that he may wish to use or not use then that is up to him and there is no point of order, Sir. He should be allowed to carry on. He is not objecting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The interjections from one side and the other are allowed up to a certain volume I suppose by the Chair. If the volume is exceeded the Chair feels it has to interfere. However, if a member does bring up the point I think the Chair does have to call the attention of hon. members to the fact and I do so now and ask the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to continue.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if hon. members who have never served in the Cabinet know how a Cabinet works. Well if a member, Sir, is sitting in the Cabinet when decisions are made then that member votes for these decisions. He has no choice. He either votes for it or he leaves the Cabinet. It is one thing or another.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is the way you used to do it.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, that is not the way it used to be done,

MR. NEARY: that is the way it is done. You cannot be hypocritical, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! The matter has come up that there are undue interruptions and I would ask hon. members therefore to pay attention to the ruling from the Chair which, after all, the Chair was asked to give by hon. members.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I do not mind the odd interruption, and if Your Honour wants to rule, rule.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is how it used to go.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, it is not how it used to go, it is how it still goes, all over the free world. If a member disagrees with a decision that is taken by Cabinet, if he disagrees with it there is only one choice and that is to leave in protest. If the member stays it means that he voted for that decision.

MR. ROBERTS: And agrees with it too.

MR. NEARY: And agrees with it, and then the member came out and denounced his colleagues. How hypocritical, Sir, can you get.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The hon. member is all -

MR. ROBERTS: I am perfectly sure that the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is making a very valid point.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, how green does the hon. gentleman think the people of this Province are? How green does the hon. gentleman think his constituents are? It is an insult to the intelligence of the good people in the district of Grand Falls, and the member should be ashamed of himself to try to con his constituents into thinking that the hon. gentleman is sincere. There is absolutely no sincerity to that at all, Sir, the lowest form of political hypocrisy.

MR. ROBERTS: Denouncing it in -

Mr. Neary:

Voting for it and then coming out and denouncing his colleagues.

If I were the Minister of Health -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is quite out of order.

MR. NEARY: It is quite in order, Sir. The hon. gentleman is out of order, and he has been out of order for some time.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: He started to ask a question so let him carry on.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we have put a number of questions now to the Minister of Health, since last night we have been trying to pry some information out of the minister, and the minister does not seem inclined to provide the House with the information. The minister just sits there like a useless stick of furniture, makes no effort to get up.

MR. ROBERTS: It is either a lump on a bog or a bump on a log.

MR. NEARY: No it is the Minister of Agriculture who is useless lump, the hon. useless lump.

AN HON. MEMBER: Come on 'Steve' give it to him.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we have now put some very, very good questions, in my opinion, to the Minister of Health, and the minister has made no effort at all to respond to the questions that we have put to him. Last night, Sir, when I spoke for a few minutes I put a number of questions to the minister regarding questions that I put on the Order Paper and today, lo and behold! during the Oral Question Period the minister came in with the answer. These questions had been on the Order Paper since sometime in early March.

MR. H. COLLINS: On the Oral Question Period?

MR. NEARY: On the Order Paper.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there were some very interesting answers provided to the questions that I have asked. One of the questions had to do with, what is the total cost of construction of the Carbonear Hospital? And what is the cost to date of equipping the Carbonear Hospital? Answer: Including equipment \$13,963,000,

Mr. Neary:

almost \$14 million. What was the original estimated cost of that hospital \$3.5 million?

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$4 million or \$5 million.

MR. NEARY: All right say \$4 million. The cost trebled the cost of the hospital trebled.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: With old Scrivener in there.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Chairman, we have been trying to find out for the last couple of months why the cost has tripled? I have asked repeatedly inside and outside of this House to have a commission of inquiry or some kind of a fact-finding committee set up to study the cost of the escalation of this hospital, the Carbonear Hospital and the Health Sciences Complex, the Roberts Memorial? And so far the government have not responded to my request. It would be a very worth-while exercise, it would certainly be in the interest of good government and the interest of protecting the public treasury and the taxpayers of this Province to carry out such a study. And I am not referring, Mr. Chairman, to the party donations, I am not concerned at all about that, well I am concerned about it, I am concerned about the system, but that is not what I am trying to get at at all, I am trying to get at, Sir, the reasons why the costs of this hospital have trebled and the cost of the Health Sciences Complex will probably double over a three or four year period?

Mr. Chairman, one time when we were building hospitals or putting up public buildings the engineers, the officials in the Department of Public Works used to supervise the job. The project was built directly under the supervision of the Department of Public Works. And back in 1971 the government of the day decided to change that technique, and I believe it was Mr. George Warren who is Deputy Minister of Public works that decided or recommended that it would be

Mr. Neary:

better to have project managers.

MR. ROBERTS: The Deputy Minister, and afterwards minister.

MR. NEARY: And afterwards minister of that department recommended, and I believe, the minister was the one that put the proposal up that it would be better to have project managers rather than the government to directly supervise the construction of hospitals and other public buildings. And this was supposed to be done in the interest of saving the taxpayers money.

Well let us see how it worked out . I cannot remember in my time, Sir, a building, or a hospital that doubled or tripled the cost while the former administration was in office. But under the new arrangement of bringing in project managers, rather than have the government supervise the construction of these hospitals themselves the cost

MR. NEARY: of the Carbonear Hospital trebled and the cost of the Health Sciences Complex will more than double.

MR. MAYNARD: What are you blaming that on the minister for? What has he got to do with it?

MR. NEARY: I am not blaming it on anybody, Sir. What I am getting at is this, that I believe it would be very worth-while for this government to find out why the cost of the Carbonear Hospital trebled and why the cost of the Health Sciences Complex is going to more than double. Some of it is due to inflation, I realize that.

MR. DOODY: Where have you been all those years?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it would be interesting to find out, Sir, if we should follow the route of getting project managers or if we should revert back to having the supervision of the construction of these institutions placed directly under the Department of Public Works and eliminate the middle man. That is what we have to find out, Sir. Which procedure is in the interest of the taxpayers, in the interest of protecting the public treasury, in the interest of good government in this Province? That is what we have to find out and that is what I have been trying to get at for the last few weeks when I have been personally slandered and libeled and ridiculed and accused of all kinds of character assassination and everything else.

All I am doing is trying to find out which procedure we should follow in the future. Should it be the old one of having the Department of Public Works supervise these projects or should we continue with project managers, give them a blank cheque?

MR. J. CARTER: Tell us about the liquor stores while you are at it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the member for St. John's North has not yet made a contribution to this hon. House, Sir. And I am afraid that kind of humour is not appreciated at this time when we are talking about a pretty serious matter. The taxpayers of this

MR. NEARY: Province are going to have to pony up, are going to have to cough up as a result of taking the route that I suggested - the project management route - the taxpayers are going to have to cough up about, I would say, anywhere between \$40 and \$50 million.

MR. DOODY: You did not suggest that route.

MR. NEARY: I did not suggest it, no.

MR. DOODY: You said you did.

MR. NEARY: No, I did not suggest it, Sir, I did not say I suggested it. No, I think it was Mr. George Warren and the Minister of Public Works in the former administration that recommended it. I would like to find out if that is the route that we should follow in the future in constructing hospitals and other public buildings. Should we give these people a blank cheque?

What there any mismanagement involved? Are they stalling because the Health Sciences Complex now is on the go since 1971 and it will not be finished until 1978. Seven years! In that length of time you could build the Brooklyn Bridge, you could build Eiffel Tower, you could build the Empire State Building, you could build the San Francisco Bridge and you could put up the biggest single structure in the world, the CN Tower in Toronto.

MR. DOODY: To say nothing of your larynx.

MR. NEARY: Very funny! Very funny! If you put them all together, Sir, they can all be constructed in the length of time that it takes to build the Health Sciences Complex. Now is that not worth finding out what the reasons are? Is it not worth finding out? Well why don't we? What is the hang up? I have been a month now trying to get the government to agree to some kind of an enquiry into this. It is not a witch hunt I am on. I am trying to find out, Sir, how we can save the



MR. NEARY: people of this Province hard earned dollars. Mr. Chairman, another interesting answer I got from the hon minister was in connection with therapeutic abortions. The hon. House may remember last night I asked the minister the total number of abortions that were performed in this Province for the calendar years 1974, 1975 and 1976 at St. Clare's Mercy Hospital, at the Grace General Hospital and at the St. John's General Hospital. And I asked for the reason pregnancy was terminated. The answer I got from the minister today was - just listen to this, Mr. Chairman. Number of therapeutic abortions: 1974-157, 1975-149, 1976-411, gone up by 300 per cent in over a one year period.

MR. MURPHY: And they are paid for by Medicare.

MR. NEARY: And they are paid for. This is the point, Sir, they are paid for out of Medicare. The costs - payments by MCP to specialists, 1974 - \$17,482.

MR. ROBERTS: Were these the only hospitals where there are abortions performed?

MR. NEARY: Incidentally the only abortions that

MR. NEARY: are done according - well I just listed three hospitals, there may be abortions done in other hospitals in Newfoundland, I do not know. I do not know if there are any done in St. Anthony or not.

MR. ROBERTS: There have been.

MR. NEARY: There have been. Well then my statistics are not 100 per cent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Grand Falls, Gander.

MR. NEARY: Maybe I should follow up by putting a -

MR. H. COLLINS: The hon. member asked about abortions in the city hospitals.

MR. NEARY: In three hospitals, that is right. Okay, well I am not blaming it on the hon. minister because now I have to put another question on the Order Paper, otherwise the minister might volunteer to give me the information.

MR. ROBERTS: Not likely.

MR. NEARY: What is the total number of abortions, or hysterotomies done in Newfoundland in 1976. In the General Hospital alone there were 411 and the cost in 1976 for specialists out of MCP was \$23,017, payments to surgeons \$202, cost of medications and other incidental expenses in 1976 - \$84,200. And my question here is of course -

MR. ROBERTS: What was the amount to the doctors, \$23 - ?

MR. NEARY: \$23,017. So if you add it all together, Sir, the average cost of each abortion is around \$250 or \$260 and the question I am asking is should MCP, I am not arguing the moral issue, should MCP pay for these abortions. When I asked the minister last night should MCP pay for tying off tubes, should MCP -

MR. ROBERTS: An awful lot of tubalegation are done in Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Well that is right. I am going to ask the minister now if the minister thinks that MCP should pay for sterilization?

MR. NEARY: Should MCP pay for - what do you call these things you get down here in the male - vasectomies? Should MCP pay for these kinds of operations that, you know, that the patient does not need to have. They are not an illness, Sir, and should MCP - the minister is talking about all the money that it is costing the medical health programme in this Province and I presume the minister is looking for ways to save money.

MR. H. COLLINS: Do you want to call -

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, but I do not want to see MCP abused. In all of these cases, I would say most of these cases the people can well afford to pay for these things that I have mentioned themselves.

MR. ROBERTS: Careful.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I do not have to be careful. I know whereby I speak.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would be interested in hearing the minister's reaction to these questions. I also put a question to the minister about the Central Supply. I had heard via my usual reliable source of information that nurses uniforms were dumped in Robin Hood Bay in 1975 by Central Supply at Pleasantville. And I asked the minister why these uniforms were destroyed. The minister comes back and says, "Yes, 340 nurses uniforms were dumped in Robin Hood Bay." The uniforms were destroyed because they had been in stock for over twenty years. They were large sizes, shop worn, obsolete and had lost their tensile strength.

MR. MURPHY: I wonder would -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I cannot question the minister's answer but I can certainly question the dumping.-

MR. DOODY: - in Robin Hood Bay.

MR. NEARY: - the dumping of these uniforms in Robin Hood Bay. I would gather, Sir, from the answer that a lot of these uniforms were in good shape and even though while they were probably there

MR. NEARY: so long that they might have been a bit mildewed, but Sir, with all the unemployment, with all the poverty we have in this Province I am sure that there are women in this Province who can sew, who would be glad to have these uniforms to cut them over for their kids, to make a Holy Communion outfit for their little girl, or to make a dress to wear around the kitchen.

