

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, as minister responsible for the Office of the Legislative Counsel, pursuant to section 18 of the Statutes of Subordinate Legislation Act, I am required to lay before the House a copy of any subordinate legislation filed under that act. Accordingly, I hereby table the additions of the Newfoundland Gazette published since July 7th., 1978 up to and including the edition of March 30th., 1979. These issues of the Newfoundland Gazette contain new subordinate legislation gazetted during that time as well as the bulk of the old subordinate legislation required to be re-published under section 12 of the act. I wish to point out to hon. members that, upon the re-publication of all of the old subordinate legislation due to end April 1979, this Province will be able to produce for the first time a consolidation and index of all the subordinate legislation presently in force. This consolidation, I believe, will be of inestimable value, not only to the legally trained person but also to the general public in locating this Province's law.

I would also point out to hon. members that government is presently reviewing the consolidation of subordinate legislation in order to remove any unnecessary subordinate legislation that may exist.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the report of the Workmen's Compensation Board for 1978.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): Hon. minister.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on tomorrow I will introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Consumers Affairs And Environment Act, 1973." (Bill No. 2).

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Crown Lands Act."

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the other day - Friday, I guess, before the lights went out - we were pursuing a line of questioning to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) with respect to this odious and insupportable practice by someone in the police department taping conversations that they were holding with perspective witnesses and other people. I was going to ask the hon. Minister of Justice, at that time, whether he or anyone in his department has issued specific instructions to the police department to cease and desist this practice or whether he has been otherwise in communication with them on this pernicious and odious practice?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the phraseology used by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition with

MR. HICKMAN: respect to odious practice, the police on the very rare occasions, I gather, that they have used that, have been acting pursuant to the law, and in particular pursuant to section 178 (11) of the Criminal Code of Canada. However, when it came to my attention following -

MR. W. ROWE: Your authority (inaudible) for the past few months.

MR. HICKMAN: - when it came to my attention on or about Tuesday or Wednesday of last week, I, last week issued instructions to both police forces that they were not to use tape recorders in interviewing witnesses unless they first asked the witness for his or her permission so to do. So it is ended, brought to a -

MR. W. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Ottenheimer): A supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: Just a follow up question on that. In other words, there are no exceptions to the rule. Is there any provision for a police officer to go to the Chief of Police, or to some official in the Department of Justice, and obtain permission from one of those officials to conduct taped interviews without the knowledge of the witness or person involved?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, the only way in which a taped interview can be carried out of a witness, even though, I repeat, it is in accordance with the provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada, is if that person who is being interviewed is first asked permission to do so and, secondly, gives permission so to do. So it is the person who is being interviewed and only the person interviewed can make that decision.

MR. W. ROWE: A further supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Ottenheimer): A supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: Does the minister intend to take any action or undertake any investigation into how widespread this practice may have been in the past?

MR. NEARY: Commission of enquiry or anything like that?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the enquiries that I have made indicates to me, I have been advised that it has been used on very rare occasions, and I repeat -

MR. NEARY: It is widespread boy. It has been going on for years, -

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

MR. NEARY: - illegal bugging in this Province.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, I have to rely on the police who are the only ones who know and they tell me that that has not been the case and anywhere it was done was done in accordance with the law.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary on the subject, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: Has the minister or any official, or the Chief of Police for that matter, received any communication on this practice from the Police Brotherhood, or from any other organized group in society asking that the police stop this practice?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, Sir, I would like to welcome to the gallery on behalf of my colleague, who is not in his seat today, a contingent, a delegation

April 9, 1979

Tape No. 792

NM - 3

MR. NEARY:

from Westport who confronted
the Premier out in front of the building about the -

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Order, please! Would the hon. gentleman please take his seat? I have to point out to visitors in the gallery that members of the Legislature are always pleased to welcome them here; however, the rules do not permit any form of participation except by people who are elected and have seats in the Legislature. So I would draw that to the attention of people in the gallery - participation in any form showing approval or disapproval. And I underline that members are always pleased to welcome visitors to the galleries, but the rules do not permit any form of participation.

The hon. member.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, these people are very welcome. This is the people's House and they have every right to be here as Your Honour indicated and if they could speak they would ask the Premier of this Province, and the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett), to give them a commitment that their road is going to be upgraded and improved because at the present time it is not fit to drive over. We have already had a petition and now we have a delegation. Now what is the Premier going to do about the condition of that road in Westport?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the people from Westport did not confront me and I think that it is unfair to the people of Westport to say that they did, because confrontation and the word 'confront' sort of indicates that they did something a little bit out of the ordinary, a little bit extraordinary. It just so happens, Mr. Speaker, that when I received the knowledge that there was a group of people in front of the steps of Confederation Building, it was through one of the members of that delegation in the lobby of the Confederation Building, and immediately I agreed to go out and meet with the delegation from Westport. So I do not think one can consider it at all, Mr. Speaker, as a confrontation, I have

PREMIER PECKFORD: met with the delegation out in front of the steps of the Confederation Building and I understand that they have a meeting arranged with the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett), as soon as Question Period is over, to further discuss the matter of their road conditions. I am aware, far better than the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), of the condition of the road to Westport. I have travelled on that road and I live in that general region, Northeastern Newfoundland, where road conditions are a real problem and have been for a long, long period of time. I have said to the people from Westport, as I will say to the people from anywhere in this Province, that road conditions and improvements to their roads are very necessary and that when in considering the budget for the Department of Transportation and Communications we will consider the upgrading of the road to Westport. I cannot, Mr. Speaker, as head of this government give a commitment or a promise to any given group of people around this Province that such and such a thing will be done. I think it is irresponsible and dishonest. What I will do is recognize that they do have a problem, recognize that the road is in bad condition and give it every consideration, in the consideration of the budget for that department, later on this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before I recognize

hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) for a supplementary

Mr. Speaker (Mr. Ottenheimer):

there are two groups in the House of Assembly. On behalf of the members I would like to extend a welcome to them. The first group is from St. Augustine's High School at Plum Point, forty Grade X students and they are accompanied by two of their teachers, Mr. Peter Sutherland and Mr. Conrad Sampson. I know hon. members join me in welcoming these students and their teachers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: We also have in the galleries a delegation Point Leamington composed of Mayor Stuckless and Councillor Cooper, and Councillor Lorenzo Andrews and Councillor Eric Andrews. I know hon. members join me in welcoming these gentlemen as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can play with words all he wants, Sir, or be wishy-washy if he wants to, but the people from Westport came in here at their own expense, came in their cars, Sir. They did not expect to get an immediate answer from the hon. gentleman. I was there and heard some of the discussion that took place, some of the dialogue back and forth. But they do expect to get a decision from this government in a reasonable period of time of what the government is going to do about that road. Could the Premier indicate to the House when these people will get an answer or will they have to come in with a larger contingent, a larger delegation than they have at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has changed his tune from his first question. His first question had to do with the commitment now. Now the hon. member for LaPoile is willing to consider a reasonable period of time. I guess by the time his fourth or fifth question comes around he will wait for two or three years like -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - was the practice of the former administration.

I can indicate, Mr. Speaker, in response to the question, if I may be allowed to in silence, to indicate to the hon. member and to the members of the delegation for Westport, who are in the gallery, that when the Budget is brought down they will have a decision on their road, whether in fact any improvements will be made.

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

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): Order, please! Before recognizing the hon. member for LaPoile for a supplementary question, I would point out to hon. members, on both sides of the House, the rules with respect to Question Period, and the same rules apply to questions and it applies to answers. And their observance in one case requires their observance in another case, and their breach in one case frequently leads to their breach in another case.

With respect to questions, it is said, Beauchesne, Page 132, "It must be a question, not an expression of an opinion, representation, argumentation, nor debate." And with respect to answers, page 131, "Answers should be as brief as possible, should deal with the matter raised, and should not provoke debate."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The same rules apply to both questions and answers because the same rules apply to the entire period. And the Chair wishes to impose them, but the Chair does not wish to take up more than the Question Period than necessary by constant interruptions of hon. members. So I point out to hon. members to my right and to my left that the rules apply on both sides and ask them to adhere to them.

The hon. member for LaPoile, a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, just sort of as a preliminary to my question, the hon. the Premier, Sir, did not tell the people from Westport that consideration would be given when the Budget was brought down. The hon. the Premier told the delegation from Westport that the Budget would be brought down in five or six weeks time and then a decision would be made. Now the delegation from Westport have been able to get information out of the Premier that we have not been able to get in this House and that is the fact that a Budget will be brought down. And I want the Premier now to confirm what he said out front, what I heard him say a few moments ago, that a Budget indeed will be brought down in this House and that the people from Westport could expect good news in that Budget about their road. Is that correct? Am I interpreting what the Premier said as being correct?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - that the Budget would be brought down in five or six weeks time? Because that is what he told the delegation.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Budget can be brought down within five or six weeks time, no question about that.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the Premier just indicated to the people from Westport and, of course, to the people from Markland and all other communities that are looking for improved roads that they have to wait until the Budget is brought down. Is it not a fact that several days ago in this House of Assembly we passed Interim Supply,

MR. CALLAN: \$356 million, and as part of the argument for granting that supply for three months until the end of June, in his presentation the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) said one of the reasons why we have to have this supply approved is so that we can get our road programme on the way, get tenders called and so on, so how does the Premier reconcile these two things, that he has to wait for a Budget when he has Interim Supply and one of the reasons for that Interim Supply is to carry out the road programme for this year?

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, primarily because there are certain ongoing commitments that government have made over the years to DREE programmes and to other Capital Works that were made in the previous year which must be kept, and in order to keep them and to get on with the jobs for this year, that Capital commitment in the Interim Supply was put in there, so that therefore, as the hon. gentleman knows, and undoubtedly, all members on the opposite side, that there are commitments from one year to the next by a particular government as it relates to federal/provincial agreements that are in place. For example, the Trans-Canada agreement involves financing from this Province and therefore we must keep our commitments, and we would be very remiss if we did not.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

I want to direct this supplementary, then, to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett). I want to ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications, in view of what the Premier just said, does this mean that the people from Westport, the people from Markland and other communities are going to have to wait

MR. CALLAN:

possibly six weeks or two more months before they can find out whether or not they will be included for road programmes for this year?

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I have told the hon. member on many occasions, if he keeps any notes across the House, almost every day in respect to Markland, I have told him on many occasions that I can make no commitments with respect to roads until such time as the complete capital programme is finished. It is not finished and I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if it will be one week, two weeks or six weeks. I have no idea but the capital works programme for highways is not yet completed and therefore I cannot make any commitments.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transportation. In view of the poor conditions of many of the gravel roads around the Province I have been informed by many of the workers supplied by the minister's department that they have, some of them at least and some with as high as fourteen years of service, been given lay-off notices. In some instances where there were two and three trucks employed there is now but one. Could the minister inform the House if this is the course he is going to follow for an indefinite period of is it just temporary, a change-over from Winter operation to Summer operation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, the lay-offs that are occurring now are the same as happen every year at this particular time. The Winter crews are being laid off and machinery will be made ready for the Summer maintenance programme. I understand that they are laid off according to the MOS agreement. It is quite possible that someone could have fourteen years experience and be laid off and I would have to assume in that case that somebody had

MR. BRETT: fifteen years experience and was kept on. But this is normal procedure, it happens every single Spring and every Fall.

CAPT. WINSOR: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) A supplementary.

CAPT. WINSOR: Can the minister inform the House whether the number will be as great as in other years. I mean there will be no reduction in staff on maintenance work, the same number of people will be employed?