No, this government with its elusions of grandeur, they will not go out and try to find -

MR. H. COLLINS: They were down there for twenty years.

MR. NEARY: I do not care how long they were there.

MR. DOODY: Come on, they would be busting out all over the place.

MR. NEARY: I do not care how long they were there.

They could have been put to better use than taken down and dumped in Robin Hood Bay.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - You are less than half a fool. Give it up.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is still smarting

Mr. Neary:

under the attack. The hon. and hypocritic gentleman is still smarting under the attack. Why look if the hon. gentleman had any intestinal fortitude, he would go out now and resign.

Mr. Chairman, this crowd do not like to hear the truth.

Mr. Chairman, I also asked some questions about crockery ware that they had down at Central Supply. And I asked if any crockery ware was dumped in Robin Hood Bay. And I am told that a quantity of crockery ware, which had no book value, was destroyed in 1975. Items were either damaged or unsealable or stocks of odd patterns no longer used by institutions. It is the policy of the department that crested chinaware is not to be distributed to needy residents of the Province. We contend that crested items in the possession of the public would be of embarrassment to them. What foolish nonsense! I wish I had some of it. I could manage to drink coffee out of some of these mugs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: Well I will have to come back at it again, Your honour. I am just getting a full head of steam here, Sir.

MR. MARSHALL: How much time is left in the Health estimates, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thirty-eight minutes.

MR. MARSHALL: Oh, thirty-eight minutes. Oh, there is plenty of time.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to get on my feet, but it is very hard for a member in the backbenches to apparently get into these estimate debates, and I am almost knocked through the wall of the House here with the decibels that have been coming across the House this afternoon or tonight from the Leader of the Opposition and the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. J. CARTER: The hon. hog.

Mr. Marshall.

Now I would like to say one thing advertent to what the Leader of the Opposition said - and let us talk about a few other things he said as well. But one thing I do agree with, that I do feel it is time for the public to be told in hospital construction, as in many other fields, that the money is not available. It is just not available, and it will not be available in the immediate future for the construction of hospitals desirable as they may be North, South, East or West. We just cannot afford it. The projected hospital construction of what is required in various places will drive the public debt up so high, beyond manageable proportions, and it is getting beyond manageable proportions now - any statements to the contrary notwithstanding.

But there is one thing that I have to point out what the hon. Leader of the Opposition indicated. He took great credit for being the government, his government, the government he was a member of, in building hospitals, the government that built the hospitals. And certainly, Mr. Chairman, I will give them credit. They built the hospital in Carbonear, and they can have the credit for the hospital in Carbonear if they will also accept the liability for the cost. They can take the Twillingate hospital if they will accept the liability for the cost. They can take the Western Memorial Hospital if they accept the liability for the cost. They can take the Health Sciences Complex if they will take the liability for the cost. And we must remember that these hospitals were built for the purpose of their own political future at that particular time.

MR. J. CARTER: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: They can also take the liability, Mr. Chairman, for the operating costs of these hospitals. If they want to take credit for them, certainly I will give them. If the hon. gentlemen wish to

Mr. Marshall.

take credit for the oil refinery, we will certainly give them credit for that if they will take the responsibility for the cost and the debt of the Province.

MR. J. CARTER: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: We will even give them credit for constructing a Linerboard mill in Stephenville with the wood sources supply being in Labrador if they will take the credit for the cost. So the purpose of what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that you cannot have it both ways. You cannot get on the air and talk about the high public debt and the very high public debt of this Province and how it is choking us, and is that public debt ever choking us, and at the same

Mr. Marshall:

time taken credit for large public works and for industries which have driven this Province, has got this Province by the neck, have driven it into debt that it will not get out of for numbers of years to come.

MR. J. CARTER: White elephants.

MR. MARSHALL: Now I feel that it should be time to get up and make this statement, because I see in this House, not all hon. gentlemen from the other side - and I suppose it is a part of the political game - they get up and they make these statements, the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) gets up and talks about the public debt, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition takes credit for spending the money. You cannot have it, as I say, both ways. But as I see in this House, not all hon. members, but members on the opposite side come up with this particular tenet, with this particular position, and I have to say, I am only a poor little backbencher in the government, but I have to say the government appears to be extremely docile, it appears to be almost like a hush puppy type of government to sit back and take these kinds of observations day after day, after day when the simple fact of the matter is sure there have been millions of dollars that have been borrowed, certainly there have had to be millions of dollars borrowed since this government came to power, but the fact of the matter is when it came to power it had a continuing legacy of \$100 million a year interest it had to pay on the public debt that was then accumulated.

So that is all, you know, that I rise to say. I had no intention of getting up until I heard the Leader of the Opposition making these observations. Because I think it very pertinent, and I think that the wool has been pulled, or the attempt is to pull the wool over the eyes of the people of this Province.

MR. J. CARTER: Disgusting.

MR. MARSHALL: And for some reason or other I do not know why the government appears to want to just lie down and accept this type of castigation. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that



Mr. Marshall:

certainly these works were built, and certainly they were put in, and I will not go into the reasons they were put in, but you cannot have it both ways. You cannot take the credit and at the same time not accept the responsibility because that is what has happened. And the reason why this Province is in the state it is now is primarily because of the previous administration added to, I might say, although this is not relevant, by mistakes that this government made in the Churchill Falls Development, - which we will have a debate on before this session closes, I hope - but primarily the responsibility for the awful position that this Province is in lies with, not the hon. gentlemen necessarily there opposite, but with the previous administration, and a member of the previous administration bears responsibility of it, and he cannot get out of it, and on the one hand, talk about, look at all the works we have done in hospitals, look at the industries, the refinery, the Linerboard Mill and then start talking about public debt on the other.

MR. J. CARTER: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. J. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I agree with a lot of what the hon. gentleman who just spoke said. There is a lot of common sense in it. And, in fact, most of it is undeniable. If a government presently in office or formerly in office takes pride in buildings, and roads and things that it built, and boasts of their accomplishments then by the same token they must take responsibility for incurring the cost of building them. That is perfectly true. The present administration must take credit for building the fine new college in Corner Brook, and by the same token take the blame, if that is the word, for the cost of it. Governments build roads and they build hospitals and schools and universities and colleges, and all kinds of things, and they are not free. They are not built without cost. They do cost millions, they cost tens of millions, they cost scores of

Mr. Smallwood:

millions, they cost hundreds of million, and they may even in the aggregate cost thousands of millions of dollars. Up to the present time the Government of Newfoundland, the two administrations of the government, my administration in twenty-three years and the present Premier's administration in five years, going on six, between us we have added \$2.5 billion to the public debt. We have to take responsibility for that. It may not be quite \$2.5 billion, it may not be \$2.5 billion, it may be only

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$2,400,000,000, between us we borrowed that. It was borrowed for a good purpose. It was borrowed to give the Newfoundland people the roads that they needed, and the paving and the water and sewer systems and the schools and the hospitals and the arts and culture centres, and the aircraft landing strips, and the public parks, and hundreds of other things that the people needed. Once we became a province of Canada the people had to have something at least resembling Canadian standards or we would have lost our people and our population tonight would not be the 550,000 it is, it would be a quarter rather than half a million souls. Because those things had to be done and it could be done only with the money that was collected from the people in taxes and the money that was borrowed by the two administrations of the government, and by the gifts from Ottawa.

Now the hon. gentleman said what he said with an air of profound wisdom and profound importance. It is perfectly obvious that if a government builds this or that and takes credit for it, it must at the same time take the blame for the money that it cost to put those things there. That is obvious, that scarcely needs to be said.

I do not claim for a moment that the money \$1400 million, \$1500 million, \$1600 million that the present administration has added to the public debt of our Province, I do not say with regard to that that they ought not to have built the things they built, the additional miles of road, we built 5,000 miles of new roads in Newfoundland and we paved between 2,000 and 3,000 miles. We built twenty-eight hospitals, twenty-five, twenty-six, twenty-seven, twenty-eight hospitals. We built 1,000 new schools. We built a great univeristy that has cost up to now, not counting the cost of the Health Sciences Centre, which is what? \$70 million.

MR. NEARY: Oh you will have to go more than that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$70 million or more. Apart from that, not counting that, the cost of the university - \$65 million or \$70 million. We did that. We did it because there was need to do it and what the present administration have done was done because it was needed.

The hon. gentleman said that we did it for obvious reasons, to curry favour. Of course that is true. That is the difference between the administration that I led and the present administration. The present administration does not do things to curry favour, to win the favour and the support and the approval of the Newfoundland electorate, the Newfoundland voters. They are not like that. We were like that. We tried to win over -

MR. NEARY: They are patriotic.

MR. J. CARTER: Shame! Shame!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Shame?

MR. J. CARTER: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What about? What is the shame.

MR. J. CARTER: Mislocating hospitals, mislocating schools, mislocating public buildings -

MR. NEARY: Mislocating the hon. gentleman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well I will not trespass on the Committee's time, Mr. Chairman, to comment on those profound remarks, which probably have some meaning if the meaning could only be found. There must be something there somewhere in those rumblings that we have just heard.

The point is and in this I am glad that the honourable and learned gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) seems to concur not only in his remarks of a few minutes ago but in other speeches he has made in the last year and a half in this House. He seems to concur utterly and completely in the point I make, namely that the time has come, not that the people have got all they need, not that there are now at this point

MR. SMALLWOOD: all the hospitals and schools and all the rest of it that are needed, all the miles of roads, new roads, all the paving, all the water and sewer projects, all the public libraries, all the arts and culture centres, all the trade schools, all the

MR. SMALLWOOD aircraft landing strips that are needed, they have not got the things that are needed and will not have for many long years to come. But the time has come to have an armistice, to have an moratorium, to have a marking time. We cannot and we must not go on borrowing at the rate at which we have done it in the last five, now going on six years, averaging quarter of a billion dollars a year, each year, added to the public debt. We cannot go on doing that. The hon. and learned gentleman just said so. He said we must not go on borrowing till we reach the breaking point if we have not already reached it or if we are not perilously close to it. Now I have been saying that. I have been saying it not for partisan reasons. Does no one credit me? Does not even the hon. gentleman from St. John's North, who is in some ways one of the wittiest members of this House, a witty man. He is evidently well read, he is evidently well informed, he has a gift of nimble speech, even he surely will not deny me the honesty and all sincerity and say that I am a complete animal, a beast without human attributes. Even he will not go quite that far. I take it, I assume he will not go quite as far as that.

And surely, Mr. Chairman, I can be given some credit at my age and at my present stage in the public life of this Province, which I helped with thousands of others to create, surely I can be credited with some regard for the future of this Province, for the future stability, the future prosperity of the Province of Newfoundland. Surely I must be given some credit for having some feeling on that and perhaps some little intelligence to go with it. And it is not for partisan reasons. As a matter of fact I do not hear - I have not heard very much on this side of the House since I have been back in this House, I have not heard all that much of a cry from my colleagues here on this side, of warning, of alarm about the financial condition of our Province. I have heard more from the other side. I heard it from the hon.

MR. SMALLWOOD: gentleman from St. John's East followed the following day, I think, by the hon gentleman from St. John's North, followed the day after that by the then member for St. John's West, John Crosbie, followed the day after that by the Minister of Finance and followed the day after that by the Premier himself. Five hon members on that side of the House got up and echoed and re-echoed what I had said. The alarm I had expressed about the conditions, the financial condition of our Province and the imminent peril, the real danger we were getting in, they echoed it. So it is not for partisan reasons. I am not saying what I say because it is part of the strategy, the tactics agreed on by the opposition. I am giving a personal point of view, purely personal, purely sincere. I am afraid of the condition of this Province. And in that the hon. gentleman from St. John's East and I, I think, see eye to eye.