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the exact number that will be laid off, but to the best of my knowledge there is no intention for any extra decrease in staff.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir, followed by the member for Eagle River and Windsor-Buchans.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman). It is a question on a very serious matter and one that has come to my attention in the past two or three hours. I first learned about it by word of mouth and then on the midday newscast there was a report, I believe on CBC radio, certainly on one of the radio stations, a press report that Judge Soper this morning, during the course of interrogating or hearing a witness which appeared before the enquiry into the leak,

MR. SIMMONS: Judge Soper, in the course of that exchange this morning with that witness, accused the witness, and these were the words used in the press report, "accused the witness of participating in a cover-up." Now, again, the minister may not take my word for this; he may want to take it under advisement, the question I am going to put to him, and respond subsequently, but I tell him, without fear of contradiction, that the press report at least stated that Judge Soper had accused, and these were the words, "had accused the witness of participating in a cover-up in relation to the leak." Presuming, Mr. Speaker, that press reports are correct, and I have to presume that for the purpose of my question, if the press reports are correct, and again, I appreciate that the minister might want to check the accuracy before responding, and I can fully appreciate that, my question is this: If the press reports are correct, will the minister agree that the commissioner has demonstrated a severe bias on this matter and should therefore be removed from the inquiry?

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, number one; I have not heard the report and, number two: the hon. gentleman did not indicate to me who the witness was. The third part -

MR. SIMMONS: Does that matter?

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: Well, I do not. But I say I do not know who it is, I am not sure that that is relevant. But, number three, I find that question offensive, totally offensive, totally unprecedented, a commissioner, a commissioner, when Judge Soper as a commissioner makes a comment from the bench.

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible) job (inaudible).

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

MR. HICKMAN: When Judge Soper makes a comment as a result of evidence that he has heard to suggest that the gentleman has any bias that should be removed. It is so offensive that it would be demeaning to even answer the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Of course, it is offensive; the truth often hurts. Mr. Speaker, indeed we are campaigning for some justice in this Province and we are going to get it eventually.-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: We might not get it under the present minister but we will get it.

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

MR. HICKMAN: I would ask that the hon. gentleman withdraw that last remark.

MR. SPEAKER: I did not hear the last remark.

MR. SIMMONS: The last remark, Mr. Speaker, was as follows, 'We might not get it under the present minister but we will get it.' Justice!

MR. SPEAKER: As it is somewhat vague, I do not think I will pursue that any further than I can see you might get

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) justice under the present minister. It is a criticism of the minister, but it is not an allegation of deceit or anything. I think it is in that vague, grey area where the Chair counts on restraint of hon. members and cannot split every hair which might come out of any hon. member's head.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

What I did interrupt on previous to the point of order brought up by the hon. gentleman to my left, is to point out to hon. members the need to observe on both sides the basic rules with respect to Question Period in the House of Assembly. All the Chair can do is to draw this to hon. members' attention and to insist that they observe the rules. I have said before, and it may well be an opportune time to say again, that the proper decorum and observation of the rules cannot be imposed just by one out of fifty-one members. The one who is in the Chair needs the co-operation and participation in maintaining order of all members. And the Chair needs, invites and indeed, requires that participation.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, lest any malice was interpreted from my statement about whether or not we would get justice under the present minister, no malice is intended. That the minister is incompetent is not necessarily his responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, it matters not who the witness was unless he is telling us he wants to know whether it was a Liberal or a Tory. It matters not - my question stands, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of Justice

MR. SIMMONS: undertake to immediately replace
- we are not asking that the inquiry be cancelled; we have
been asking it be broadened to the proper subjects.

MR. F. WHITE: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: The cause.

MR. SIMMONS: But, Mr. Speaker, we are not
asking it be cancelled, but broadened, of course, and then
have a new commissioner. And here is my supplementary to
the minister. Will the minister first of all take the
information I have given today about the press report from
the inquiry - check its accuracy first, of course - and
I tell him he will find that a witness whom I can identify
for him either privately or publicly - there is nothing to
hide, it was a public inquiry - will he take that information,
check its accuracy, and then if he finds it to be accurate,
as he will, will he in the interest of demonstrating that
justice is not only being done but is appearing to be done -
and I point out to them all, Sir, that it is not a court of
law, and that is another red herring the minister often drags
into things; it is not a court of law, it is a public
inquiry and the judge is

MR. SIMMONS: not on the Bench, will the minister, assuming he can establish the accuracy and all he has to do is get the transcripts of the enquiry this morning, assuming he can establish the accuracy will the minister undertake now publicly, will he make a public undertaking to have the commissioner replaced as soon as possible with someone who hopefully does not have the bias which this present commissioner obviously has.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Ottenheimer): Order, please! Order, please! The first duty of the Chair, obviously, is to protect the area of the freedom of speech of all hon. members. However, this is not his only duty, and at times this duty has to be informed by other rules because the only rule applying is not freedom of speech. It is an extremely important one but it is not the only one.

I draw the attention of hon. members to Beauchesne, page 114, under the heading "Protected Persons", and there are two citations there, (1) and (2) which I will read out. "All references to judges and courts of justice of the nature of personal attack and censure have always been considered unparliamentary." I realize the references have not been to a court of justice but the commissioner is, in fact, a judge and references to judges in the form of censure are unparliamentary.

Subsection (2) makes the same point from a different perspective. "When a judge has been employed as a Royal Commissioner, it is proper in the House to criticize his report but not its author."

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Ottenheimer): I think it is quite clear from those two citations that the commissioner being a judge does not lose his position as a judge and that the first citation is operative in that all references to judges of the nature of censure are unparliamentary. The second one certainly makes that clear to the extent that when a judge has been employed as a royal commissioner it is proper for the House to criticize his report but not its author. I would therefore insist that hon. members observe that rule and to refrain from censure of the commissioner who in this case is a judge.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I want to put a supplementary but before doing it, if the Chair will permit, just a very preliminary response to what the Chair has just stated by way of concurring completely with the Chair. In fact, of course, the gentleman to whom I refer is a judge. I submit he is not there in his capacity as a judge but that is another issue because the second point that Mr. Speaker has quoted fully covers the matter. And there is to be no criticism of the author and I abide by the parliamentary rule on that particular matter as much as I have strong feelings on the subject. So therefore I shall -

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker, I said I have abided by the -

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. I have to hear a point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman indicates he is going to now ask a supplementary question -

MR. SIMMONS: Yes indeed.

MR. HICKMAN: - supplemental to the one that he just asked. Your Honour has ruled that the last question was out of order, which it so obviously is, and I would ask that the hon. gentleman withdraw that question before he is permitted to proceed with any further supplementary question.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Ottenheimer): To the point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: The wording I have written down in front of me actually is not something about rephrase and I was about to undertake to rephrase my earlier question, to take it away from the author as the books refer to him and to get it to another -

MR. SPEAKER: Right.

MR. SIMMONS: May I be allowed to rephrase then, Mr. Speaker, to decide whether it is in order?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I will recognize the hon. member. It occurs to me that I, and I think the hon. member would probably wish to make this clear himself. It occurs to me that for our precedent it should be made clear. I will recognize the hon. member to ask an additional question. What I would ask the hon. gentleman to do is to make a statement so that the entire House and it is a public record, that however one might interpret his previous questions it is not his, or was not his intention to speak in terms of censure of the individual. I think that the House should have that clear and then the hon. gentleman proceed with his question.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, you said it much more eloquently than I could, Sir, and I thank you.

April 9, 1979

Tape No. 799

NM - 4

MR. SIMMONS:

I completely concur that that is what needed to be said and I hope the House will consider that I have just said the words you have, that I intend no censure of the judge whatsoever, or the commissioner, and that I refer to him in that capacity, no censure whatsoever. My concern, I believe as conveyed in the questions is that, and I said this actual phraseology, that justice appeared not only be done but appear to be done,

Mr. Simmons: and I ask the minister now in a rephrasing of one of my earlier questions, if the minister would check the accuracy of the reports coming out of this morning's enquiry, and presuming their accuracy, would he then take the necessary steps, as he deems advisable, to ensure that the enquiry proceeds to its ultimate conclusion without any fear whatsoever that the report of that enquiry -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: It is so difficult, you know, Mr. Speaker, when you have a group of men having to contend with a little boy in their midst all of the time, the boy from Bonavista South. Mr. Speaker, will the minister undertake, presuming the accuracy, will he undertake to take the necessary steps and take them immediately to ensure that the report is a fair, equitable, unbiased report of the circumstances under investigation?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENEHEIMER): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN : I have no hesitancy in saying that any report by His Honour Judge Soper will be equitable, fair, totally unbiased, He is a man who has been a member of the Bench for over twenty years and who has very properly earned the respect of all Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Rural-Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) concerning some owner-operators and people who were left in the Labrador situation after the Labrador Linerboard closed down. I wonder if the minister is prepared to reverse his decision in which some owner operators and other people involved with Labrador Linerboard did not receive assistance from the government on the closing of Labrador Linerboard

Mr. Strachan: operation, especially in view of the fact that they were refused this assistance on the basis that they were carrying out functions ordered by Labrador Linerboard to them. They were people who were trucking, for instance, in some cases trucking wood, who were asked by the Labrador Linerboard to truck gravel for the roads, and therefore on the closing of the Labrador Linerboard mill were not assisted because they had not trucked sufficient cordage under the criteria set down. That is one situation. I might as well ask the supplementary question which I was going to put; whether assistance could be given to the people in Labrador who have had a different set of criteria applied to them on completion bonuses compared to the people, for instance, in Stephenville? The completion bonuses were not available to certain people in Labrador, which were available to all people in Stephenville.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): The hon. Minister of Rural-Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, the second part of the question, I think, would be more properly addressed to the Minister of Industrial Development in relation to completion bonuses.

In relation to the first part of the question; assistance which was provided to the truckers who had been working in different capacities with the Labrador Linerboard operations at Goose Bay, be it trucking gravel or wood or whatever, we could review the case, I think, but as I understand it from my own submissions alone to government, prior to getting into Cabinet, it had been reviewed three times and the answers were all the same. I do not know if it would serve a practical purpose to review it or not. But certainly if these individuals want to contact me then they are free to do so.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, the hon. Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act", carried. (Bill No. 27).

On motion, Bill No. 72 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of The Whole on Bill No. 6, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Cross)

Order, please!

A bill, "An Act To Provide
For The Registration Of Qualified Social Workers." (No. 6)

On motion clauses (1)
through (11) by leave, carried.

Motion, that the
Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee
of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have
directed me to report Bill No. 6 without amendment and ask leave
to sit again.

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act
To Provide For The Registration Of Qualified Social Workers,"
read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order
Paper (Bill No. 6).

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer)

The adjourned debate on
Bill No. 13.

Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned
the debate on this bill the other day, Sir, judging by the reports
in the press you would say that not a single word was uttered in
this House about the criticism of the government in the way that
they have been handling the secret loans made by the Rural Development
Authority and by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation,
secret loans being made to every con-artist that comes along in this
Province with a harebrained scheme. And, Mr. Speaker, the government
so far have stonewalled and refused to give us a list in this

MR. NEARY: hon. House of these secret loans.
Who are these loans made to, Sir? We do not know. What are they made for? We do not know. What is the track record of the Rural Development Authority and the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation? We do not know. We do not have any information concerning the business that is transacted by either one of these government lending agencies because the government have refused to supply a list to this hon. House.

MR. DOODY: We have not refused.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman has refused.
The hon. gentleman, whether he likes it or not, is a part of the cover-up. If the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Goudie) and the Minister of Industrial Development (Mr. Maynard) and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) refuse to give us a list of loans of taxpayers' money made to people in this Province then the minister is as much responsible for that cover-up

MR. NEARY: as the hon. the Minister of Finance. It is a cover-up, Sir, they are ashamed to lay on the table of this House -

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

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) A point of order has come up.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. gentleman is using the word 'cover-up' with respect to ministers in the performance of their ministerial duty who are performing it in accordance with the law. There is nothing being covered up; they are complying - I repeat, complying - with the law and I submit that the use of that phrase and the connotation in which it is used is most unparliamentary because it implies a motive on the part of the hon. ministers concerned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit to Your Honour, there is precedent, Sir, under the British parliamentary system of government, there is ample precedent for accusing government of covering up when they refuse to give the House information, especially on loaning public money or giving out public money, taxpayers' money, for grants. There is ample precedent, Sir, and there is a tradition for it, that one of the first obligations of government, Mr. Speaker, is to provide information to the House on every dollar of taxpayers' money that is spent -

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. NEARY: - and so far, this government have refused to do that, Sir, and what else could you call it but a cover-up?

MR. R. MOORES: That is right.

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

As hon. members know, the authorities, although they give examples of words or phrases which are unparliamentary, they also state that the list, itself, is not the determining factor, it is the connotation or the context within which something is said.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

The term 'cover-up' obviously can have, I suppose, two connotations, one, an hon. member by saying something is a cover-up can be implying that he does not have what he considers to be sufficient information; it can also be used in the connotation that there is deceit or duplicity, and if it is the latter, then obviously it is unparliamentary. But if the hon. member is saying that there is not sufficient information available without attributing motive or making any suggestion of deceit or duplicity, then I think it is a neutral term. But I would ask the hon. member perhaps, so that hon. members in the House are aware of it, to state in his use of the word 'cover-up' he is not making any allegation of improper or illegal conduct.

MR. NEARY: I think if the hon. gentleman had been listening to me, Your Honour, he would have heard what I said, that there is no information, we are not getting any information in this House concerning the secret loans that are made by the Rural Development Authority and the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, and therefore, I argue that the government is covering up this information, refusing to give the information to the House, and that is the context in which I use it, Your Honour. So I would submit that I am

MR. NEARY: completely within my rights and in order under the rules of Parliament.

Now, Sir, when Joey Smallwood carried on his industrial development programme in this Province he did it in the open, he did it above board, he made no bones about it. He told the people of Newfoundland about the industrial development projects, where they were going to be located, the amount of money that was going to be spent on them and who owned the project. Now then, Sir, he did it openly and above board. That does not necessarily mean that the hon. gentleman or anybody else agreed with his programme, with his policy or with his projects. He had more successes than he had failures. But this hon. crowd, Mr. Speaker, are spending millions piled upon millions of taxpayers' dollars on every hare brained scheme imaginable on the face of this earth to every con artist that comes along and then refuses to give the House any information on these loans and grants.

AN HON. MEMBER: He turned seven sods for every project.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I told the House the other day, if I wanted to, I could go down in the Registry office in the last seven years since we have had a Tory administration in this Province and I could dig up a scandal a day - a mini-scandal a day - from now until the time this House closes. And I could do the same thing, Sir, with Newfoundland Farm Products, the Farm Loan Board, and I could do the same thing with the Fishery Loan Board. I could have a mini-scandal a day, especially the Farm Loan Board, where a former Tory candidate over on Bell Island where I was one time the member, who opposed me, went and got a tractor from the Farm Loan Board; and I brought it up in this hon. House

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: But he was not farming. He was allowed to get it if he was farming. He was an insurance salesman, an insurance salesman here in St. John's. And he went down and got a tractor that - and they never stuck a plow in the ground. My hon. friend knows what the tractor was used for. It was used when the hon. gentleman persuaded his colleagues -

MR. DOODY: To plow you off Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Could I have order, Mr. Speaker?

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

MR. NEARY: - when the hon. gentleman persuaded his colleagues to buy the stadium over there. Then they started to renovate and upgrade the stadium, and God only knows how much it cost, and the gentleman who got that tractor from the Farm Loan Board hired it out to the stadium. And that is what the tractor did. And it lay there until it practically rusted out and then I believe it was put up for sale, not by the Farm Loan Board. And I would like to know to this day, we have never had any information tabled in this House on loans made by the Newfoundland Farm Loan Board, but I would like to know if that tractor was ever paid for. I doubt if it was, Sir. I would be willing to bet my life here and now that that tractor was never paid for. That was a bit of graft, a bit of political patronage that was pushed out to a Tory hack. And the same thing is happening, Mr. Speaker, in the Rural Development Authority and the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. Joey did it in the open, this crowd hide it. Mr. Speaker, covered up in the books of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and the Rural Development Authority, Sir, are mini-scandals. Covered up in the records of both of these government lending agencies, and my hon. friend

MR. NEARY: sits there and grins at it as if it was funny. Well I do not think it is funny.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the most serious obligations of a member of the House of Assembly, Sir, is to protect the public treasury from being looted. God only knows we have seen enough looting in the last several years. What about the new Premier, the hon. gentleman who comes in and says, "Oh, everything is going to change now. We are not going to follow the same old Moores' policies of covering up, we are going to lay the information on the table of the House. We are not going to follow the tradition of the former Tory leader, of refusing to give the House information, the gentleman who went out and said he brought democracy to Newfoundland. "Brought democracy to Newfoundland by doing away with the Public Accounts Committee and by refusing to give this House information, by refusing to give this House Bob Cole's contract, by refusing to give this House lists of these secret loans and grants. And that is the gentleman who brought democracy to Newfoundland. That is the gentleman who started the cover up in Newfoundland. There was no cover up before that. A gentleman who went out with half of his administration under investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time, Sir, it is time, it is time to put all these Crown corporations and agencies and companies under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Finance, providing, Sir, providing the Minister of Finance will give us a report of these agencies and Crown corporations in this hon. House and not continue to cover up the information; that the hon. gentleman, when asked in this House by elected representatives of the people, will give us the information that we want on public spending, on every dollar that is spent belonging to the public. If

April 9, 1979

Tape No. 803

NM - 3

MR. NEARY: the hon. gentleman does that, then I would say this is a good bill. But there is no indication the hon. gentleman is going to do it.

I would suggest, Sir, to the contrary, that the hon. gentleman will continue to cover up information. Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will have a chance in a few moments to answer me. I have accused the government, and I cannot be any stronger, I have accused the government of covering up many scandals in the Rural Development

Mr. Neary: Authority and in the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. I cannot be any more blunt than that. And The Fisheries Loan Board and the Farm Loan Board. And what about Nordco? Will Nordco, which is a private company registered under The Companies Act by the Provincial Government, will they have to report to the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins)? Will Dr. Stu Peters have to report to the Minister of Finance or does he have carte blanche now to go out and do as he wishes?

You know, Mr. Speaker, it amuses me, Sir, it amuses me when I hear government—I heard the Premier this afternoon when we were talking about the road in Westport, standing up and saying, "Oh we cannot make a decision, we cannot make a decision for five or six weeks." We hear that day in and day out. We hear it about electricity rates. We need more money for electricity rates, we cannot afford to build hospitals, we cannot afford to improve the road in Westport. But, Mr. Speaker, how long, Sir, will it take the message to filter through that this government in the last seven years, Sir, has been responsible for more extravagance and waste and more throwing away of taxpayer money than in our 450 year history?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And if they want to know where they can get the money, Sir, to do that road in Westport or do the road out in my own district, out in LaPoile, the road to Grand Bay West, cut out this foolish nonsense, cut out this extravagance and waste, cut out this political patronage and there will be all kinds of money to do the things that need to be done, to carry out the essential projects in this Province. The people down in Westport know, they can see it every day. They hear about the helicopter contracts, they hear about renting office space in downtown St. John's at exorbitant prices, they see ministers going around in the whirly-birds, going around on personal business, and not government business. They see them going off to weddings in government aircraft and helicopters. They see them

Mr. Neary: going off in government cars and they hear about them travelling around the world at public expense, on joy rides around the world. They know about the foolish Norma and Gladys nonsense. And I have as much pride, Sir, in our sailing ships as anybody in this Province, but let us get our priorities straight. There is another thing we have never been able to find out, how much that trip cost, to Europe, of the Norma and Gladys? I would say somewhere, I would make a guess, hazard a guess, somewhere in the vicinity of \$3 million. Three million dollars, what for? For a big booze party, a big bash, for a big bash, Sir, a big bash. And you talk about Commissions of Enquiry; there is where a Commission of Enquiry should be set up, Sir.

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

MR. SPEAKER (MR. CROSS): A point of order has been called.

MR. HICKEY: A point of privilege. I have been associated with this project and he keeps pointing the finger and he says, "There is where a Commission of Enquiry should be launched." What is he talking about? He is absolutely out of his cotton-picking mind, Mr. Speaker, \$3 million. A half million dollars is what we are talking about of Provincial dollars. What is the hon. gentleman talking about? Or is he confused with the Mifflin Enquiry on Bell Island -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: - and the waste of \$300,000 on building materials? And the manipulating of the civil service, is that what he is talking about? Now if he wants to start pointing fingers we will start pointing a half a dozen at him.

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN: A point of privilege, he said.

MR. NEARY: A point of nothing.

MR. SPEAKER (Cross): Order, please!

There is no point of privilege, I think it is just a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a few words of advice for the hon. gentleman; If I were the hon. gentleman, at this particular point in time, I would not try to smear anybody on this side of the House or attack anybody's character. Because, Mr. Speaker, we saw the hon. the Premier do that when the government was under attack for its corruption, political patronage, political appointments. When we were accusing the government of being the most corrupt in our 450 year history, Sir, when the Premier was under attack, the Premier used to come back, lash back by getting personal with members of the Opposition. I remember the hon. gentleman said before he

MR. NEARY: I will get 'Rowe' and I will get 'Neary'." Well, he has not gotten either one of us yet. We are still around and he is gone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And I would submit to my hon. friend that he not resort to that tactic, the mugs game, because two can play that game, Mr. Speaker, and if I were the hon. gentleman, I would be very, very careful.

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

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

MR. HICKEY: I have to insist, Your Honour, I am not going to be brow-beaten here every time I open my mouth. I be very, very careful - I be careful about what? This hon. member has nothing to be careful about, let me inform my hon. friend opposite. I am on no witch hunt, I am not getting personal. He raised it - he points the finger at me, Your Honour, and he talks about the Norma and Gladys project, he quotes \$3 million, he suggests a public inquiry or a Royal Commission - What is he talking about? I do not want to get personal with the hon. gentleman. My record in this hon. House has been one of defence, not attack.

MR. W. N. ROWE: On the point of order, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order.

MR. W. N. ROWE: There is no point of order.

The hon. gentleman, under the guise of raising a point of order, got up and made a speech and entered into the debate. And I would urgently suggest to Your Honour that the hon. member be told to stop employing that tactic and interrupting the debates in this House, because there was no point of order - he got up on a difference of fact and opinion between two hon. members - no point of order at all, Sir. And all it is doing is wasting the time of the House

MR. W. N. ROWE: and he is trying but failing to succeed in detracting my hon. friend from the important points he is making.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

I see this, too, as sort of a debate where there is difference of opinion between two members, and I would ask the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to continue.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and what I suggested, Sir, was that \$2.5 million to \$3 million of taxpayers' money, I do not care whether we are talking about Canadian taxpayers - and the hon. gentleman can play with words all he wants - or provincial taxpayers' money, \$2.5 million to \$3 million of taxpayers' money went down the drain, was flushed down the toilets in the capitals of Europe, went through the bladders of all these people who were invited out to these bashes, flushed down the toilets of the capitals of Europe, \$2.5 million to \$3 million of taxpayers' money - Canadian taxpayers, if the hon. gentleman wants me to be specific about it - and provincial taxpayers' money. That would have done a lot to improve the roads in Westport and in Markland -

MR. R. MOORES: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - and in a few other parts of this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, the point that I was making when I was so rudely interrupted by the hon. gentleman, Sir, was that millions piled upon millions of dollars are thrown away by this administration and no accounting given to this hon. House. That is the point I am making, Sir. And I do not have to give the hon. gentleman a lecture in the first obligation of elected representatives of the people, that it is to protect the Public Treasury.