I credit him with more sincerity than I believe perhaps he credits me with. I mean every word I am saying, and I am not saying it to help a general election, to help any party to win a general election, this party of which I am now again a member or the party opposite, or any party, or any politician. I am not saying it for such small and unworthy reasons, I am saying it because I believe with every fibre, with what knowledge I have - and do not forget, it was only five years or so ago when I stopped writing budget speeches - I wrote them for twenty-three years, and I know something about budget speeches, and I know something about public finance, and from the basis of my practical knowledge I say to this committee tonight and through the committee to the people of Newfoundland, Newfoundland is in a perilously dangerous condition financially. And what is

MR. SMALLWOOD:

needed is to tell the people jack blunt, much more jack blunt than the Minister of Finance did it the other day in his Budget Speech. The people have got to be told in blunt language that for the next couple or maybe three years, they have got to be satisfied to do without this and do without that and do without the other .



MR. SMALLWOOD: It will come as a great shock to them. There has been no preparation of it. The speeches I made on the subject here and by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), and St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), and St. John's West and the Minister of Finance, and the Premier, not a word of that got in the papers or on the radio or television, not a word, and the people to this moment are completely unaware of the perilous condition we are in and they have got to be made aware and then perhaps for a year or two they will understand that they cannot get the artesian wells they want and they need and the water and sewer systems they want and they need and the roads and the paving they want and need badly. They cannot get this and they cannot get that and they cannot get the other for a while because the money to build them, to put them there has to be borrowed. And we have reached the point where every time now we go on the market we are drawing visibly, noticeably closer to that fatal moment when it will be a waste of time to go on the market and ask people to lend money to Newfoundland.

Now have I few minutes left, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Until nine twenty-nine.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Until nine twenty-nine.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well all right. What I am going to say, I hope I can compress. The hon. Minister of Industrial Development, and of Rural Development, who is the elected member of this House for the constituency of Grand Falls, without the shadow of a doubt is an angry honourable gentleman, angry and frustrated as must also be the Minister from Trinity North (Mr. Brett), Minister of Social Services. He too must be angry and frustrated, and when in Cabinet they concurred in the estimates and the Budget, and concurred in another delay, another postponement, a necessary postponement, an inevitable postponement of construction of hospital extension in Grand Falls and in Clarenville and in the other parts

MR. SMALLWOOD: of the Province where it is so badly needed, they no doubt when they concurred they concurred angrily. They concurred with disgust and almost perhaps they were so angry as to be fit to be tied. But, Sir, the minute a minister concurs in a decision of Cabinet, such is the great British principle of parliamentary government, Cabinet, collective responsibility, that either they say, "No, Sir, I cannot take it I will leave this Cabinet," or they will concur and be silent from there on.

Indeed men in my Cabinet have expressed vehement opposition to some proposal and always invariably I said to them, "Do you feel this as a matter of conscience? If it is a matter of conscience, a matter of religious conscience or something of that nature, if it is that then we will not violate your conscience or ask you to violate it." But if it was not a matter of conscience, if it was just a matter of policy, if it was a matter of ordinary practical, pragmatic policy, my question to them always was, "You are against it?" "Yes, Premier." "You do not like it?" "No, Premier, I do not." "Well you have made that abundantly clear you have made it but if the Cabinet decides to do it will you support it? Indeed if I ask you to be the one to stand in the House of Assembly and explain and defend it will you do it? Because if you concur, if you do not leave the Cabinet, then you fall in line and you cannot go out and attack it after without leaving the Cabinet."

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The same thing happened in Germany.

MR. NEARY: Now who is the big fool?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am enunciating -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - the telling about democracy.

MR. NEARY: Resign! Resign!

MR. ROWE: Go out boy, go out.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Never at a Cabinet meeting in his life.

MR. NEARY: Go out and resign boy. Do not be such a hypocrite.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman one day will be ashamed of what he said there a few minutes ago and he will be ashamed of his conduct in Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You never held a democratic meeting in your life.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Telling us about democracy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: The Chairman said Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was not talking about democracy,

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was talking about the system of British Cabinet Government. The British principle, the British system, the British way of conducting government, which is to have a Cabinet, to have them sworn to secrecy, to have collective Cabinet responsibility. This is the system. I did not invent it. I followed it for twenty-three years. The present Premier no doubt is following it for the last five, going on six years, and that is the system. It is the system around wherever the Union Jack flies, wherever there is parliamentary government, that is what Cabinet Government means. And Cabinet Government can be no other, it cannot be otherwise, and be British, and be the parliamentary system.

MR. NEARY: The other one is phoney.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You never had the guts or the ....  
that is why we are in the mess we are in today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: You should hang your head in shame.

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

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do suggest that the hon. minister - an hon. gentleman for whom, may I say, in passing, that I have considerable -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: (Inaudible) what is this word?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Keep quiet boy. Keep quiet.

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

MR. SMALLWOOD: - for whom I have considerable respect. I believe that he is a minister who is energetic, I believe he is a minister who is ambitious to do a good job, to get things done, I believe he is a minister who takes pride in his department and in his accomplishments. And I am not saying that now for the first time. I have said it on a number of occasions, and I have said it, I think, on radio or on television, and I have certainly said it here in this House, and I repeat

Mr. Smallwood:

it, but I say at the same time that he will be ashamed if the Premier does not dismiss him from his Cabinet, if he does not he will live to be ashamed of his conduct in Grand Falls and his remarks here tonight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: (MR. YOUNG): The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. FLIGHT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. A point of order, Sir. I want to raise a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): A point of order has been raised.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a point of order based on -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. FLIGHT: - I have been watching the clock and I had intended to say a few words in this debate. Now, Sir, we have just gone through - the minister has got ten minutes left to go - we have just gone through three hours and fifty minutes of the Department of Health's Estimates, and the speeches we have heard are wide-ranging speeches with no relevancy to the estimates at all, Sir, and if this continues in the rest of the heads to come up then I suggest to you that this House is getting hoodwinked and the people are getting hoodwinked because we are hearing speeches with no relevancy, and we are supposed to be debating the estimates.

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: You idiots.

MR. PECKFORD: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FLIGHT: You people as well.

MR. PECKFORD: To that point of order. The comments by the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) in his point of order are well taken. The estimates for the Department of Health were called, and we got on the first subhead, I guess, the minister's salary. Hon. members on both sides of the House got up and gave their opinions on

Mr. Peckford:

health matters and health care in the Province in general, and the debate has ranged about health care in its broadest sense. There has been no attempt by hon. members on the other side of the House or on this side of the House to restrict that debate on the minister's salary. It is in our own hands as hon. members to restrict our debate on the minister's salary, so that we can get down to the more specific items in the estimates. That is something that we all have -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. PECKFORD: - and therefore the point of order is not a point of order at all, it is just a point of debate and a lot of -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The cheapest - The rawest kind of politics

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

I feel that there is no point of order. If the hon. member feels that the debate was not relevant he should have brought it up when the member was speaking.

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I have not got a big lot of time, Sir, -

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Ten minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Eleven minutes.

MR. COLLINS: - to respond to all of the questions which have been asked, and all of the allegations which have been made. The Leader of the Opposition is not in his seat now, I understand earlier this evening there was some food served downstairs, fish, I believe, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. COLLINS: I do not know if they served live crabs or if he was eating -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. COLLINS: - eels or if he swallowed a fish hook or what happened to him, but certainly he was in a gay mood tonight - he is not here. It is either that something went afoul down there or otherwise the pressures are coming on in the leadership race, I will leave it to

Mr. H. Collins.

hon. members to judge for themselves what it might be. But certainly, you know, he really came to life, and I am sure that we are all excited on this side of the House to know that he is still the Leader for the night anyway. How much longer that will last we do not know.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is a pity that we do not have more time, and this is a new experience. Last year in the Department of Health we had three days to debate the estimates. This year because of a new agreement which looked liked it might be a worth-while one and possible it is or possibly it will be as we go along, but certainly it does not leave me much time to respond to all of the questions. And I suppose had I extended myself in the debate before, we would have been accused maybe of taking up needless time. I could have gotten up several times.

But I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the first part of this debate, yesterday and last night, was a very worth-while exercise. A lot of people talked about the health care system. Members on this side and members on the other side, on the opposite side, and a lot of good, relevant comments were made. Tonight I cannot say the same thing about that. Now as all hon. members know any Minister of Health would like to build fifteen or twenty hospitals. Would I not love to be able to go to Grand Falls and announce construction of a new hospital? Would I not love to go to Clarendville and go to Burin and go to Flowers Cove and go to all of the places, and not only open new ones but announce the construction of additional ones. But, Mr. Chairman, I believe, and some hon. members opposite, particularly the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) - and he and I have had a lot of disagreements over the years - but I believe he agrees too that the day of reckoning has arrived in this Province, and we are not the last to realize this, because last year, as hon. members know, we tried to bring about some rationale as to where we were

Mr. H. Collins.

in Health and where we should be going, and we took it upon ourselves - it was not a very popular move I can assure you - but it was a move which got a lot of consideration from people in the department, and I think that I have one of the better departments in government. We have a tremendous staff in the Department of Health. I am sure that other ministers will say the same thing about theirs, but in Health we do have a tremendously efficient staff.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Five or six thousand.

MR. H. COLLINS: Five or six thousand? Well in the whole health field we have about 8,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Eight thousand.

MR. H. COLLINS: But last year we took it upon ourselves to try and stir the people of Newfoundland into what we were up against in terms of the cost of services, particularly the cost of health services, and we took it upon ourselves, as I said, to try and change the psychology, if that is a good term. And we went about meeting with the hospital administrators, with the Medical Association, with the Association of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland, and all the other people involved from a professional and an administrative point of view, and pointed out to them that the day of reckoning was coming, and it was time that we sat down and try and establish, you know, where we are going from here on knowing that our budget this year - and it is - our budget this year is approaching a quarter of a billion dollars. We closed 200 hospital beds, and I was severely criticized at the time by some hon. members opposite. I was told that we were being inconsistent in that we were closing beds, and we were stopping construction, etc. But we went ahead with the full co-operation of all the people involved in the health care system, and we closed, for the information of the Leader of the Opposition again tonight, 210 beds across this Province.



MR. NEARY: You could just -

MR. H. COLLINS: So when I say, Mr. Chairman, we closed the beds, when I say we closed the beds, that may not be a true statement, but in our negotiations with the various hospitals, in negotiating their operating budget, we cut wherever we could cut, and believe me we cut, and we cut in places almost to the bone. And we were told invariably that if you keep doing this it is going to mean closing of beds, and we said, All right, if it means closing of beds, let us go ahead and see what we can do with that. And at the time we did that and when we got approval from all the people to give it a good try, let us give it a shake, we set up a review committee, which was constituted by the appointment of a member from the Medical Association, a member from the Hospital Association, which is the administration side, and my own deputy minister, Dr. Klippert, to monitor the effects of the bed closure programme. And we monitored that, and monitored it very carefully those three people who made up the monitoring and review committee. And the results so far, Mr. Chairman, have been that in some hospitals, depending on which one it might have been, in some hospitals, in some referral centres, we had to modify

Mr. H. Collins.

our plans, because the demands on the hospital beds were such that we knew that we had to change our approach and we were willing to change our approach provided it could be proved to us, and if it was proved to us, that we should do that. In other areas it was proved to us that we could have gone further, and in fact we did go a bit further. We modified our plans as we went through. And the result up until this time, Mr. Chairman, is this, that in every single case where beds were closed we have found that the put-through, the productivity in the hospital concerned has improved, has increased, and there has been no real impairment in terms of the delivery of the health care to our people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that being repeated in other hospitals

MR. H. COLLINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not really sure of that. I would not want to make a prediction but the experience which -

MR. NEARY: What about the children's hospital?

MR. H. COLLINS: The Janeway Hospital is a good case in point, and we closed -

MR. NEARY: They are needed. They are needed.