MR. NEARY: That is our first obligation, Sir. And, Mr. Speaker, can anybody in this Province say that the Public Treasury has been protected in the last seven years since the Tories formed the administration? No, Sir, it has not been protected - anything but - it has been wide open for misuse, abuse and looting. I cannot be any more outspoken, I cannot be any more blunt. And is not personal when I talk about the Norma and Gladys. The hon. minister has to answer for the Norma and Gladys. That is not a personal attack. It is factual, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, if we only could get our hands on these lists. I mentioned one case the other day of Pelcon, and then I swung into the second case of a company called Canadian Cushion Craft. Canadian Cushion Craft, I told the House, was registered under the Companies Act down here on the ground floor but the owners of that company were not named. On the share list, Sir, and lawyers have a knack and a technique for doing this, they never give the real name of the company, they put on the names of their secretaries.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: Well, go down and check Canadian Cushion Craft and you will find the names of three secretaries on the share list. The real owners were never named. And the law firm that they belong to is down at 1 Church Hill, I believe, downtown, a law firm, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, that has the name of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) on the door.

AN HON. MEMBER: A great firm.

MR. NEARY:

Ah, a great firm he says. And, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen might be interested in knowing that the hon. gentleman had to put an order through the Cabinet, had to get a Cabinet order the hon. gentleman did, so that they could name the company, Canadian Cushion Craft. That is also in the file in the registry office.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can shake his head all he wants. The hon. gentleman had on behalf of his law partner to go before the Cabinet and ask the Cabinet to approve the name of that company, to call it Canadian Cushion Craft. And then lo and behold they went to the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, Mr. Good and Mr. Halley - it is just as well to come right out and say who they are, one since appointed to the Public Utilities Board and the other gentleman a land speculator and one of my hon. colleague's law partners - they went down then and borrowed \$150,000 from the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and then shortly after put the company in receivership. All we got for that, Sir, was a little show down on Quidi Vidi one Sunday afternoon when they had a few little plastic speed boats down there, down on Quidi Vidi Lake one Sunday afternoon. That \$150,000 went down the drain, went into receivership. And, Mr. Speaker, \$150,000 of taxpayers' money given out without the Newfoundland Development Corporation knowing at that time who the owners of the company were. I could go on and on, Sir. I could get a list of failures from the Rural Development Authority and the Newfoundland Development Corporation the length of the floor of this Assembly. We cannot on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, we cannot say whether the Rural Development Authority and the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation have been a success or a failure, we cannot say what their track record has been, we do not know, because we cannot get the information. We cannot find out, for instance, how many loans were made, who they were made to, what they were made for and what the payback is

MR. NEARY: and how many of them have gone into receivership and into bankruptcy. We cannot find out. It is unheard off in British parliamentary history, unheard off. We have a new Minister of Finance now, we have a new Premier and we hear a lot about a new broom sweeping clean. Well I say let us come clean. Give us some information when we ask for it on the Newfoundland Farm Products and on the Fishery Loan Board and on the Development Corporation and on the Rural Development Authority. Do not cover up the information. Tell us what is happening. Tell us about Nordco. Tell us who is funding Nordco and how much and what controls the government have on Nordco.

Mr. Speaker, I got the shock of my life when I wrote the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) and the Attorney General for this Province and I said, "Dear Mr. Minister; Will you let me have the report of Labrador Linerboard from 1973 up to the present time. It being a Crown Corporation and you being a member on the Board of Directors will you please let me have the annual report of Labrador Linerboard?" And what was the reply I got back from the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman)? He said, "I was not a member of the Board of Directors of Labrador Linerboard in the time that you specified. And I want to point out to you that Labrador Linerboard is not a Crown Corporation but a private company."

MR. S. NEARY: That was the answer I got. \$250 million of taxpayers money thrown down the drain on Labrador Linerboard and the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) and the Attorney General refused to give me the reports and have stonewalled and refused to this day to give me the reports, the annual reports of Labrador Linerboard. So it is a company, it is a private company. So then I went down in the company's office and I looked up the share list and who is on the share list but the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice in 1973 and 1974 - not for the whole time of the operation of Labrador Linerboard - so then I wrote the hon. gentleman back again and I said, Well, will you please give me the report for the years that you were on the Board of Directors? And I have not got an answer to this day. Why, Mr. Speaker? Why? Because, again, we have a cover-up of information, and well they should cover-up. By the time the RCMP and the police are finished with that one I guarantee you the dragnet will be out. Well they should cover up. But how can we, Mr. Speaker, as elected representatives of the people, how can we do our job in this House when we cannot get information that we ask for from ministers on the government benches? What does the Minister of Justice have to say? The Minister of Justice! I mean, I would not mind if it was the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Power) or some flunky that you were asking -

MR. FLIGHT: The Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. S. NEARY: - or the Minister of Mines and Energy. (Mr. Doody) - no, I am sorry I said that because I guarantee you this, if I asked the Minister of Mines and Energy for the information if it was within his power to give it to me, he would give it to me. He has, and I have no reason to suspect that he would cover up, but he is a part of that collective cover-up. And the hon. gentleman

MR. S. NEARY: knows that. If the hon. gentleman were on this side of the House he would feel the same as I do. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman), the Attorney General of this Province refusing to give elected representatives information that they are entitled to have. I would not mind if we were not entitled to it. It is not private information, it is public information, it should be made public. But no, the Minister of Justice, who should be setting a good example, the man who administers justice in this Province, the man who is supposed to see that everybody gets a fair deal and fair shake, he is the one who leads in the cover-up of information. He is the leading culprit by refusing to give us any information on the Labrador Linerboard mill, to give us the annual report of the Board of Directors of which the hon. gentleman was a member representing the people of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do hope, Sir, that when the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) stands to speak this afternoon, as he will, that he will tell us that the day of the cover-up is over, the day of cover-up is ended, that they are now going to get back to where the situation was in 1971, and beyond that, when 'Joey', with all the criticism he had flung at him, did not cover up, came out in the open, laid his Industrial Development policy on the table, let the people have a look at it, be it good or bad. Remember all the criticism the Tories flung at him for spending the \$40 million that Commission of Government had accumulated after Confederation? That was a big issue for years. For twenty-odd years the Tories carried on that crusade. Oh, what did they do with the \$40 million? Well, Mr. Speaker, I would venture a guess, Sir, that that \$40 million is small potatoes compared to what the con artists are after getting out of the public treasury via the Newfoundland Farm Products, via the Newfoundland Development Corporation and via the Rural Development Authority, small potatoes, Sir, in the last six or seven years. Then

April 9, 1979

Tape No. 807

DW -

MR. NEARY: you wonder where the money is going to come from to build hospitals. You wonder why people are paying the highest taxes in the whole of Canada. And a few poor old suckers say, you know, Well, the government, they do not have the money. They do not have the money? Why do they not have the money?

 Once in awhile I hear that, I hear that a few poor old suckers

MR. NEARY: like myself who do not know any better would say, "Well boy, you cannot do everything because you do not have the money." No. but you can fire millions of dollars away every year.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Minister of Finance (Dr.J.Collins) Sir, will put an end to the covering up that has gone on in this Province in the last six or seven years. And if the hon. the Premier does not instruct him to do it, then the hon. gentleman is just as bad as his predecessor who has now gone out and has set himself up a little holding company that I am taking a look at, that I have been examining for some time. A holding company! Well, we will find out in due course what he is holding.

AN HON. MEMBER: Huh!

MR. NEARY: And if the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) wants the name of it, I can give him that too. I will guarantee you now that if they think for one minute, Mr. Speaker, if they think for one moment that all the corruption and all the extravagance and waste is going to be forgotten because Moores is gone, then I have news for that hon. crowd, Sir. We still have a few rotten apples in the barrel. There are still a few rotten apples on the other side of the House, Sir. We do not have all the culprits yet. I think I can claim an assist for getting a couple of ministers and a Premier. I can cut a notch in my belt. But there are a couple of more yet. We have not gotten the really rotten apples out of the barrel yet, Sir, but we will get them.

The hon. the Premier made his first mistake when the hon. gentleman had his

MR. NEARY: opportunity to clean her out, to gut her out. The hon. gentleman was scared, lost his nerve. He wanted to do it. He wanted to shake a couple of ministers. They would not let go. He could not get rid of them. He was afraid that there might be resignations, she might fall apart. He did not want that to happen, he wanted time to get in the comfortable pew down on the eighth floor. He was afraid that the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Doody) and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) might rebel, might revolt because of the way they were treated in the leadership.

The hon. gentleman may sit over there and smile and say, "Oh, the Liberals have dissension in their ranks." We can settle our problems, Sir. No problem!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I would submit the hon. gentleman is the one who has dissension in his ranks.

MR. FLIGHT: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I am sure today, Sir, we have a couple of ministers who cannot wait for the election to be called. Or cannot wait for something to happen, some excuse to disassociate themselves from that administration, they cannot stomach it any longer.

MR. FLIGHT: No wonder 'Jim' is going to Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: The Premier had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to gut her out, to clean her out and he did not have the courage to do it.

MR. SPEAKER(Cross): Order, please!
Would the hon. member

MR. SPEAKER (Cross): yield for a moment?

MR. NEARY: Sure.

MR. SPEAKER: I am pleased to announce that there are forty-two grade X and XI students from Holy Trinity High School, in Heart's Content in the galleries, accompanied by their teachers Mr. Eric Legge and Mr. Grant Tucker. We hope that your brief stay will be informative and interesting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we hear very often about how Newfoundlanders are cynical about their politicians, disillusioned, discouraged, disgruntled, fed up with their politicians, fed up with the two old line parties, now turning in droves to the NDP. We hear that every day, Sir. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker? Is it any wonder? I do not believe, Sir, it is the fault of the way we do business in this hon. House. Because this House has been working for a long time. One thing I want to point out, especially for the media who fall into the trap everytime, that if somebody did not observe the rules of this House, Sir, they would be put out by Your Honour. Everytime that somebody says that the House is not working, especially the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), that is one of his pet peeves - the House is not working, she is like a bear pit, they are uncivilized in there - in my opinion that is a reflection on Your Honour. Your Honour is the one who enforces the rules of the House and I would resent it, if I were Your Honour, everytime I heard somebody on that side say the House is not working, everybody is unparliamentary, there is

MR. NEARY: you follow the rules if you are playing a game of hockey, you have a referee, and Your Honour is the referee, and every time a newsman says that about the House he is insulting Your Honour. The House is working. I have not heard of anybody being flung out so far this session, anybody put outside the rail. So the House is working, Sir. So what is making people discouraged and disillusioned? Well, I will tell the House, Sir. The people out in Grand Falls were promised an extension to their hospital and then the government reneged on the promise and then a minister resigned from the government because the government reneged on the promise. And then shortly after that, after the government saying they did not have the money, "We do not have the cash, the dollars, to put the extension on that hospital," the member for Gander (Mr. H. Collins), the Minister of Health, announces that \$350,000 is going to be spent on a golf course in Gander.

Mr. Speaker, would that not have a tendency, Sir, to make people disappointed, disillusioned, discouraged and fed up with their politicians, after being told by the administration, "We do not have the money to put the extension on your hospital," and only a few miles down the road then they decide they are going to build a golf course for the big shots and the mucky mucks so they can go down and enjoy the nineteenth hole.

MR. H. COLLINS: Who are the big shots?

MR. NEARY: The big shots and the high mucky mucks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I read what they said about the hon. gentleman's granting a golf course in The Gander Beacon. I read it, Sir. No, do not put an extension on the hospital to look after sick people, but build

MR. NEARY: a golf course so they can go down to the 19th hole and get sick.

MR. CANNING: Priorities.

MR. NEARY: Those are the priorities of this government and I would suggest, Sir, that is the sort of thing that is making people discouraged, disillusioned, fed up with their politicians in the old line parties - not this House. This hon. gentleman, the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford), the new Premier, had a golden opportunity to clean her up. "Close down the House for two months", he said. "We are closing her down for two months so we can have a leadership and get a replacement for the Premier". And I kept saying outside the House - First of all, he should not have closed the House for two months. They should have closed it for two weeks when they got near the day of voting. They should have closed the House down then, taken a couple of weeks off. I hope they will give us a couple of weeks off when we get up around near June 15th, give us a couple of weeks off so we can go and elect our leader. I hope they will do that. I hope they will have the decency to do it. I hope the hon. gentleman will not be cowardly enough to pull the plug while we are trying to get a leader. Mr. Speaker, there is a tradition, Sir, whether it be written or unwritten, there is a tradition amongst parliamentarians and parties that when a party is getting a leader that the other party will not be so cowardly, will not be so -

MR. MORGAN: It is only a review.

MR. NEARY: It is not a review, Mr. Speaker. Ah, Mr. Speaker, it is not a review. The hon. gentleman need not take any consolation in that and try to encourage his boss.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do you want to get rid of

him or are you joking?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, it is a full-fledged leadership convention in case the hon. gentleman does not understand it, I am telling him now.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a very cowardly act on the part of the Premier to dissolve the House although we are ready. We have the candidates.

MR. FLIGHT:

Call it. Call it, Brian.

MR. NEARY:

Call it. If that is the way the hon. gentleman wants to play the game, the hon. gentleman wants to be unfair, does not believe in British fair play, Go and call it and see what the backlash will be. Give us a chance, give us a chance to have our convention. We gave the hon. gentlemen a chance. We gave the hon. gentlemen two months. They closed down the House, Mr. Speaker, for two months in order to go out and get a leader. We are not asking for two months. We want the House kept open, but when we get near the day of reckoning, we would like a week or ten days or a couple of weeks off.

Once, Mr. Speaker, I was in this House when we shut her down - 'Joey' was here, the dictator - shut her down and let the Opposition go to Ottawa to elect 'Diefenbaker' leader of the Tory party of Canada. I do not know if the hon. gentleman was here or not. We did it many's the time. Many's the time I saw leaders come and go, leaders of the Tory party and

MR. NEARY: every time we would agree to shut the House down for a few days to let them go out and select their leader. And it would be very unfair, Sir, and it would be very cowardly indeed and it would not be in accord with British fair play and British justice for the hon. gentleman to dissolve the House and not give us a chance to get our leader.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, at least, I have the hon. gentleman sized up enough to know that the hon. gentleman will give us a fair chance. But if the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) were here he would be nudging and pushing and bullying the hon. gentleman. He has gone off to Florida, I understand, on a couple of weeks vacation, which is a good thing. Because if he were here he would be saying, "Oh jump on them now, jump on them while they are disorganized and while they are in disarray, or they look like they are in disarray. Jump on them! Do not give them a chance to have a leadership convention." That is what the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) would be saying if he was here. Fortunately he is not here so I am appealing to the hon. gentleman's sense of fair play and British justice not to pull the plug. If the hon. gentleman wants to pull it, okay, fine, it is all right with me.

MR. DOODY: If you pulled the plug on that crowd you would have a ring around the harbour.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, did I hear the hon. gentleman talk about rings around harbours, Sir? The hon. gentleman sat with the most corrupt administration in our 450 year history and did nothing about it, The most corrupt administration in our 450 year history and it is not all going to be swept under the rug if that is what the hon. gentleman thinks. The investigations and the enquiries will still go on and on until justice is done and until the culprits are caught. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) what about the Traffic Court? Does the Traffic Court report to the hon. gentleman under this new bill? Because we are told, Sir, that the Traffic Court,

MR. NEARY: the accounting in the Traffic Court is in a terrible, in a horrible mess. You would not know but it was a bunch of little kids in kindergarten, I am told, going around with pencils making on bits and pieces of paper and drawing little figures. The Traffic Court could not be in a worse mess - the accounting in the Traffic Court. Every year the Auditor General tells us that in his report. And if the Auditor General did not tell us we would know it anyway, Sir. Every time that the bailiff or whatever he is comes and knocks on your door and delivers a summons for a traffic ticket that you had forgotten about, that you did not even know you had two years ago, they come down and knock on your door and the poor old fellow has got to back in he is so ashamed. He says I am sorry I have to do this but here is a traffic ticket a year and a half old, two years old. And you say to him, "How did that happen? Where did I get it?" "Well I do not know, Sir. I know the place is in an awful mess over there. Everybody over there feels ashamed sending out these summonses." And the Auditor General again this year reminded us -

MR. FLIGHT: And convictions two years old.

MR. NEARY: Convictions, Sir. You get a summons and if you do not pay up, double the amount sometimes, you are hauled into court for a sloppy accounting system. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, I am sure as every hon. member and everybody listening to me in the gallery and anybody who hears me outside of this House that I have paid tickets twice. I am sure I have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Do not be breaking the law.

MR. NEARY: Very, very funny. Mr. Speaker, poor people, ordinary people, people on unemployment, people trying to struggle along, do not think they owe a cent in this world and they go up to pick up their car licence and they are told, "You owe \$100 in parking tickets." "I beg your pardon" - I have heard the arguments. They come to see me - "I beg your pardon, I do not owe \$100 in parking tickets or expired meters or no parking zones." "Oh yes you do." Two

April 9, 1979

Tape No. 810

AH-3

MR. NEARY:

years ago, a year and a half ago, a year ago. Ancient history. I wish the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) were in his seat to hear this because he is the hon. gentleman who is responsible for it. If the hon. gentleman heard me, what is the hon. gentleman going to do about it, having these tickets slapped at you two years after, a year and a half after and a year after? I would say clean up,

Mr. Neary: start off with a clean sheet.

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

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): A point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: The Bill before this House there is a very simple bill with a very simple principle asking the House to give authorization to the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) to sign guarantees of loans. It has absolutely nothing to do with the Traffic Court. It has absolutely nothing to do with what the hon. gentleman is referring to, and it is not all all germane or relevant to the issue before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, Sir. It is very relevant. The hon. gentleman knows that, Sir. We are talking about government financing, borrowing, loans, where the money comes from to give out in loans and grants, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Minister of Finance is responsible for all of this. And I would submit, Sir, I am in order.

MR. SPEAKER: Certainly the principle of the bill deals with the guaranteeing of loans by the government. And the debate at this stage has to deal with the principle of the bill. When hon. members bring in matters which are either extraneous to the bill then obviously they are out of order. Or if they bring in matters which do not appear to be relevant to the bill then obviously they have to endeavour if they can to make it relevant. But no doubt the principle is authorization to guarantee loans. So I would ask hon. members, all hon. members in debating this bill to relate their remarks to that principle.

MR. NEARY: I thank Your Honour.

Mr. Speaker, Crown corporations are another area where the Auditor General has had great difficulty, great difficulty, Sir, in auditing the reports of Crown corporations and companies that have been formed by the Provincial Government. The Auditor General says "That in the past he has been unable to meet the auditing requirement that is necessary under The Public

Mr. Neary: Administration Act for reasons of not having staff and for reasons of not having the authority to audit the books of some Crown corporations." There are Crown corporations, Mr. Speaker, that the Auditor General is not allowed to touch, and unfortunately Labrador Linerboard happens to be one of these companies. The Auditor General was not permitted, not allowed to look at the records of the Labrador Linerboard. And we have similar situations existing with other Crown Corporations.

And so, Sir, there has been a tendency in the past several years to be sloppy and careless with the public money, millions piled upon millions of dollars have been wasted, thrown away as a result of lack of control by the ministers and by the administration over Crown corporations and over the boards, such as the Farm Loans Board. If we could ever get the information, if we could ever lay the Farm Loans Board out on the Table of this House and scrutinize it, and examine it, I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, it would knock your eyeballs out. The patronage, and the many scandals that are covered up would make your hair stand on end. And I can get up here, Sir, I know if the hon. gentleman think that I am ranting and raving today, it probably will not get one paragraph, one syllable in the newspaper, but neither will it get a rebuttal or an answer from the administration because they know what I am saying is true. That this government has a bad record, has a sad history of covering up information. And now we have a bill before us to force some of these boards and some of these Crown corporations to report to the hon. gentleman. Well, Sir, I would have no hesitation at all in voting for this bill, if I thought the hon. gentleman would give us the information that we ask for, give the House the information that it asks for repeatedly day in and day out, follow the recommendations of the Auditor General, pages 42 and 43 that I have in front of me.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, what about the reference - in here, I think it is. I read here somewhere about the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Housing. Do they now have to report to the hon. gentleman or are they a law unto themselves? Does the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing do as it sees fit? Can it do as it likes, like the Newfoundland Hydro? We have created more monsters, Sir, in this Province in the last several years than you could shake a stick at. They are all out doing what they like. They are riding off in a hundred different directions and wasting and squandering taxpayers' money, and then we wonder why we are paying the highest taxes in the whole of Canada.

Perhaps, Sir, I have said enough to give the minister an idea, an inclination of how I feel about this bill. I feel very strongly about it. I do not think the bill goes far enough; I think it is about time - as the Auditor General, himself, pointed out this year in his annual report - it is time that the Auditor General was given the authority to place some value on the dollars that ministers in government spend. Are they getting value for their money? In Ottawa now they can do it. The Auditor General can come out and say, 'I figure the money you spent doing this was a waste of time - it was squandered, it was extravagant, it was wasteful, unnecessary.' You cannot do it in Newfoundland. If the Auditor General could, I tell you, you would have a much larger report than you have at the present time. The Auditor General cannot get the information - he does not know if it is right or wrong - and neither can the members of the House of Assembly. Maybe we should pass a law to put some teeth in the Public Administration Act. Maybe this bill should be beefed up a little bit to force the minister to give the House any information that is in the public interest, such as the

MR. NEARY: ones I referred to, the secret loans that are made by the Rural Development Authority and the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. Nothing sets the devil in me more, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure nothing sets the devil in members of this House any more than asking for a list of secret loans made to party hacks, the political patronage, and then not being able to get the list. I heard ministers, I heard members on the government benches, defend their policy by saying that political patronage is an acceptable thing; it has been going on ever since time immemorial and it is going to continue to go on. I have heard ministers on the government benches make that statement, 'political patronage is an accepted practice in our society.' Well, maybe it is, Sir, but at least, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentlemen believe that and they are going to continue with political patronage, then let us have a list of those who are the benefactors, of those who receive the political patronage or are they ashamed of that? Or will they continue to cover up?

So, Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the bill. I do not think it goes far enough, and I would hope that this will change the policy of this administration over the last several years, an administration that has followed the example set by the Nixon regime down in the United States - covering up. They will get caught at their cover ups, Mr. Speaker. Some of them have been caught already, covering up information and lying - and telling untruths - doing some fancy stick handling and fancy footwork and fancy figure skating rather than give the House the information, giving political answers and so on. But it will not work, Mr. Speaker, and if the hon. gentleman, the new Premier, can do nothing else - he tells

MR. NEARY: us the new broom sweeps clean - well, let us clean up the corruption and the extravagance and waste and let us stop the cover-up. If this bill will do that and if the hon. gentleman will give the information to the House that we ask for from time to time during the Oral Question Period, during our debates and questions that we put on the Order Paper - if the hon. gentleman has the authority to do that under this bill, well then

MR. NEARY: I would say it is a good piece of legislation, but I am afraid that is not going to be the case.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister speaks now, he closes the debate.

Hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I am glad there was a point of order raised by the Minister of Justice a minute ago questioning the relevancy of what can be said in this debate and it was clarified to the satisfaction of the House and since this is a money bill it has ramifications on every aspect of life in this Province. Therefore, as long as one is talking about the realm of finance in this Province, one can get away with anything that relates to the spending of money.

Mr. Speaker, I want to zero in on something that has concerned me very much and concerned all of Newfoundland very much this past month or two and that is the issue as to whether or not we have compulsory insurance in this Province. Mr. Speaker, there is a money principle involved here -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! So that the hon. gentleman will not be lead astray, I should point out what the principle of the bill is, as I stated before, is that the wisdom or lack thereof of designating the Minister of Finance as the responsible authority to guarantee loans undertaken by various government-appointed boards and commissions and hon. members are required to relate their remarks to that principle. The reason I am pointing it out at the beginning is that I understood the hon. member's original statement suggested to me a somewhat different interpretation of the Chair's previous ruling than the Chair held and remarks will have to be made relevant to that principle. Hon. member,

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I submit that anything I say will be relevant to the debate and I regret that the Minister of Transportation is not in his seat. The Minister of T.&C. is not in his seat or the Minister of Consumer Affairs and it is difficult to know who the Minister of Consumer Affairs is.