MR. H. COLLINS: That is not true. The hon. member can make wild statements if he wants to. Now if he wants to refute -

MR. NEARY: How do they -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. H. COLLINS: - the information which the Medical Association and the hospital administration and my deputy minister and my staff is giving me, that is fine. But I think the people in this country will accept our views rather than his.

Mr. Chairman, the Janeway is a bit of a different case, but we have had a lot of luck with the people at the Janeway, and we recognize that the Janeway does have a peculiar problem, because it is a provincial institution dealing with all of the illnesses related to the children of the Province, but we have got by in the Janeway pretty well too. And all told, Mr. Chairman, I believe

Mr. H. Collins.

that our exercise last year has had the effect of changing the whole psychology in terms of health care. And I can tell the hon. House in the two or three minutes which I have left that the day of reckoning has arrived, and it has passed. The hon. Leader of the Opposition asked me, What the effect on the health care system in Newfoundland would be as a result of the change or the new arrangements with the federal government? And I do not want to stand here and criticize the federal government to too great an extent, but the changes which the federal government have brought about, - I am a little bit ahead of myself. The plan which we had under Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act Agreement and the plan under the Medicare Agreement means that the health care system across Canada was just about equalized. Newfoundland had an opportunity to raise its standards approaching the standards in Ottawa, in Ontario, approaching the standards of care in British Columbia, approaching the standards of care in Quebec and the so-called richer provinces.

The effect of the changes which have now been brought about by Ottawa will mean that the standard of health care in this Province, and in all of the other provinces for that matter, but we are talking about Newfoundland, the standard of health care in this Province will now be geared to the Gross National Product. And, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that I need to say too much more about that other than to indicate -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Gross National, the Provincial?

MR. H. COLLINS: Well, it is the Gross National - well both are tied.

But the Gross Provincial Product - where is the Minister of Finance? I do not know if he understands this entirely or not. But the system which they have given to us is a pretty complicated one, but whatever it is, Mr. Chairman, the growth in the health care system or plan in Newfoundland is going to be returned. I think that is a fair statement to make, because we will not be getting the monies from Ottawa which otherwise we would have received. It will not be on the

Mr. H. Collins.

equalized basis to the extent that it was before. But, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding that, even if the monies were coming from Ottawa, I think that we have a responsibility in this Province to make sure that we get the best value for every single dollar we spend.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H. COLLINS: Even under the old system they were fifty cent dollars, and I believe that one of the tragedies of the whole system was that our old health care system was distorted, because the fifty cent dollars from Ottawa looked so attractive that we got involved to a great extent in the most expensive acute care type of hospital services. We did not get involved in the less expensive, and sometimes most beneficial programmes like home care, like, day surgery, and a lot of other areas which are very beneficial, less cost by, most beneficial to the people. We did not do that, because those programmes were not cost-shared, and the provincial dollars could not be found. I believe that if we tackle this problem properly, with co-operation from hon. members opposite and co-operation from the people of Newfoundland, that this move on the part of Ottawa might be a blessing in disguise for us, because

MR. H. COLLINS: I believe if we all approach it properly and go about our business as we should, and explain to people where we can and try to get people to understand what we are trying to do, I believe that in the end we will come up with a good health care system which will meet the needs of the people of Newfoundland -

MR. DOODY: We would have less money than we would have had -

MR. COLLINS: And we might have money for other purposes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! Can I report -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order -

MR. COLLINS: There are a hundred - To answer the Leader of the Opposition, there are 160 still closed.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, how firm are we on the hours? Can we take - For instance, we have four hours here for Rehabilitation and Recreation which I think is too much time on that department. Can we spend another hour on Health, take it from Rehabilitation and Recreation and spend another hour on Health, is that permissible under the new system?

MR. PECKFORD: No, what the new rules are is that whatever hours are left at the end that they are going to be split equally between two departments, as I understand it, the Department of Mines and Energy and the Department of Fisheries. And whatever hours are left that are not used under the standard allocation now in place that at the end, however many there are left, will then be equally shared amongst the two departments.

MR. NEARY: Can we switch them around?

MR. PECKFORD: Well I think if we start doing that we could run into all kinds of trouble and be back to the old system.

On motion, Head X, Health, all items, carried.

On motion that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN(YOUNG): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have

MR. CHAIRMAN (YOUNG): considered the matters to them referred and have passed all items of expenditure under Head X , Health, all items without amendments and have made progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have passed all items of expenditure under Heading X and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, committee ordered to sit again, presently.

I am in a position now to inform hon. members of my decision on the point of order with respect to the motion made by the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy. I thank hon. gentlemen who contributed in the submissions and would for the sake of clarity say at the very beginning that the ruling on this specific point does not alter or affect three quite clear principles, and I will restate those because it is possible that confusion can result. There are three clear principals which are quite distinct. (1) One is the operation of Standing Order 8 at 11:00 P.M., as last night. (2) The second, the making of a motion not to adjourn at a certain time when made previous to eleven, which is in order, not debatable, and our precedents are quite clear on that. (3) And (thirdly, the requirement that to amend the Standing Orders there must be two-thirds members of the House of Assembly who vote affirmatively. They are independent principles.

Now hon. members I think will agree when I say that the question before the Chair may be put succinctly as follows: Does parliamentary procedure permit (and recognize a motion (the passage of which will fix the hours of sitting on a certain day -)

MR. ROBERTS: Hours of meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: Hours of meeting, but which is not an amendment to the Standing Orders. That essentially is the question. If such a motion is an amendment to the Standing Orders there is a certain

MR. SPEAKER: statutory requirement. If such a motion is not an amendment to the Standing Orders, then it is not affected by the statutory requirement and is passed by the majority of members present in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: In order to determine whether parliamentary procedure recognizes such a motion, and not as one which amends the Standing Orders, I have to refer to four sources of authority: Standing Order 29 of our own Legislature, which reads; "Twenty-fours notice shall be given of a motion for leave to present a Bill, resolution or address, or for placing a question on the Order Paper; but this rule shall not apply to Bills after their introduction, or to private Bills, or to the times of meeting and adjournment of the House. Such notice shall be laid upon the Table before six p.m."

Now that clearly establishes that notice is not necessary for such a motion. The reference in the Standing Order to the item, "Times of meeting and adjournment," and its reference in context with the other matters referred to is, in my opinion, not conclusive but persuasive that such a motion is in order. It is persuasive, in my opinion.

There are a number of precedents in our own practice, and I will refer to only three, and hon. members may regard them in the Hansards of February 28, 1975, March 6, 1975, March 7, 1975, and I am quite sure there would be others. These precedents show that a motion similar to the one made by the hon. minister has been made and accepted.

Now as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition pointed out - or it was his submission, part of his submission - that this may have been done by leave. Obviously, that is a possibility. The Hansard does not indicate whether it was or was not by leave. Obviously, it may have been done by leave. It may also have been done by a unanimous vote, a unanimous affirmative vote, but still not by leave. One could have a unanimous affirmative vote not involving the



MR. SPEAKER: principle of grace, or it may have been by majority vote. No division was ever called for. I have no way of knowing.

Again, I regard those precedents because of the lack of any challenge to them, so the lack of any information, apart from the fact that the motion was carried, the lack of any decision from the Chair, because the matter never came up to be judged, I regard it as persuasive. Again, not conclusive.

Furthermore in the House of Commons, Standing Order 32, which the hon. the Leader of the Opposition referred to, the specific provision there is 32(p) but I will first refer to - what Standing Order 32 does is enumerates all of the motions which are debatable. "The following motions are debatable," and it goes through numerous kinds: "Motion for the previous question; for the concurrence in the report of a special committee; for second reading of a Bill; for third reading of a Bill; for adjournment of the House when made for the purpose of discussing a matter or urgency; for the consideration of the budget," and numerous other procedures from 'A' to 'O'.

And 'P' reads: "Such other motions made upon routine proceedings as may be required for the observance of the proprieties of the House, the maintenance of its authority, the appointment or conduct of its officers, the management of its business, the arrangement of its proceedings, the correctness of its records, the fixing of its sitting days, or the times of its meeting or adjournment."

Again the Standing Order starts off by saying, "The following motions are debatable." It would appear to me however, since everything from 'A' to 'P' and down to the last two items in 'P,' which are the matters before the House now, that these are obviously matters which

MR. SPEAKER: would be carried by a majority. It again in context would strongly appear that those other items, the fixing of its sitting days, or the times of its meetings or adjournment, would have the same nature. Again I say that is persuasive. There is no authority I am aware of directly on, specifically on the question.

The fourth matter I referred to is May, Page 351, and the paragraph starts off: "Examples of motions regulating the sittings of the House."

"Examples of motions regulating the sittings of the House are: To provide for the meeting of the House and the taking of questions at a different hour from that appointed by the standing order. This motion is made either when it is necessary or advisable on a particular occasion for the House to meet at a different hour etc."

I repeat that there is no specific authority which is precisely on the point brought up. Bearing in mind, however, Standing Order 29, which I regard as persuasive - our own Standing Order 29 - the precedents of the House, which I regard as persuasive, the House of Commons Standing Order 32, and list of debatable motions, and the section I read from May, I regard them all individually, and certainly collectively, as persuasive. I would therefore rule the motion is in order and in so doing what I am saying is that, in my opinion, parliamentary procedure does recognize the validity, permissibility of a motion the passage of which would fix the hours of meeting for a specific day which is not at the same time an amendment to the Standing Order.

So I therefore rule the motion is in order and debatable.

MR. ROBERTS: And requires a majority.

MR. SPEAKER: And requires a majority for its disposition.

MR. NEARY: That is only for one day, eh?

MR. SMALLWOOD: A majority of what, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: A majority of the members present in the House.

MR. ROBERTS: That is for one day, Your Honour.

MR. FLIGHT: Just one day?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, one day at a time.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House, yes, it is for Thursday.

MR. ROBERTS: And we have a debate each day as to when the House meets.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do I understand now that we can debate this?

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is now before the House unless any other order of business is called.

MR. ROBERTS: Government can call their orders if they want.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. If another order is called then the motion is not before the House. Otherwise, the motion is before the House.

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have moved the motion and you have now ruled it in order, and I think the motion now should be debated.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is just another case, Sir, of the government using brute force, using their majority, Sir, to get their own way. Mr. Speaker, this government has become very arrogant, as Your Honour is aware. They seem to be in a big rush to get the House closed up. They are going to force now members to meet at all kinds of irregular hours. Nobody,

MR. NEARY: Sir, let me make it abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, right from the start, that nobody, but nobody is objecting to working five days a week from nine o'clock in the morning until six in the evening.

MR. PECKFORD: This is ten o'clock in the morning.

MR. NEARY: This is ten o'clock in the morning, Sir, until eleven o'clock at night three days a week.

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible) this motion.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, but that is what the hon. gentleman tried to ram through the House yesterday.

MR. PECKFORD: You had agreed to that.

MR. NEARY: We had not agreed to it, Sir. We had not agreed to it and Your Honour - as a matter of fact, we had no right to agree to it because Your Honour came in and gave a ruling and said that we could not agree to it. Your Honour said we could not, it was against the rules, it was against the rules of procedure of this House. Your Honour rightly pointed out yesterday that - Mr. Speaker, there are all kinds of meetings going on and I cannot really get in full flight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member should be allowed to continue.

MR. NEARY: Nobody is objecting to a meeting, the House meeting and working five days a week, giving up our weekends for that matter, giving up some of the holidays that we have had in this hon. House. Nobody is objecting to that, Sir. We are quite prepared to do it. I know I am. I would move my bed in here if I had to. But, Mr. Speaker, is it fair to the staff of this House? Is it fair to the press, the eyes and ears of this House? And is it fair, Sir, to the minister and to the members

MR. NEARY: who are devoted. Mr. Speaker, is it fair to the members who want to do a job for their districts?