The fact is, Sir, that in this Province today we have a law that makes compulsory insurance - makes automobile liability insurance compulsory. A survey has shown that more than 40 per cent of the drivers in Newfoundland today are not carrying compulsory insurance. When it was put to the minister, he fudged on it, Sir; he indicated that he is accepting the insurance company's version of why we cannot determine how many drivers in this Province have not got compulsory insurance. It will create too much paperwork for the insurance companies.

The member of Lapoile (Mr. Neary) just indicated, Sir, that there are summonses going out across this Province today for tickets in the Traffic Court two years old and that is indeed a fact. Let some person apply to an insurance company for liability insurance; apparently, the insurance companies have a deal, the paperwork do not bother them when they go to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and ask for the driver's record. There have been cases where liability insurances have been sold, billed and paid for and six months after, having got what might or might not have been confidential information from the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, that individual's automobile insurance doubled as a result of having picked up speeding tickets over the past two years. Now, if we

MR. FLIGHT: can have that kind of a understanding, Mr. Speaker, with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles - if the insurance people and the insurance companies of this Province can have that kind of an understanding with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles so they can get all the information they require, then I submit that the Minister of T. & C. or the Minister of Consumer Affairs it should be a two-way street and the insurance companies in this Province should be required by statute if necessary to notify the Minister of T. & C. or the Registrar of Motor Vehicles the minute that an insurance policy is allowed to lapse or voided for any reason in this world. We would have then, Mr. Speaker, what is truly a compulsory liability insurance program in this Province. We would have the people who are concerned about their personal property or lives, the bills that they may have incurred in the event they are involved in an accident where the vehicle owner is not carrying liability. We still have people in this Province, Mr. Speaker, who are suffering immensely financially and every other way because they are continually day after day getting involved in accidents involving drivers in this Province without any liability insurance. Forty per cent of the people in this Province

MR. G. FLIGHT: today are driving on the Trans Canada Highway without any insurance and people are getting wiped out financially. Any way you want to look at it they are getting wiped out and this Administration put through this House one of the great reforms, put through this House a bill requiring compulsory liability insurance. We do not have in this Province compulsory insurance in any sense of the word, Mr. Speaker - Any person in this House today or any person in this Province can cancel - It is conceivable that every person in this Province today can cancel their liability insurance instantly, and as of that moment there would not be any insurance on his - and there is no authority - Insurance companies are under no obligation whatsoever to notify the Minister that such has happened and the people of this Province would be driving under the illusion that they are protected in a sense, or that they can take a chance on daring to go on the highways in this Province and that they are protected because the other drivers have liability insurance.

Now that is one issue, Mr. Speaker. I want to get off that now and mention the performance of this Government and how, in their political patronage, they manipulate things to suit their own whims at the time, how they drag, bleed every little incident that comes up in this Province for every inch of political mileage that is in it. The Premier of this Province, the prior premier, the premier before the hon. Premier of the day, made an announcement, called a press conference, Mr. Speaker, and made an announcement to the Province. The announcement was, "I want to announce that Buchans, the mining town of Buchans has gotten a shot in the arm. Mining activity is going to continue; the life expectancy of the mine has been increased by a year and possibly more." The very minute that the premier was making that press release, Mr. Speaker, and confusing the people in Newfoundland

MR. G. FLIGHT: and creating a false impression everywhere else in Newfoundland besides Buchans, the executive of the union was sitting with their membership telling them that in six months half the work force would be laid off.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to presume that if I went into any community in Newfoundland today, in Musgrave Harbour or St. Anthony, and said, "Gentlemen, I have an announcement to make that in effect is a shot in the arm -"

MR. T. A. HICKMAN: A point of order,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Ottenheimer) Order, please! A point of order has come up.

MR. T. A. HICKMAN: I appreciate the hon. gentleman's concern for Buchans but the matters that he is referring to now are not even remotely connected with the bill or the principle of the bill that is presently before the House. It is not only irrelevant but there is no conceivable way and no one could be ingenious enough to bring the comments of the hon. gentleman, the ones that he has just made on automobile insurance and now on Buchans, within the confines or within even the broad scope of the bill that is presently before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order the principle of the bill is quite easily discernible in this particular one and that is whether it should be the Minister of Finance who has the authority to sign guarantees for loans undertaken by various Government bodies. So remarks have to be related to that. It may well be that a number of things can be said but they have to be related to the principle. So I would point out to the hon. member that if our rules and the rule of relevancy is to mean anything then it has to mean

MR. SPEAKER:(Otteneheimer) that what is said in debate has to be related to that principle. It is not my wish to be overly technical but I do have to, as all hon. members have to, realize that that rule of relevancy means that debate on second reading must relate to the principle. So it is incumbent upon all hon. members when they speak to relate their remarks to the principle of the bill.

Hon. member.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the point I was making on the Buchans situation is that I can conceive of a situation that if the trend in Buchans continues the Minister of Finance may well be - Once we vote on this bill today and assuming it is carried the Minister of Finance may well be faced with a situation where he will have the responsibility of spending or judging over what happens to monies passed over to boards to spend because there will be boards of some kind. There will be a lot of money required to take care of the situation that may be involved in Buchans. It will be Provincial money and whether it comes directly out of the Treasury or whether it is set up as a

MR. FLIGHT:

contingency to look after the problems that will be created by this government's attitude to Buchans, Sir. So in that way see it is as relevant. I do not know what is going to happen six months down the road. Are we going to set them a board in Buchans that will make it possible for people to relocate out of the town when 500 men loose their jobs? Are we going to set them a board to decide who is entitled to have special financial assistance or who is not? I want to know that before I let go on this one, Mr. Speaker. I know what the ex-Premier has done to the town of Buchans. I know what he has done. I know what he did from a political point of view. He tried to give the impression throughout the Province that they had just pulled off a great coup, that they had just extended the life of Buchans, that there was no more problem. Wherever I went in Newfoundland apart from Buchans itself, wherever I went the next day people came up to me and said, "Boy, it is some good, ah. Did you hear the Premier last night. The problems are all solved, an extension to the life expectancy of the mine in Buchans." Because the Premier got in cahoots with Abitibi Price and decided that he would play the Buchans situation for every inch of political mileage that was in it with no regard, no concern for the feeling or for the impression that he created in Buchans or outside. All that was important to him was that the word went out in St. Anthony. Buchans has been on the scene this past couple of years. It has been a major an issue. Everybody in Newfoundland recognizes what is happening. Everybody recognizes this government's inability to solve or to even consider solutions for the Buchans situation, knowing that a mine is going to close, knowing that 500 men are going to be in limbo, no jobs, no secondary industry. They are incapable and have proven that they are incapable of addressing themselves to the problem. And the Premier tried knowing that the Buchans situation was important to everyone in this Province, he tried, Mr. Speaker, to use the Buchans situation politically. He called a press conference and indicated that the government was indeed concerned, that the mine would go on

MR. FLIGHT:

and that Buchans had gotten a shot in the arm. And the truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that in July half the Buchans work force will be layed off. The company's stated policy is that they may be able to go into 1980 with a very, very reduced work force.

That is the kind of thing that this administration, this hon. crowd is prepared to do politically, Mr. Speaker, to garner a little support, to garner a few votes and to garner a little good will anywhere in this Province. They take a situation like the Buchans situation and play the dirtiest kind of politics with it. It is too bad the Premier is not here to answer for himself.

Mr. Speaker, we hark back to the present Premier. He walked into Buchans one day after three years of promising the people of Buchans that they were going to take the Buchans situation seriously, after spending \$200,000 dollars on a Buchans Task Force Report, ignoring all the recommendations, ignoring all the representation they got from Buchans this past five years, ignoring every word that I might have said in the House, the hon. the Premier walked into Buchans, the first minister to show up there since this administration has been put in place and he stood up in the hall shortly before Christmas and said, "Look, I am not responsible for Frank Moores. I cannot help it if Frank Moores has lied over the years. I cannot help it if Frank Moores has misled you. I cannot help it if the ministers concerned -

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

I must point out that the hon. member is referring to an hon. member of the House of Assembly and just as one cannot directly allege any hon. member lied, one may not do it indirectly or retorically or hypothetically. I would therefore ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the allegation.

MR. FLIGHT: I withdraw the allegation, Mr. Speaker. I am not stating what I think, Mr. Speaker. I am only bringing the House up to date as to what occurred, a certain set of events and I certainly am not at all worried about withdrawing. I withdraw without

MR. FLIGHT:

qualification. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the minister went in as Chairman of the Resource Policy Committee and at a meeting told the people there that the problem is a lack of communication, no communication. That has been the problem the past three years. He ignored the Task Force Report that was sitting at his elbow, \$200,000 spent, the bulk of that money spent on bringing delegations of the Buchans Task Force into St. John's for weeks and weeks and weeks at a time. He ignored the fact that most of that \$200,000 was spent in sending top flight civil servants into Buchans for weeks at a time. He ignored the fact that trips were made to Scotland to look into scenarios in Scotland that may be something like the Buchans situation. No communication that is the problem

MR. FLIGHT: and at his elbow there was the Buchans Task Force report that he had voted on, spending \$200,000 of which was bringing 35 people from the town of Buchans for a full year and half continuously for weeks and weeks and weeks sequestered in the Battery Motel or in the Airport Inn or in Holiday Inn with topflight civil servants - no communications. He ignored the fact that out of frustration when the people of Buchans realized that the Buchans Task Force was not going to be dealt with -

MR. SPEAKER: A Point of Order has come up.

MR. HICKMAN: I hate interrupting the hon. gentleman, but the hon. gentleman is not following the ruling laid down by Your Honour a few minutes ago. He is totally and absolutely out of order. It is not relevant to a bill which is simply a bill authorizing the Minister of Finance to guarantee loans. It has nothing to do with the Task Force on Buchans.

MR. SPEAKER: I do have to point out to the hon. member and I read from Beauchesne and from May and they both say the same thing: Beauchesne, page 224, "The second reading is the most important stage through which the bill is required to pass; for its whole principle is then at issue and is affirmed or denied by a vote of the House", and May, page 470, "The second reading of a bill is a stage at which the general principles of the bill are considered", and it is not the Chair's wish to be restrictive or to endeavour to make it difficult for hon. members to speak their minds, but the rules do require that all hon. members speaking on second reading speak on the principle and they have to relate their remarks to the principle of the bill. So I require the hon. member to relate his remarks to the principle of the bill and the principle I state before is not a particularly complex one. However one may put it, it is and revolves

MR. SPEAKER (Ottenheimer): around the Minister of Finance being the person responsible for guaranteeing loans or other forms of indebtedness undertaken by certain boards and commissions set up by the government.

Hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in questioning that Point of Order or speaking to it, are presently constituted boards named in that bill? Are any boards that the minister might have in mind of appointing two years down the road or two days down the road named in that bill?

MR. F. WHITE: Boards already appointed.

MR. FLIGHT: Boards already appointed. Boards already appointed or boards that made it. Mr. Speaker, we are giving within this bill the authority to the minister - Municipal Financing Corporation - is that considered a board that can - is that one? Mr. Speaker, the boards that exist in this Province - Municipal Developing Corporation - was the Buchans Task Force - was that a board under this? Well, Mr. Speaker, until it is clarified exactly what we are talking about here, I mean I can talk for a week on the Municipal Financing Corporation as it relates to town councils and municipal taxes and the rest.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not accept that there was a Point of Order and I submit with the vagueness of the bill that there is no irrelevancy as long as we are talking about money being spent and how the the government is spending it and how the Minister of Finance will spend it.

MR. SPEAKER: I would have been pleased to hear the hon. member's submission on the Point of Order before having made the ruling but when the hon. gentleman to my left sat down and the hon. gentleman to my right

MR. SPEAKER (OTTENHEIMER): did not get up, then I made my ruling and it is there.