MR. FLIGHT: The executive assistants are -

MR. NEARY: There is nothing at all wrong, Sir, and I have claimed inside and outside of this House, despite the fact that the Government House Leader, the acting Government House Leader took to the airwaves yesterday and condemned me, the one member of the House, I think the hon. gentleman said, who has been trying to get the House to meet longer and more often and longer hours. And that is true, Sir, and I reiterate that statement here tonight that I want the House to meet twelve months out of a year, five days a week, weekends if necessary to try to come to grips, to solve the problems of the ordinary people of this Province. That is not the argument at all, Sir. I think everybody will agree that we have an easy time of it in this hon. House working three hours a day from three to six o'clock in the evening.

What the government is trying to do, Sir, Mr. Speaker, what the administration is trying to do is to get the House to work from Monday morning 10 o'clock until 11 o'clock Monday night. Tuesday morning 10 o'clock until 11 o'clock Tuesday night. Wednesday 3 o'clock until 6 o'clock. Thursday 10 o'clock until 11 o'clock Thursday night, Friday from 10 o'clock until 1 o'clock.

MR. DOODY: Is it too much for you?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, it is not too much for me.

MR. MORGAN: What are you complaining about?

MR. NEARY: What I am complaining about is the irregular hours. Mr. Speaker, what the government should propose is that the House work regular hours from nine o'clock until 1 o'clock, take an hour out for lunch, come back at 2 o'clock and meet until 6 o'clock. That is what the government should be proposing. And why they are

MR. NEARY: doing it this way, Sir, I do not know. Because they do not get anything done this way. All it does is make a mess of everything.

AN HON MEMBER: I do not know of any mess.

MR. NEARY: The only mess, Sir, is down in Torbay, Placentia and Pouch Cove made by the hon. gentleman, and down in Burin Bay Inlet made by the hon gentleman. And that is the mess that we got around. The hon. gentleman can pick his choice.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is morally wrong what the government is trying to do. I am all for changing the times of meetings of this hon. House.

MR. MORGAN: You believe in working and getting paid.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, I certainly do - Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a member in this House who works for his money it is the gentleman who is on his feet right now.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, has the hon member of Municipal Affairs been into the punch bowl again tonight? Because the hon. gentleman only gets libby, Sir, during these lunch periods. Like a good many more members on the government benches.

MR. J. CARTER: Irrelevant, irrelevant.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is in order to move an amendment to the hon. gentlemen's -

MR. ROBERTS: The amendment is in order -

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I could I would like to move if I could have a seconder. Would the hon. member for Baie d'Veerde second the motion?

MR. ROWE: I want to hear it first.

MR. NEARY: Well the motion I want to make is I move that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: if I could get a seconder. That we meet -

MR. MORGAN: We will get a seconder to the motion when we know what the motion is.

MR. ROWE: Will you be <sup>quite</sup> ~~quite~~-opposite I would like to be able to hear the amendment -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could Your Honour restore a little order, keep the Yahoo's quite on the other side, Sir.?

SOME HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what I would like to move is that the House meet Mondays from 10 o'clock until 1 o'clock and from 3 o'clock until 6 o'clock. On Tuesdays from 10 o'clock until 1 o'clock and from 3 o'clock until 6 o'clock. On Wednesdays from 3 o'clock until 6 o'clock. On Turdsdays from 10 o'clock until 1 o'clock and from 3 o'clock until 6 o'clock. On Fridays from 10 o'clock until 1 o'clock and from 3 o'clock until 6 o'clock. How does that hit the hon. gentlemen?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Do I have to put that in writing, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: You want all your nights off for poker playing.

MR. MARSHALL: Do you want a seconder?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman will second it? No I have a seconder, the Leader of the Opposition is going to second it.

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon gentleman would consider adding, Without the --- in the

MR. MARSHALL: motion I probably would second it.

MR. NEARY: My motion Mr. \_

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I move an amendment Sir, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition that the House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, did you ever see such an arrogant, did you ever see such an arrogant crowd Sir, in your life?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my amendment is that the House meet from 10.00 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays. And that the House meet from 3:00 p.m. until 6:00 p.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays. And the House meet on Wednesday from 3:00 p.m. until 6:00 p.m. I will have that now for Your Honour in writing in a few minutes as soon as my secretary can get it down.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of Order:

MR. PECKFORD: Point of order Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise whether in fact this amendment to the motion has the same authority behind it as , you, Mr. Speaker, ruled on for the original motion. The original motion was: That we would meet on Thursday at 10:00 a.m. it said nothing about closing. It said about meeting on Thursday, specific day at 3:00 p.m. It was that motion that was ruled in order and debatable and could be won by just a majority. The amendment now proposed to the motion by the hon. member for LaPoile, I do not know, if it changes the original text of the motion therefore it could be out of order on that score. An amendment must be consistent with the original motion. That is one point that will have to be clarified.

Secondly, if in fact that first point is not valid and one can move on to other points that could be raised the question arises as to whether the amended motion has the same power to be in order as did the original motion, so, that therefore I would raise those two points of order at this particular time as it relates



MR. PECKFORD: to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say I have had a lot of time to consider the amendment but I do feel it is in order on the ground that it presents an alternative proposal. I am not sure to be quite candid whether it is in order to go beyond Thursday, maybe the amendment will have to be restricted to just Thursday meet 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. It may not be in order to go Friday, Saturday, Sunday, Monday, and so forth and so on. Because as I understood Your Honour's ruling with respect to the so-called test case, the motion would have to be moved each night.

But I do submit it is in order for the hon. gentleman from LaPoile to move that the motion be amended by changing it to read that the House shall meet from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on Thursday and 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Thursday. I think that is in order, Sir, within the ruling which Your Honour made a little earlier. I think that, the Speaker, has power to change an amendment so as to allow it to be debated, it is done all the time. It has been done in this session. And beside if one amendment is ruled out of order the hon. gentleman can come banging back and you know, move another amendment. It is in order on the ground that it presents an alternative which allows the House the choice and this would give the House the clear choice between 10:00 a.m. until 11:00 p.m. on the one hand or on the other hand 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. in the afternoon. I think that is a clear choice and a valid choice and I for one would like to have the opportunity to vote on it and that is why I am quite prepared to second the amendment which, as I said, I believe to be in order.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment that I have from the hon. member for LaPoile would purport to amend the motion by setting the hours of sitting for Monday, Thursday and Friday.

MR. SPEAKER: I would rule it on the grounds of relevance out of order. The motion before the Chair is a very specific one dealing with the hours of meeting Thursday. So an amendment which went beyond Thursday and covered a week would, I think, be out of order on that ground. So I would not accept the amendment.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Well then I move that the House meet on Thursday from 10:00 A.M. until 1:00 P.M. and from 3:00 P.M. until 6:00 P.M. and seconded by the Leader of the Opposition, Sir.

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

MR. J. CARTER: A point of order. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this other amendment is equally out of order for another reason. It is - The hon. member for LaPoile has failed to be specific. At the moment we are on daylight saving time and he has not specified whether it is daylight saving or standard time. And since any amendments made in this hon. House have to be very specific and should be strictly construed I would rule that it is out of order. I would suggest that it is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. gentleman for his submission which I have given consideration. Anybody else wish to speak on the matter?

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, a minor point, as I understood the original motion it was a motion to meet on Thursday and it was ruled to be in order. The present amendment to the motion is that we meet on Thursday and also it definitively gives a time in which we close on Thursday. So there is a change in the amendment from the original motion in that you are not only indicating a meeting time but also a closing time whereas the original motion only addresses itself to a meeting.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that I would merely say simply that, of course, there is a change in the amendment from the motion. That is the

MR. ROBERTS: whole purpose of the amendment or of any amendment and if an amendment as proposed did not purport and did not, in fact, achieve a substantive change in the motion it purports or desires to amend then there would be no point in having the amendment. Of course the amendment is a substantive change but it deals with the same matters. It deals with the times of the meeting of the House and the times of the closing of the House and that is exactly the matter which is dealt with by the main motion. The earlier one obviously was not in order because it dealt with more than one day but surely this one is in order, Mr. Speaker. It deals with, you know, it deals with the same subject matter as does the main motion. All it does is present the alternative with which the House may or may not wish to agree but we cannot agree unless we have the opportunity to vote on it.

Of course it is changed, Sir. That is the whole purpose of moving an amendment in the first place and it is not a change that could be achieved by a simple negative.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment proposed by the hon. member for LaPoile and seconded by the hon. Leader of the Opposition reads;  
"to remove all the words after 'that' and to substitute therefore the House meet on Thursday from 10:00 A.M. until 1:00 P.M. and from 3:00 P.M. until 6:00 P.M."

On whether the amendment is in order, I think the two matters that I have to refer to are number one whether it negates the main motion and number two whether it is relevant. Under the negation rule, what is understood there is a direct negation. What this motion purports to do is not negate it. To modify it, to alter it, and it is on the subject matter, it is on the time of sitting on Thursday. Now it also refers to the time of closing but I would not regard that as being so unrelated to the time of sitting as to make it irrelevant. The general area of debate is on during what time period will the House do its business on Thursday, so I would think very closely related to the time of sitting would also be

MR. SPEAKER: the time of ceasing to sit.

So I would move the amendment in order  
and I shall now put it. Moved by the hor. member for LaPoile,  
seconded by the hon. Leader of the Opposition to remove  
all the words after "that" and to substitute, "Therefore

MR. SPEAKER: the House meet on Thursday next from 10:00 A.M. until 1:00 P.M. and from 3:00 P.M. until 6:00 P.M.

The hon. for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am terribly disappointed that the government did not accept my offer to add, I think, twelve hours a week to the sitting, to the time that the House sits. The Government House Leader has been critical and tonight bandying back and forth across the floor of the House, said "Oh the hon. Minister of Transportation is equally as guilty, the hon. member does not want to work, he does not want to sit that long. I made the government an offer and they turned it down, they rejected it. I made the government an offer to work an extra twelve hours and they rejected it, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who made you an offer?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they have rejected it because they want to try to force this House to close as fast as they can so they can get out of here. They are trying to bulldoze the estimates through the House. They are being unrealistic, Sir. They are being arrogant.

MR. NEARY: They want to get the House to work all kinds of odd hours. Last year they had the House meeting all night over foolish matters, nothing was accomplished. Meeting from 10:00 o'clock in the morning until, I think, it was about noon the next day. Here all night, nothing going on except booze being drank mainly in the corridors and in the back rooms.

MR. MORGAN: Where? when?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Booze? who?

AN HON. MEMBER: Unsubstantiated.

MR. NEARY: It is not unsubstantiated. And there is probably a drop on the go tonight to. There probably is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Where, where?

MR. NEARY: That is probably one of the reasons why the government want to work odd hours so they hope nobody would be around to see the condition of some of the ministers and some of the members when the House is sitting.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has come up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell him you are a teetotaler.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Environment.

MR. MURPHY: The insinuation that I as a member of this House a government member meets here in the night-time so that I can drink liquor, I think, is utterly offensive as far as I am concerned and as far as the government is concerned, and I think the member should be asked to retract that statement.

MR. DIMN: Yes. Distasteful.

MR. SPEAKER: The point raised by the hon. gentleman is that he feels it offensive that the hon. member is suggesting that he may have consumed any alcoholic beverage while here in the evening.

MR. ROBERTS: He did not mention the hon. gentleman.

MR. MURPHY: I am a member of government. He said the government meets nights so they can drink liquor. That is his insinuation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Obviously the criterion has to be what is offensive language. And a person may feel it is a question of the subject or the object if a person may feel something is offensive himself, but I think there has to be some objective criterion and perhaps it is because I am not a member of any abstinence society, but I find it hard to see the suggestion that a person, you know, has consumed liquor as particularly offensive, if one were to suggest excessive amounts or improper behaviour, but I would find it hard to rule that as offensive.

Mr. Speaker:

I would trust that the hon. gentleman's remark was one made in passing because it could be that the continuation along that line might be irrelevant to the hours of meeting, but I would find it very difficult to rule that it is offensive.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker ,

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Environment.

MR. MURPHY: - I listened with care to your judgment. I am not in the least worried if I drink or not, but when someone in this hon. House makes a statement that the reason we meet nighttime is to come back here and drink, I think, it is an insult to the House, Sir. Quite frankly -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Your Honour made a ruling -

MR. MURPHY: Good enough I accepted it.

MR. ROBERTS: - Your Honour made a ruling, and if the hon. gentleman from St. John's Centre does not like the ruling he has no right to comment on it. He has no right to debate it. All he has is a right to challenge it. Well if he wants to challenge it let him, if not, I would suggest, Sir, that what he just did was challenge without challenging Your Honour's ruling, and I would ask that the hon. gentleman from St. John's Centre be asked to withdraw those remarks. You cannot comment on a Speaker's ruling after the Chair has made it, and that is just what he did. Now you can challenge it.

May 3, 1977

Tape no. 2136

Page 1 - ms

Mr. Roberts.

Well and good if they want to challenge it. That is permitted under the rules, of course. But, you know, Your Honour made a ruling. It obviously was not what the hon. gentleman from St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) wanted, well that is tough on the hon. gentleman from St. John's Centre, but he cannot be allowed to get up and then comment on it or could we all get up from now on and comment on rulings? Is that to be a new practice in the House? I think he should be asked to withdraw it, Sir, and the gentleman from LaPoile can get on with his few remarks, and we will see who else might want to say a few words on this amendment to the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister on that point of order.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, to that point. The first point of order, as I understood it, was the hon. member felt it was a reflection on himself. The second point of order was the fact that he thought it was reflected on the House itself. And so, therefore, he changed his point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I think in order to clarify the matter I will have to ascertain from the hon. minister whether his last remarks were intended as a second specific point of order, because the hon. Leader of the Opposition is correct in stating what has been stated from the Chair before, that it would be improper for the House to permit reflection on a ruling of the Chair.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, on your ruling as I understood it, it was more or less intimated that whether I drank or not, you know, there was no reflection as far as the member was concerned. All I am saying that what I meant to convey to the Chair was the fact that a member did assert that this House meets nighttime by the government for the purpose to consume liquor. I think my feelings on the thing are a bit different than the ruling that you gave. Even if I did drink liquor I do not come here nighttime or ask the Premier to call the House so that I can come in here and drink liquor. Basically, I was just trying to make that thing clear and I think the reflection is on the government.



MR. SPEAKER: I think it can be agreed that the hon. gentleman to my left did not intend to comment upon the ruling. I would now ask the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to continue. I think in a previous ruling I did indicate the requirement of relevance, and I would ask him in speaking now to the amendment to relate to the specific amendment before the House which is the hours of sitting on Thursday.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour. That is a pretty fair ruling, Your Honour and, of course, again I would like to reiterate what I said a few moments ago, Your Honour, that one of the reasons I would not like to see the House meet at night is because members have a tendency to get uptight, Your Honour, and they might yield to the temptation. And if we are going to meet at night, Sir, I would submit in the future, if the past is any indication, that we install a breathalyzer in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Maybe the hon. gentleman from St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) takes offense to that. But I have seen it, Sir. I have seen it here in the last five years when there were gentlemen in this hon. House at three or four o'clock in the morning - and one of the gentleman is not with us now - I had the pleasure of removing that hon. gentleman - I remember gentlemen being in this House in a disorderly condition at three or four o'clock in the morning.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has come up.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, this is the essence of ridiculousness. The hon. member is standing in his place right now deliberately trying to provoke some kind of tactic in the House to delay and provoke kinds of irrelevant debate. He is involved in a debate on the hours of sitting, a motion before the House to try and have the House work hard in order to handle the most important matters facing the Province, the decision on Supply, and the member is there, having stood

Mr. Lundrigan.

in his place this afternoon on several consecutive occasions making comments about resignations all over the place. He is an absolute nuisance to the House, and I suggest, Your Honour, that this kind of irrelevancy should be brought to order. He is making a nuisance of the place.

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

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

MR. ROBERTS: The views of the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) are interesting. They have little to do with the rules of order, the rules of debate. The hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) may certainly have been saying things which the hon. gentleman from Grand Falls did not particularly like, but I mean that is not against the rules of debate. What he was saying was as relevant, not as anything, as relevant as ninety-nine point four four per cent of what is said in this House to the subject. He was talking about the motion. He was making a point in his own inimitable style and there is a multitude and a plenitude of rulings from Your Honour and from Your Honour's predecessors in the Chair, that a member has the right to make his point as long as his point is relevant, a right to make his point in his own peculiar and particular and inimitable way and that is what the gentleman from LaPoile was doing.

He has a very effective style, very different from many of us but nonetheless effective.

MR. DINN: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I mean it is as relevant as the Minister of Municipal Affairs getting up with something that I consider nonsense and he believes not to be nonsense. I suggest that what the hon. member for LaPoile is saying is in order and that the gentleman from Grand Falls did not make a valid point of order. That is all I am saying. Now if the Minister of Municipal Affairs wants to get into a little badinage I would be quite happy to. I am always delighted to take part in these things if they are permitted under the rules and I would welcome him into them, but I do not see how it is going to help anybody. I particularly do not see how it is going to help the House. If the minister persists in interrupting me, as he is doing, eventually, I do not know if we still have the twit for twot rule, or the tit for tat rule or whatever it was, but if we do the minister if he tits will get tat back.

MR. ROBERTS: All I want to say is the gentleman from Grand Falls in my view did not make a valid point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment before the Chair specifically is that the House meet on Thursday next from 10:00 A.M. until 1:00 P.M., and 3:00 P.M. until 6:00 P.M. As I recall the hon. gentleman's remarks he was giving reasons why he thought those hours would be preferable to having hours later in the P.M. And the reasons may not meet with other hon. members' concurrence and they might have various opinions of the reasons but as long as they are related to the motion before the Chair then I could not rule them irrelevant.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, we are now battling on this side a thousand. They have not won one point of order, Sir, since I started even though I have been interrupted now five times and the hon. gentlemen have not yet had a valid point of order. All they are doing, Sir, is interrupting for the sake of trying to distract me from the topic, from the amendment that I introduced in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I started out a few moments ago but saying that I was terribly disappointed that the government did not see fit to go along with the invitation that I extended to the administration that I was quite prepared by leave, unanimous consent of the House, to extend the hours of work in this House. And the hon. gentlemen rejected it. That was rather unfortunate Sir, because I think the schedule that I put forward was more realistic than the one that the Minister of Mines and Energy is trying to ram through the House with brute force, using the government majority.

Mr. Speaker, this whole matter now raises the question of having the Standing Rules of this House amended so that the

MR. NEARY: House can meet more realistic hours on a permanent basis. I know we cannot do that now and I appreciate Your Honour's ruling earlier this evening. It took a tremendous amount of research for Your Honour to arrive at Your Honour's decision and I have to say this that since this session of the House started that I really appreciate the role that Your Honour is playing in this House. I would go as far as to say, Sir, that Your Honour is probably the best Speaker that I have seen in this House since I have been here and I have been here now, this is my sixteenth session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Your Honour is a very fair and impartial Speaker and I am sure that Your Honour does his homework and researches motions and points of order very carefully before handing down a ruling, and I must

MR. NEARY: say I am extremely pleased because the decorum of the House, Mr. Speaker, has gone up considerably this session.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I did not say this session. I said if the past is any indication. And my hon. friend has been here, I believe, for several years, and my hon. friend knows what I am referring to. We have had all night sessions here that they have had more order down in the Cottage Gardens. I remember a couple of times I was challenged, members hauled off their coat and challenged me out. And that is why I am against -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Right here in this hon. House. Members had to be restrained in their seats. Now the hon. member for Grand Falls is going to raise a point of order or is the hon. gentleman coming over to challenge me?

MR. MORGAN: Who took off their coat though, seriously?

MR. NEARY: That is what I mean, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman if off to the press gallery. I wonder what the attraction is up there?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is why I believe the House should meet by day and not by night. The members have a -

MR. MORGAN: You pay for the smile do you not?

MR. NEARY: -member have a tendency, Sir, to go off the deep end.

MR. MORGAN: You cannot be serious about it.

MR. NEARY: I am quite serious about it. If we are going to get the business of this House done, and we are going to be bright and alert and be able to come to grips with the problems that are facing the people of this Province.

MR. HICKEY: You never expect to get thirsty again.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not a reformed drunk if that is what the hon. gentleman thinks. I probably drank my share of it in my day but I have yet to take a drink in this hon. House.

MR. MORGAN: Who has, who drinks in the House?

MR. NEARY: I have yet to take a drink in this hon House.

MR. HICKEY: Who has taken a drink in the House?

MR. NEARY: Do I have to answer the hon. gentlemen.

MR. HICKEY: Yes, because I am a member of the House and you cannot refuse.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that I have not ever taken a drink in this hon. House.

MR. HICKEY: You have insinuated that other members have. And I say name one.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with the hon. gentleman?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The question before the House has nothing to do with hon. members drinking in the House or not drinking in the House and I would ask the hon. gentleman to my left not to ask questions on that subject and the hon. member for LaPoile to continue but to bear in mind that that question is not the one before the House.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Your Honour.

MR. NEARY: I thank Your Honour again. And I would like to use the last half hour, Sir, as an example of why I do not think the House should be meeting at night. Hon. gentlemen get jittery and jumpy and nervous, uptight, shellshocked and you just cannot have a rational debate. You just cannot carry on the business of the Province in an orderly fashion. So if we are going to change the hours -

MR. MORGAN: There is only one main reason for that.

MR. NEARY: And what is the main reason for it? When the hon. gentleman was out of this House for the last -

MR. CARTER: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from LaPoile has made all the points that can possibly, legitimately be made about changing the hours of sitting on Thursday. And in fact he has made some of the points that should not have been made. In any event, Mr. Speaker, I would urge you to consider asking the hon. gentleman to sit down because there is nothing more that he could possibly say that could be relevant.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I feel the hon. member for St. John's North is expressing a personal opinion but I would not consider it necessarily a Point of Order so I would ask the hon member for LaPoile to continue.

MR. NEARY: That is seven points of order that they have lost, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Go ahead.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker may I say a few words on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.

MR. MORGAN: Sav a Point of Order.

MR. ROBERTS: No he has finished his speech and now I am speaking, and I predict I will probably go until eleven o'clock. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the motion before the Chair now is an amendment to a motion moved by the Government House Leader. I do not have the wording, the precise wording of the motion as it was moved by the House Leader. I believe it was something along lines of "When the House meet on Thursday, I think the



MR. ROBERTS: table, the officers at the table" No, that is the amendment. But I think the main motion itself was something along the lines of "When the House meet at Thursday, it meet at ten o'clock Thursday morning" The amendment which is before the Chair now is to remove all the words after 'that' and to substitute therefore the following, the words "that the House meet on Thursday from ten o'clock until one o'clock, and from three o'clock until six o'clock.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should say a word or two on this because I seconded the amendment and I intend to vote for it. And I also,

Mr. Roberts.

if the amendment is defeated, as I assume it will be, except it is not going to come to a vote tonight, I am prepared to vote for the main motion, and I speak for my colleagues on that. Now that may seem paradoxical, but I do not think it is, and I would like to try to outline my reasons for so feeling. To do so I think, Mr. Speaker, I have to go back to - not to disclose anything that is secret and certainly not to reveal anything that ought not to be revealed, because there is nothing that ought not to be revealed. A number of us in the House have been concerned - and I think the concern is felt on both sides of the House and by members who are in the Cabinet and by members who are not members of the government, but who may support the government or who may sit as we do in Opposition to the government in the House - a number of us have been extremely concerned about the estimates procedure about the way in which we debate the estimates in this House. Now this has changed a lot in the last few years. When I first sat in the House, I suppose the entire estimates were done in - I do not know - three, four, five, six days. Maybe some hon. gentlemen - the gentleman from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) was a member of the House in those days. He was there, and I was there, but we were both in the House. I suppose - what? - three or four or five days the whole estimates were polished off really. Occasionally there might be a fairly lengthy debate on a particular subhead, and it might be a half an hour or an hour and maybe a little longer.