MR. FLIGHT: I accept Your Honour's ruling, Mr. Speaker, and finish up on that Buchans situation. The compromising situation I found myself in, Mr. Speaker, sitting with the man who eventually became the Premier of the Province, telling 500 people that there was no communication - that is the problem. Ignoring a task force report, ignoring the fact that an action committee had been set up and then, Mr. Speaker, telling them that, "I am here now, the Messiah, I have come. I keep my word. The fact that I have supported an administration this past four years that have not kept their word, forget that. As of this moment I will keep my word. I will see that the proper things are done." Mr. Speaker, any credibility that he may have had when he walked into that meeting was blown when he walked out. I do not know what his own personal impressions were.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the boards, the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation. Since the Minister of Finance is going to be given now control over moneys spent or moneys borrowed or the use of money in any way as it applies to the Newfoundland Financing Corporation, let me ask the minister this -

MR. FLIGHT:

Is he going to stand by the decision or the legislation that permits the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation to intercept revenue grants to town councils? Right now there are hundreds of communities in this Province, Mr. Speaker, whose only means of survival up to a year ago was their revenue grants. That cheque coming out from government all the time was what kept it going. They kept the water going. They kept the snowclearing going. They maintained the facilities. And suddenly, Mr. Speaker, this government four or five years ago had guaranteed a loan in the name of a given town and said that they approved a \$20,000, \$30,000, \$50,000, \$100,000 loan for the purpose of establishing a community service. The loan carried a government guarantee and on carrying that government guarantee the principles, Mr. Speaker, accepted by the town council was in the event that the town could not meet the conditions of the loan, when the loan became due if the revenue to pay the interest was not there or the principal payment was not there the government would pick up that bill. I mean that is the principle. That is the idea behind a government guaranteed loan. Why guarantee it? What is the point of guaranteeing it if for arguments sake when the payment becomes due the government is prepared to default on it and force the municipality to pick up the interest.

Hundreds of communities, Mr. Speaker, over the past three or four years, over the past twenty years for that matter, have borrowed that kind of money under government guaranteed loans, borrowed it in the belief that when the time comes that based on the town's revenue they could not meet the interests or the principal payment that the government having guaranteed the loan, recognizing in the first place that the town would never have the ability, no way to generate the money that would be required to amortize that loan, to pay the interest and the principal. Suddenly they found themselves, Mr. Speaker, and again it was under the present Premier, the then Minister of Municipal Affairs, that legislation was brought in

MR. FLIGHT:

that allowed the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation to intercept revenue grants. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if a community in this Province today owes \$100,000 that was guaranteed by government ten years ago and they have \$1,000 coming out from government, from the Department of Municipal Affairs as a revenue grant, the Municipal Financing Corporation can now intercept that \$1,000 and leave the community in a position where they do not have the necessary funds to keep their water system going, collect garbage, maintain a fire fighting facility. And, Mr. Speaker, they are in a position now - and I know of lots of councillors, Mr. Speaker, who are thinking about throwing it in. It has gotten impossible to manage a town financially in Newfoundland today.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to hear the minister when he gets up now that he is going to be given the authority, the responsibility for the use or abuse of monies allocated to various boards responsible to the government, tell us where he stands on that kind of a situation. Is he going to stand by legislation that permits this Province to intercept government grants, municipal grants, to deny the people and the council in any given town, to deny them the benefits, to deny them the revenue they need to maintain the basic services having talked them into, having cajoled them into accepting a government guarantee loan in the first place?

There was a situation, Mr. Speaker, that prior to an election a representative of this administration walked into a community - and of course there is not a community in this Province today that does not want water and sewer or do not want street lighting or snowclearing or what have you or another fire truck - and prior to an election walked in and suggested to them, why not go ahead and make the application. Guaranteed it will be approved. And having made the application, Mr. Speaker, it was approved. It was approved under a government guaranteed loan. For the time being the community council did not care. I mean, you know, they knew - all government was saying, "Sure go ahead, we will give you the

MR. FLIGHT:

permission. Here is a government guarantee." A letter to the council authorizing the bank to make a short term loan. The council walks down to the bank and gets their loan, comes out, lays the bit of pavement that they are going to do. What a wonderful crowd! What a wonderful minister who came in here or a representative of his a few days ago! Up until that point, Mr. Speaker, for every dollar collected in that town they were getting a dollar from the government. And then suddenly, bingo, they get a letter from the Municipal Financing Corporation saying that as of now because you are in arrears and because you cannot pay the interest on your last loan, the Municipal Financing Corporation is going to as of now intercept your grant and it will no longer be payable. I have known of councils where there have been

MR. G. FLIGHT:

crisis. Mr. Speaker, and council meetings called, and say what are we going to do?

That fifteen hundred, two thousand dollars a month we were getting for our grant was paying our administration, paying our town clerk, paying our town manager, paying off a loan - paying off the interest on a loan, and the principal, that we negotiated ourselves without a Government guarantee. And suddenly the crisis situation, Mr. Speaker. The present Premier, Mr. Speaker, was the minister, and this will be a household conversation before this over, I will guarantee you, that the present Premier is the minister, Mr. Speaker, who put the word out across this Province that water rates are going to twelve dollars. The \$144-a-year man. Any municipal council that came into Confederation Building while the present Premier was the Minister of Municipal Affairs that told us, Mr. Speaker, that, "Whatever it is you are looking for - it may be a possibility it is there for you, it might be, however, we have to get a commitment from you now that you are prepared to move your water rates to twelve dollars" - that is the magic figure - "twelve dollars a month." And out of a desire, Mr. Speaker, to get the things that they wanted for their community, out of a desire to be able to go back to the community and say, "Well, yes, look we got approval to extend our water system, or to improve our roads, or to put a little pavement in" - out of a desire for that the councils concerned were prepared to abide by the wishes of the Minister that we will move the water rates to twelve dollars a month. Insidiously, Mr. Speaker, they were also given the impression that if your water rates go to twelve dollars a month, of course your revenue grant will then be based on that twelve dollars a month. But they lost both ways because they had to go back and sock it to the taxpayers of their community. And there are communities in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that the tax base is senior citizens. Practically their whole

MR. G. FLIGHT:

tax base is senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, another thing the Minister of Municipal Affairs under the same programme should take some responsibility for is to start taking the town councils off the hook with regard to senior citizens. Senior citizen after senior citizen after senior citizen will go to a council and say, "Look, I have my Old Age Pension; that is all I have to live on." Municipal taxes have doubled in the past two or three years, property taxes have doubled, poll taxes have doubled, so they ask for an exemption from the council. And the council goes back and say, "Look, we would like to give you an exemption, however, the Minister must approve it. The Minister is the man who says whether you get an exemption or not." They write the Minister or some representative writes the Minister's office and the letter goes back that there is provision in the Local Government Act for your town council to exempt you.

Now, when is the Minister going to show some courage, Mr. Speaker, or some guts in this matter and make the decision, stop holding the councils over a barrel? Because the Minister knows and I can name communities in this Province that if ever a given town council decided to exempt all senior citizens their tax base would disappear. But that is the kind of position that the Minister is prepared to see the councils live with.

Mr. Speaker, the \$144 a year, twelve dollars a month - When the present Premier took over Municipal Affairs the basic rate across this Province for water rates in unincorporated towns, smaller towns, I am not talking about St. John's or Corner Brook, was around six dollars a month. The Minister made an arbitrary decision that water rates were going to go to twelve dollars a month across the board in this Province, water and sewer was going to go to twelve dollars a month, \$144 a year. It has

April 9, 1979

Tape 818

RT-3

MR. G. FLIGHT: . . . got there now, Mr. Speaker. It has got there with this effect that people are labouring, they cannot afford their municipal taxes. In communities where we have today Welfare recipients, people surviving on Workmen's Compensation, Old Age pensioners, they cannot afford it, Mr. Speaker. And without the revenue grants coming

MR. FLIGHT: in from the Province. Some of those towns are going to fold up. Mr. Speaker, we have had suggestions that there would be great seminars to look at the problems of offshore oil. I am going to submit to this government that one of these days there is going to be a great need to call a seminar to look at municipal government in this Province because we are looking at a situation that cannot be maintained, Mr. Speaker. The majority of the communities in this Province today are bankrupt or close to it, and all that is happening when they come in to talk to the government about their problems is more pressure to increase taxes - more pressure to increase your revenue - increase your revenue - sock it to the taxpayers in your community, Mr. Speaker. We have gotten to a point, Mr. Speaker, where there are communities in this Province today that are paying in excess. They should not be paying the taxes they are paying for the services they are getting. The councils have been pressured by the Department of Municipal Affairs to increase - you have to prove now, Mr. Speaker. When you come in here and indicate that you have a problem in your district, that you need a sewage treatment plant, or you need garbage collection, you have to prove to the Department of Municipal Affairs how you are going to pay for that. No more accepting any responsibility, Mr. Speaker, that the government of this Province has some responsibility to maintain a decent level of services that they owe their people. I do not care where the money comes from. The minister talks about it is more important to look at the resource sector than it is the social sector, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the government of this Province has a responsibility to allow the people in this Province to live in decency and dignity, and we are fast approaching a point, Mr. Speaker, that the people

MR. FLIGHT: living in incorporated areas in this town, not the larger centres; St. John's has a tax base that the Government of Newfoundland need not put another cent in for the next twenty years and it will grow. The private sector will guarantee the future growth of this city. The private sector will guarantee the future growth of Corner Brook, but the private sector will not guarantee the future growth of Badger or Millertown or Buchans Junction, and the private sector will not guarantee - will not put the kind of money into those communities that will allow the people to have the basic services. So, Mr. Speaker, the government has a responsibility whether you want to say the social priorities of - I mean this Premier is noted for saying that, "I put greater emphasis and greater priority on the resource sector of the Province. We will make the money. We will develop our natural resources and make the money to pay for these facilities and these services." Well, Mr. Speaker, I tell you that may happen but the danger is that the money they make will be spent in St. John's and Corner Brook and Grand Falls and the great urban centres. It will not find its way into helping put a water and sewerage system into Buchans Junction. So this Province has a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to provide the basic services for communities that have no way of generating the revenue they need on their own to provide basic services to the various communities.

Mr. Speaker, they need not put a freeze on. I will tell you, there was a freeze put on incorporation in this Province a year or two ago, but the way that this government has allowed municipal taxes to increase the smallest community, Mr. Speaker, is now looking

MR. FLIGHT: at a \$12 a month. If they want a water system - \$12 a month, and, Mr. Speaker, there is another policy too. I know of some communities, Mr. Speaker, that have put in water systems under Canada Works and the deal was that when the water system was put in the only charge would be the maintenance of the system after it was put in. Of course, after the system was put in operation, Mr. Speaker, then obviously there started to be problems. The operational cost was greater than they thought it would be. There had to be additions. The chlorinator was not big enough originally, so they had to come back to the Province for some money to help them finish or to help them make the water system serve the purpose it was meant to. Suddenly they found themselves, having accepted a Canada Works grant and having put the system in that they thought would service their communities, having to come to the Province a year after for money to enlarge and maintain. The old \$12 trick again, Mr. Speaker. Yes, we will undertake to spend the money that is required to do what you want, but, however, you have to understand that any municipality now that wants any kind of services must prove to this minister that they have to financial wherewithal to pay the bills, to pay the loans. Well, Mr. Speaker, either the council accepted that they would go with the system they had or they would accept the minister's ultimatum - get the water rates up to \$12 a month -

MR. R. MOORES: \$144 a year.

MR. FLIGHT: - \$144 a year, and then unwittingly, not being told by the minister that the minute that you do not meet the commitments that you make your revenue grant will be intercepted, unknown to the council, Mr. Speaker, they found themselves into this kind of a situation.