But over the last seven or eight years that has changed. And I think it began to change first when Mr. John Crosbie and Mr. Clyde Wells, each of whom, of course, was then a member - Mr. Crosbie as the member for St. John's West, and Mr. Wells, the member for Humber East, the Humber East seat, the old Humber East seat - they sat in Opposition to the Smallwood administration, and they sat just down here to the right of where I now stand. They sat as Liberal Reformers.

Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Beaton Abbott, then the member for Bonavista North, I guess, Mr. Beaton Abbott sat with them as did Mr. Gerald Myrden who was then the member for the old district of St. Barbe South. Mr. Myrden and Mr. Abbott were not very vocal in debate as a rule, but Mr. Wells was certainly eloquent and vocal and Mr. Crosbie was eloquent and vocal and spoke very often. And beginning about then the estimates began to take a very long time indeed to go through the House. I can recall being congratulated because - I was Minister of Health - I got my estimates steered through the Committee in, I think, six hours. That was considered to be, you know, fairly quick given the fact that Health then, as now, was one of the larger departments. It was not nearly as many dollars, but it was a large chunk of the money that the government were spending in those days. And six hours was considered to be quite a good amount of time.

Well by comparison now the most that any department has been allotted in the schedule we have agreed to has been six hours, and that is for the Fisheries Department and for the Mines and Energy Department, each of which has a major degree of priority, each of which - I think the feeling of all members is this year - each of which ought to be given a great deal of time. Well now the practice then on estimates began to change. And the debate which had always, and I say always - I can only speak of eleven or twelve years myself, but I think my friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning) who goes back to 1949 in the House, back to the first House to sit after Confederation, the first House to sit since 1933, in 1934, February, 1934, was it, Responsible Government was suspended? I think it was February, 1934.

AN HON. MEMBER: February, 1934.

MR. ROBERTS: February, 1934, was it not? I think it was.

But in any event it was late 1933 or early in 1934. And I doubt if there are very many people left alive who ever sat in the old House as members; Mr. Phil Lewis -

AN HON. MEMBER: W.J. Browne

MR. ROBERTS: There were two or three others. There are very few men alive today who sat in the old - Mr. Bill Browne, of course the hon. W. J. Browne and Mr. Phil Lewis for two. There may be others. But in any event the point is as long as anybody can remember - and I venture to say that as long as there has been a House of Assembly, up until a year or two ago debate on the estimates was without limit. As long as it was relevant, as long as the member speaking spoke to the point, the debate could go on indefinitely. And if the House needed more hours or more days it got more hours and it got more days.

Well, Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Wells, particularly Mr. Crosbie tended to go on at some length. The Opposition of the day, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Ottenheimer) as he then was - he now occupies the august position of our Speaker - was Leader of the Opposition; the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) succeeded him as Leader of the Opposition; the member for Gander came into the House in a by-election in 1967 and

Mr. Roberts:

the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) then and now made up the official Opposition, they did not take a great deal of - I am sorry the gentleman from St. Joh's East (Mr. Marshall), the present member for St. John's East who succeeded Mr. Speaker when Mr. Speaker left the House in 1969 or 1970, the gentleman for St. John's East was returned in a by-election in that Spring, the Spring of 1970 and took his seat that Summer. I think we had a session in July.

In any event the Opposition did not take a lot of time, it was the independent member, so in that sense my friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is only following on in a tradition. The point I am making, and I regret I seem to be a little wordy, but it has been a long day, and it takes, you know, perhaps our thoughts are not as sharp as they ought to be, and we have not had enough time - you know the old story, Mr. Speaker, I think, it was President Woodrow Wilson, somebody said to him, "How much notice would you need if we were to come to ask you to make a speech, Mr. President?" And he said, "Well that would depend entirely upon how long the speech was." "Well said, the inviter, the person who wanted him to come to make the speech, if we asked you to come to make a fifteen minute speech to our organization, how long would you need to prepare?" Well said the President, "I would need a month to get ready for that." The man did not quite understand, and then he said, "Well if I were to ask you, Sir, to come to speak to us for half an hour, how long would you need." Well said the President, "If you need a half an hour speech I will need two weeks to prepare for that." And that completely astonished the man. Well he said, "If I were to ask you to come and speak for as long as you want, how long would you need?" To which the answer was, "When would you like me to begin?" The point of that is that if you have a long time to speak you tend not to organize your thoughts as you ought to.

Mr. Roberts:

I think the best procedure we have in this House now is the five minute late show debate on Thursday Afternoons, five minutes for somebody on this side or a backbencher on the other side if they wanted to use it, five minutes for a minister. It is usually the most effective means of debate that we have. But in any event I wander and I apologize.

The Opposition of that day bolstered by Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Wells began to consume vast amounts of time on the estimates. And then came 1971 and 1972, the two general elections, the House elected in 1971 met for only an afternoon, and then it was dissolved and came back, so there were no estimates considered by that General Assembly. Then there was a General Assembly elected in March 1972, and I think there were thirty-three on the government side and nine on our side when the dust cleared before there were court actions or anything, and so in we came. Well that was when the trouble began, because a number of us, all of us in the Opposition felt that we ought to debate the estimates and vigorously and forcefully and we did our best to do so. And the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), if memory serves me, was at that time the House Leader on the government side, and whatever his faults, he may have one or two, he has many strengths, and one of them is a great belief in the rightness of his own opinion, in his own virtues, and he was convinced that the government had the right to carry the estimates as they do in law, and he was determined to get them through and so we had some battles royal. Your Honour at that stage had not come to the House, Your Honour was full-time practicing medicine, as a pediatrician and looking after children instead of being here in House, and I will not take that line of argument any further, so Your Honour is not personally familiar with the debates. Your Honour may have read of them or may have been told of them, but there were some real donnybrooks, some battles royal. The House on one occasion sat for twenty-seven hours because the government's tactic after a little while when they turned out we were not going to be threatened,

MR. ROBERTS:

we were not going to be coerced, we were not going to be argued down, we were determined as an Opposition to exercise our rights, and we were exercising the same rights that Oppositions have always had, and if the government felt we were being obstructionists they ought to see the records of the Hang Her down Opposition back in, I think, it was 1923 or 1924 when Sir Michael Cashin and a group of men sat in Opposition to the Administration of that day, and I think they were four months getting off the Throne Speech, you know, and did no other business at all.

But in those days as I recall it every member could speak for an unlimited amount of time if Your Honour can credit it, but apparently that was the rule. And it was not - it was only in 1880 in England that the House of Commons adopted any time limits when Parnell, the Irish Nationalists - they first came to prominence in the 1885 election and the 1886 election - the Irish obstructionist tactics really came to the floor. It was the first time we ever had any rules on time limits in the Parliament at Westminster.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, we in the Opposition then decided that we would exercise our rights and the government's response to that was to try to wear us out and that led to the spectacle, not a very pleasant one - two, four, six, eight, ten, twelve - Mr. Speaker, I would think we do not have a quorum and I would accordingly bring the matter to Your Honour's attention and ask that the procedure be followed.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): I would ask the Law Clerk to count the House.

I am informed a quorum is present.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank Your Honour and I am grateful now. I mean if one is going to have to make a speech at a quarter to eleven at night the least one can do is have some of an audience. They might not listen to it but at least they have to be here.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that there has been a lot of unhappiness with the way the estimates are being handled. The administration two or three years ago forced through a seventy-five hour rule, a seventy-five hour time limit on the estimates procedure. That was the first time to my recollection, to my knowledge that that had ever been done in this Province. I am not sure of the procedure in other provinces. Some may have it, some do not. But it had never before been done in this Province.

We in the Opposition were very unhappy over that. We felt it was the wrong way to proceed but in any event the government insisted upon it and in those happy days the government had two-thirds of the House within their own ranks, a situation which does not obtain today.

Now what happened? Well the new rule came into effect, we were allowed seventy-five hours for the estimates. We have now had I believe two years of debating estimates under that rule, 1975 session which was succeeded by the general election and in the 1976 session, the session last year.

In each of these two sessions we operated under



MR. ROBERTS: the seventy-five hour rule but we did not change our other procedures. We did not. We followed the same procedure we had always followed - the government would call a head, whatever one they wished and then the House would debate it. There were not limits placed on the debate other than the rule of relevancy and the rule of repetition, both of which I would say to the gentleman from St. John's North are well entrenched in the rule books and in the precedent books and the result was that the seventy-five hours ran out with at least half the departments not debated.

My friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) might recall

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) might recall which ones were not debated but as I recall it we have not had a debate on Transportation and Communications in this House for the last two or three years.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not think the present minister has ever had the opportunity to show that he can defend his estimates, if in fact he can. Last year Fisheries -

MR. MORGAN: Well that was your fault.

MR. ROBERTS: I will deal with whose fault it was, Mr. Speaker, in a moment. Fisheries, one of the absolutely crucial topics that this House ought to be debating and discussing, Fisheries last year I believe, the minister began an opening statement and it was twenty minutes, half an hour. The minister did not have the opportunity to finish his opening statement when the Speaker, or the Chairman I am sorry in Committee, interrupted and said, "I am sorry but the time, the seventy-five hours has expired, that is the end of it." So the minister did not even get the opportunity to make a statement. The House never got the opportunity to discuss the fisheries. And there were a number of other departments. I do not have a list here but I would say from memory that five or six or seven of the departments, including some of the more important ones, were not debated last year.

I remember my friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Canning) being horror struck, a man with twenty-three years service in the House, being absolutely horror struck that a whole session went by without a debate on the fisheries. And I think he put down a private member's motion to ask for extra time to debate, specifically, the fisheries, nothing else but just the Fisheries estimates. But of course that got no where. The government would not allow it to go ahead and it did not go ahead. It died when the session died.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, my friend from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) and he is my friend, we have our differences of opinion but I do not take him very seriously and so I do not get upset when he and I differ. My friend from Bonavista South has said that, I think these are his words, "Well you were at fault," meaning "we", the humble but loyal members of the Opposition.

MR. MORGAN: I take it back -

MR. ROBERTS: Well the hon. gentleman may take it back if he wishes but he has now provoked me into wrath, as it were, and so I shall say a word or two or three about this particular matter.

I am prepared to admit, and I think whether I am prepared to or not I would have to in any event so I will do it, that all members on both sides of the House have every right to feel that they are responsible for the fact that the estimates procedure got in such terrible shape. All of us debated at length, and many felt at an interminable length. I mean, last year we did Mines and Energy and Mr. Crosbie absent but still with us, gone but not forgotten, Mr. John Crosbie was the minister.

MR. NEARY: As for me I am feeling rotten.

MR. ROBERTS: And Mr. John Crosbie, I mean, could do a lot of things but not the least of the things which he could do was (a) provoke the Opposition, often intentionally and secondly or (b) consume vast amounts of time on his feet and what were we eighteen or twenty hours last year on Mines and Energy? You know something like a quarter to a third, a quarter going on a third of the entire time of the House of Assembly allotted by the government for the discussion of estimates was placed on one department. Now an important department, true, but nonetheless only one department. Why was Mines and Energy called early on? Why was it first or second? Well partially because the gentleman who was the minister, Mr. Crosbie, was the House Leader and thus

MR. ROBERTS: could determine the schedule but also because the government felt, and I guess with wisdom and with rightness on their side, that Mr. Crosbie could handle himself, and so they put him on and some of the other ministers whom they felt, I think, with equal reason would not be able to handle themselves very well in Committee, they were put at the bottom of the queue, the end of the queue and of course their turn at bat never came.

MR. NEARY: That is what happened to the Minister of Transportation.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. The Minister of Transportation, for example, was placed at the end of the queue and the thought in Mr. Crosbie's mind, and in the mind of the directing minister's opposite, the group who were running the government was that, "Well if we are lucky the Minister of Transportation will never get on." And that is the way it turned out. He never did get on.

MR. MORGAN: I will be on this year.

MR. ROBERTS: Well he will get on this year and he will also get off this year and we will see what happens. But that is just the point, that is precisely the point, that the system was mutually unsatisfactory and so negotiations began amongst the house leaders and amongst the Premier and myself and others and as the Premier has just indicated, an agreement was reached and the agreement was embodied in the motion of which the Minister of Justice - I am sorry, no the Minister of Justice was away at the time, of which the Government House Leader gave notice yesterday morning when we met at ten o'clock. We agreed on Thursday when the Budget debate was finished -

Mr. Roberts.

there was a bit of discussion on this side, one or two of my colleagues had some questions about this particular draft order and what it meant, and that we wanted a little time to consider it, so we agreed then that the House with our consent - we can only speak for ourselves; we cannot speak for my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) or my absent friend from Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe), but we can certainly speak for our group - we agreed that we would let the House sit at ten Monday morning, and it did meet at ten yesterday. And we said that we would support this motion, and we would and we did. We agreed to it unanimously. Now where does the trouble come?

Well, first of all, before we get to that, let us look at what the motion does. There are two motions. One is to set the sitting hours; the second is to allocate the seventy-five hours amongst the various departments. Now let me take the second one first. I think it is a bad second choice to allowing the House the time it feels it needs for debate. But if the government are adamant, as they are, at not extending the seventy-five hour rule then we must accept that. Whether we like it or not we have to accept it. And so this is the second best choice, and I think it is a vast improvement over the procedure which we followed in 1976 and in 1975, a vast improvement indeed. And I think the experience - we have now done four Heads of expenditure. We have done the Executive Council, Head III ; we have done the Consolidated Fund Services, Head I ; we have done Department of Finance, Head IV; we have done Legislative, Head II; and we have done Health, Head X . We have done five of the twenty Heads of expenditure, and I think it has been by and large a good debate, Not as good as if we had unlimited time as in the old days, not unlimited time for an individual speaker, but unlimited time

Mr. Roberts.

in that the House as long as there were matters to be debated the House would debate them. The Minister of Health did not have enough time to say all he wanted to say tonight. I am sure he did not. And I certainly would have liked to have said more, and you know the many members would like to get in, but the rules are the rules. And this is a compromise, we accepted it; we felt that it was the best we could do. Then there was the first part. The government asked to have these hours of sitting. It was not our suggestion. When the matter was first brought to our caucus, I do not think I am revealing any secrets when I say there was horror. The hours do not seem unreasonable, nine hours a day, three days a week, and then three hours on the other two days. It does not seem unreasonable. It is thirty-three hours a week. Most people work - what? - thirty-five hours or thirty-six hours or at least they are employed thirty-five or thirty-six hours a week. It does not seem unreasonable. But the work of a member of the House is not just here in the Chamber. It is not even just connected with preparation for the Chamber, although any member who is going to do his job properly has got to prepare. Ministers have to get their facts up and get their advisers to give them advice and opinions and information. We all have that. But then we all have districts, and we are all elected to represent a district and particularly those of us from rural districts find - I suppose - what? - an average day I would get eight to ten to twelve letters which have to be dealt with one way or another, and another eight to ten to twelve phone calls. My friend from Green Bay represents a rural district, and I think he tries to serve his district in the same way I try to serve mine. I say that as a compliment to him. And he gets the same type of response from his constituents. And it takes a lot of time.

Now it is true that ministers have executive assistants. I have an executive assistant, too, as a matter of fact, thanks to the kindness and generosity of the present administration. They allow it to be

Mr. Roberts.

and I am deeply grateful. But still and all to spend nine hours in the House is just about impossible without scanting, skimping or even ignoring one's other duties. That is tolerable for a short time, particularly if there is some urgent reason, if there is some emergency or if there is some need for speed, but to do it on a regular basis is very difficult.

Well the House Leaders went back and forth as they do, and they talked back and forth. To make a short story long the decision our caucus came to - and this is why we are prepared to vote for the motion, why we did not object to it yesterday - the objections which my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) made, which he made after telling us what he would do, he did not do it sneakily, he said, You know, have your members here, we will not do it, we will not degree. But anyone of us, and there are fifteen or sixteen of us, whatever there are, anyone of us could have made the same objection, but we did not, and we will vote for the motion, but therein lies the problem. This motion is an amendment to the Standing Orders. It is not like the motion now before the Chair which is in effect for only one day, and would have to be moved each day and could be debated if one wished each day and so forth.

Mr. Roberts:

obviously this is the proper way to do it, the proper way to do it is to have an amendment to the Standing Orders, a sessional order because it would be in effect only for this session.

So then we had a look at the law, the statute which says, Thirty-four members, two-thirds, must vote affirmatively before we can change Standing Orders, and the simple truth of it, let it be recorded, is that there have not been thirty-four members -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: - in this House from ten o'clock yesterday until today and that is why we are in the bind we are in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: That is right. That is right.

MR. PECKFORD: No.

MR. ROBERTS: When have there been thirty-four?

MR. PECKFORD: I never said that.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is what I am saying and the minister said, no.

MR. PECKFORD: No. I am saying, no that is not why we are in the bind we are in because if we had unanimous consent we could have continued on without the amendment.

MR. ROBERTS: But I have done, I have not withheld or withdrawn consent for anything.

MR. PECKFORD: I never said you did.

MR. ROBERTS: All right. But if we had the - and the moment there are thirty -

MR. PECKFORD: If we had at least unanimous consent with the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) there would be no problem.

MR. ROBERTS: - four members here - some of my colleagues have been absent. One or two are away from the Province, my friend from Stephenville (Mr. McNeil) and my friend from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and my friend from St. George's (Mrs. MacIsaac) were in there districts for perfectly understandable reasons. They are coming in tomorrow at my specific - the member for St. George's is here, but my friends from Stephenville and Port au Port are coming in at my specific request,



Mr. Roberts:

but I may say very unhappily because they want to be with their constituents at this time above all others. My friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) was down in the district of Fogo where he has been attending a conference of the Fogo Co-op, and he is very involved, in his work with them. And that is - essentially all of us have been here. My friend from Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) was here yesterday, my friend from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) has been here, and the other members. But the moment there are thirty-four members here or thirty-four who are prepared to vote in the affirmative, we can change these rules and that is all we need.

Now I will support them. And as I have said, if this amendment is defeated - and I hope it is not, I will support the amendment and I will ask my colleagues to do the same - if the amendment is defeated and the main motion stands I will vote for it. I will even do it without debate, because I have had ample opportunity, or will have had by the time I finish, to state my views on this question. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not like the procedure we are in now. And furthermore and I have said this, I said it privately, and I will say it now in the House, and I said it yesterday in the House, I think, this schedule is too much. I am prepared to go along with it because it was offered as a package deal. You know, the hours and the change in the estimates, and the Minister of Mines and Energy confirms that it was a package - it was not one or t'other it was both or nothing,

MR. PECKFORD: Exactly.

MR. ROBERTS: - and we felt the estimate's procedure was such a shambles last year, such a shambles reflecting upon all sides of the House, I am not blaming any one side.

MR. PECKFORD: Remembering always that the hours we are recommending to sit are more onerous on the ministry than they are on the other members.

MR. ROBERTS: Well maybe, maybe. You know, maybe they are and maybe they are not, although given the fact that most of the ministers visit the House only - the Minister of Mines and Energy is faithful -

Mr. Roberts:

but a number of other ministers sort of drop through the House, you know, visit it when they have but a spare moment. But the fact remains that I think this schedule of hours is too heavy. Now we have accepted it, unhappily we indeed -

MR. PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: - it is less onerous now than it would have been if the government's original proposal had been accepted. They did relent a little. We still feel it is too much, and yet given the fact that it was either take the package of hours they wanted together with the allotment of time within the estimates or go back to the chaos we had last year, there was no choice at all. so we took it. We take it unhappily. You know, half a loaf- is that not the saying? - half a loaf is better than no loaf. Somebody once said that, and if somebody did not, they ought to have said it. So that is what brings us where we are.

Now it shortly will be eleven o'clock, At eleven of the clock as I understand the Standing Orders, Your Honour reminded us of this last night, Your Honour leaves the Chair until three o'clock tomorrow.

MR. PECKFORD: Until three o'clock tomorrow.

MR. ROBERTS: It is Standing Order (8), I think. We have been through these Standing Orders enough times in the last few days. So the motion will not come to a vote tonight. And, of course, there is no point at coming to a vote tomorrow - it cannot come to a vote tomorrow because it is Private Members' Day and a government motion has no precedence. What I am going to suggest to the government is that we find out when we are going to get thirty-four people here and we put the whole thing to a vote, We are prepared to vote for the package we agreed to. We are quite prepared to vote for it and to live with it, but I would say to the Premier and to his colleagues that I still think the schedule of hours is too much. I think that we will pay a price in a lowering of the quality of debate and in a rise in the temper of the House, and I do not think that serves anybody's

Mr. Roberts:

interest. I think that the debate - well, Mr. Speaker, to be quite candid I would not be surprised if Your Honour were to interrupt me at any moment to point out that it is eleven o'clock, may I just finish the sentence - I do not think the experience of the last couple of days has helped anybody. I think that the way in which we are going with the estimates has been an immense improvement, and the House improves, we have had good debates and everything is further ahead. Let us have a few fewer hours than I think we can get ahead with it, but if not, we will stand by the commitment which we made, we will honour it to the breach.

Now I am not going to allow the hon. gentleman the floor because he can move the House sit after eleven.

MR. PECKFORD: No, no, I am not going to do that, I am not that kind, boy!

MR. ROBERTS: If the hon. gentleman is not that kind he will not be House Leader for long.

MR. PECKFORD: No, no!

MR. ROBERTS: But the point is if the Speaker calls it eleven o'clock I will yield the floor and/ or I will yield the floor to the hon. gentleman on condition he not move any of these procedural motions. I mean, I am not trying to play games, I just - I am determined that this not come to the rule tonight. But I will accordingly, Mr. Speaker, it being eleven o'clock I note the House has now adjourned.

MR. PECKFORD: May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have leave to ask a question?

MR. ROBERTS: Fine. Of course.

MR. SPEAKER: All right then, by leave.

MR. PECKFORD: Is it possible on tomorrow within - for all hon. members to agree if we have the two-thirds number which we think we can have tomorrow to

MR. PECKFORD: put the motion now before the floor and then to put the package so that we can get it cleared up ?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if we have thirty-four we do not need to worry about the motion before the Chair. That would be superceded by this. I can only repeat what I have said before, my colleagues and I are prepared to vote for the arrangement we agreed to. You know we think it is a better arrangement than the one that prevailed before that. We still feel the hours are too long and I mean we are deadly serious about that. The government obviously -

AN HON. MEMBER: Would Private Member's Day have anything to do with that?

MR. ROBERTS: Well it would have to be by consent because a government order cannot be called on Private Member's Day. But I for one and I can speak for my colleagues but my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and my friend from Port de Grave (Mr. Dawe) speak for themselves, of course. But I mean we will be delighted to vote on it without debate but we still renew our plea as I do now for a little relaxation in those hours. It is pretty hard on most of us and nobody is going to benefit.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the thirty-four members are here tomorrow of course I will give consent. That is the only hang-up, Sir, it is not the fact that I am trying to be hard to get along with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Could we have that in writing?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the whole truth of the matter is that the government have not been able to get their motion through because they cannot get thirty-four members in the House. That is the truth of the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It now being eleven o'clock I now adjourn the House until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 P.M.

This House is adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday,  
at 3:00 P.M.