April 9, 1979

Tape No. 819

GH-4

MR. FLIGHT:

So, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance is going to be responsible for the moneys allocated and spent and administered by the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation,

MR. FLIGHT:

And I want to hear him when he stands up indicate as to whether he is prepared to go along with the set up we have today with regards to the autocratic way that the Newfoundland Development Corporation intercepts with the approval under legislation, the Municipal Financing Corporation, can intercept any monies owed by government to councils, and are doing it every day under the Financial Administration Act.

So now is that one of the reasons why the minister wants this legislation passed so he can change that? Is that one of the reasons, because he has got some concern for the positions that the town councils find themselves in? That is maybe one of the reasons and if it is I will certainly vote for this bill. I guaranteed you I will try to take the pressure off and some of the councils out of their misery and try to avoid massive resignations that you are going to get over the next couple of years from town councils. Right now as a matter of fact I understand the minister has a worry in a given community, that the whole six councillors are thinking about resigning for various reasons. That is not the only council, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is going to have trouble with. I can name other councils. Either the government meets their responsibilities and makes it possible to do the job the way that they thought they could when they were elected or else he is going to lose a lot of councils.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to hear the minister say something about that. I want to also know, Mr. Speaker, about the boards, the small boards that are set up around this Province. How about the small boards that are funded by government money around this Province? Pardon me?

AN HON. MEMBER: B-o-r-e-d?

MR. FLIGHT: No, no. Only when the minister is up that is pertinent. Mr. Speaker, to get back for a second to - there are all sorts of advisory boards set up in this Province. The Newfoundland

MR. FLIGHT:

and Labrador Housing Corporation, in every community where a publicly located housing programme is on, subsidized low rental units, in every community in this Province where that is, where Newfoundland and Labrador Housing have established housing there is a committee. Do those committees come under this bill?

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. FLIGHT: They do not. The minister is sure of that.

MR. HICKMAN: Positive.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, just in case he is not sure of it let me point out to the House what is happening.

MR. HICKMAN: On a point of order, Your Honour.

MR. FLIGHT: I am not too sure that he is sure. The Minister of Finance sits there as though he would not be.

MR. HICKMAN: I can assure you that this bill has nothing to do with these advisory boards. I repeat it is simply to give the Minister of Finance the right of control over grants rather than have it spread around all the ministry so that he will know what grants are being given by the Crown, that is all. Or guarantees rather, not grants. It has nothing to do with grants, guarantees. That is all. Nothing to do with boards. Nothing to do with advisory boards, not even remotely connected with advisory boards, 1,000 miles from advisory boards. But you know if the hon. gentleman wants to continue to board us and board us and board us and board us. I do not care.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the minister has not convinced me.

MR. SPEAKER(Cross): Order, please!

Other than the point of order, I think the hon. minister was answering a question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I would not want to bet any money that before this bill is passed that down the road sometime we will find out that at any rate there is money involved here. This government sets up a Committee, an Advisory Committee, to allocate houses for the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. They go into a community and they

MR. G. FLIGHT: appoint five people and I understand that there is so much per meeting paid. Maybe the Minister would indicate and deny or confirm that it will not be his responsibility to determine whether that money is being spent properly, or not. The fact is that there is a board and there is an allocation for every meeting, Mr. Speaker. Let me tell the Minister and let me tell this House that I am aware of boards being set up, those allocation committees being set up over the past two or three years, and the political patronage that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) mentioned is oh, so obvious in these boards. When I got elected, Mr. Speaker, I was aware of four or five boards that were comprised of certain individuals. The boards are still there, Mr. Speaker, but those individuals are gone and have been replaced. It would not surprise me, Mr. Speaker - having listened to the hon. member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. T. Hickey), after listening to his campaign speech in his election bid it would not have surprised me if that had happened the next day after that speech. It would not have surprised me if he had something to do with the difference in the make-up of the various boards now than as they were when I got elected. Those boards, Mr. Speaker, when I got elected, the boards that I am talking about -

MR. T. HICKEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. T. HICKEY: May I inform the hon. gentleman in case he - Well, actually, seeing he did not read the papers after the Leadership Convention - I did not win. The hon. the Premier won. I made that speech and the hon. the Premier did not. I just want to bring the hon. gentleman up to date: The result of that convention was the hon. the Premier won it and I lost.

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

MR. SPEAKER:(Cross) The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. gentleman may have lost the convention, Sir, but the hon. gentleman is still the Minister of a very large department of Government and we are just wondering how much damage and what kind of a hatchet job the hon. gentleman is going to do on the civil servants in that department. I would advise the Premier to keep an eye on the hon. gentleman and watch out for the political appointments and the patronage and the like that will go on in that department, maybe people demoted, discriminated against by the hon. gentleman. I think that is what the hon. the Premier is going to have to watch.

MR. T. HICKEY: Sir, I would not want my hon. friend, my very close friend, the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) to lose any rest over what may happen in the department which he headed at one time and which he knows so much about. I would want to say for the benefit of hon. colleagues on both sides that the civil servants are in no danger. There is no witch hunt, or anything like that, but I will say, Your Honour, in keeping with my speech to the people of the Province that if I find any civil servants in my department, or in any department of Government, who feed the hon. gentlemen information to sabotage the programmes of this Government I will bring them to the attention of the hon. the Premier and my colleagues in Cabinet and they in their wisdom will do whatever they see fit in the interests of justice.

MR. SPEAKER: (Cross) Order, please!

I think I can rule on that point of order now. I think the hon. Minister was making more of a point of explanation rather than that of a point of order. I would ask the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) to continue.

MR. G. FLIGHT: The problem I have with giving the Minister authority to administer funds allocated by Government to boards, boards per se. And I know of boards, Mr. Speaker, that in 1975 were made up of responsible people in various communities across the Province for the purpose of administering with a fairmindedness -

MR. SPEAKER: (Cross) Order, please!

I will let the hon. gentleman finish the sentence and then I must inform him that his time is up.

MR. G. FLIGHT: being made up, Mr. Speaker, of responsible people to administer in a fairminded way the funds made available to them by this Government. The boards exist, Mr. Speaker, but they are constituted differently. They are now constituted in a way that the hon. member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. T. Hickey) would have had them constituted in his message to us at the Leadership Convention. They are now constituted on strictly political terms, political basis and political patronage.

Thank you.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: (Cross) If the hon. Minister speaks now he will close the debate.

The hon. member for Burgeo-

Bav d'Espoir.

DR. J. COLLINS: Was not it me who was recognized that time?

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, instruct the Minister on the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister wants to answer some of the questions that have been raised we would certainly allow him to do it by leave but, of course, as he probably knows, or certainly should know - I realize his House Leader has abandoned him and has gone South today

MR. R. SIMMONS: but surely there is somebody over there that can instruct him in the procedures of the House that when the Minister introduces a bill like this and rises to speak a second time, Mr. Speaker can recognize him only on the understanding that he is closing the debate and that in that context, of course, if there is any other member of the House that wants to speak first then that person is first recognized before the Minister of Finance. So it is not a question at all, as much as Mr. Speaker and I have a very warm relationship over the years, it is not at all that he is showing any favoritism in the matter, he is just being a good Speaker as we

MR. SIMMONS: predicted he would be in the first place. The fact that he has on his left some ministers who are not particularly informed on what his duties are is not the Speaker's fault, I suggest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance will allow me to say a few words on this subject.

This has got to be, Mr. Speaker, one of the most abominable pieces of legislation ever to come before this House, and quite in addition to that, it has to be one of the most contradictory pieces of legislation. I heard, Mr. Speaker, this hon. crowd talk about how they were going to decentralize and there was going to be a democracy. I nearly floated myself out of the chair that March 17th, that Saint Patrick's Day and it had nothing to do with booze, Mr. Speaker, but tears. What a touching time it was, Mr. Speaker, hearing how Sir Gallehad Moores had brought democracy to this beknighted land! How touching! How the knight in shining armour had done away with the days of dictatorship and had brought to this fair land some freedom! That was the watchword - freedom. How our knight in shining armour through his various vehicles such as the Public Tender Act was going to see to it that everybody had a fair chance in this Province, was going to see to it that the money was well spent, that the tenders were called, awarded to the lowest bidder! It was a good script, Mr. Speaker. It was a good script, because, you see, the people who alluded to all that on the night before March 17th were telling the truth. They were telling the truth when they said that in 1971 the now member for Humber West, the former Premier, had promised democracy and freedom and openness in government, fair play, no skulduggery, no scandal, no greasing of palms, no under-the-table deals. They were right, Mr. Speaker, when they saluted the truth of that particular statement. They were right when they stood back and looked with a certain amount of awe back to the days when freedom began, when daylight dawned in late 1971 or early 1972. It was not a question of lying, Mr. Speaker, to the people who watched

MR. SIMMONS: that day. It was not a question of lying, it was a question of telling the truth selectively. Because while they were very accurate in talking about what their outgoing Premier had said he was going to do, what they did not bother to talk about was what he had done after he came into office. What they did not bother to talk about was what he had done with the freedom and the democracy and the openness. What they did not bother to tell us was about the private deals for office space, about the \$20 million that was squandered against the law in the Department of Public Works. Why did they not tell us? Because they were a bit afraid, Mr. Speaker, that out there there might be just somebody bright enough to figure out that there was a contradiction in terms, there might be somebody left out there bright enough to realize that this party had not put its money where its mouth is, that this party had not delivered on its promises of 1971 and 1972. Oh, but, Mr. Speaker, they had a cure for that too in case the question came up. The cure was this, 'We will change leaders - that is what we will do to solve that problem. We will change leaders - have another go at it, start talking about honesty all over again.' It is a fair tactic, Mr. Speaker. The member for St. Mary's-The Capes, my good friend, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) will be very interested in what I am about to say and it

MR. SIMMONS: friend 'Crosbie' left here to go to Ottawa because he could do more in Ottawa than he could do here. Now, I am sure that is simple but I will run it through you one more time, Mr. Speaker, because you know it is not the kind of thing you are confronted with every day. It is so simple it escapes one. The minister from St. Mary's (Mr. W. Carter) came back from Ottawa because he felt he could do more here than he could do in Ottawa and also because he was coming to replace the fellow 'Crosbie' who left here to go to Ottawa because he felt he could do more in Ottawa than he could do here. Now, 'Tom', is that not simple? But if you think that is simple, Mr. Speaker, listen to the next one. Now we hear that another of the decisions the minister is faced with these days is that he might deciding these days to try and get back to Ottawa because he thinks he can do more in Ottawa than he can do here although he thought first he could do more in - You follow me, of course, you follow me, do you not? I mean that is simple. That is only of his decisions, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to present him now with some information which will make all his decisions very, very simple. If he thinks I am being too hard on him, one of the best signs of good friendship is frankness, I say to him, and I hope he will accept what I have said in that spirit and he will see that I meant it in that spirit when I give him a bit of information.

You see, the minister when he came back from Ottawa, I feel, Mr. Speaker, was genuinely convinced that he could play a part in an open, honest administration, an honest, energetic, businesslike administration. I believe he felt that, that he could participate in an honest, sound, energetic, businesslike administration.

MR. SIMMONS: And I would go so far as to say, Mr. Speaker, that if he did not think he was doing that he would not have stayed there. I am sure that he felt that in the years he sat in the Moores administration, the member from St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. W. Carter) was convinced that he was participating in honest, sound energetic, businesslike administration. As a matter of fact I thought that not only did he believe it but I thought it was the agreement over there that they were going to project that image sound honest, energetic, businesslike government I thought that. I thought that, I really thought that! And then, Mr. Speaker, I come across this advertisement in the paper - the Premier will be interested in it, it is called the 'Peckford Campaign'. It is addressed to friends, "I am sure dear friends we all look forward" - listen to it, Mr. Speaker, "We all look forward" - not we continue to look forward, not we are presently enjoying and will look forward to some more of but 'we look forward'. In other words at some point from now, not now but at some point in the future we look forward to the day of sound, honest, energetic businesslike political leadership. It breaks the minister's heart I am sure that by the acknowledgement of the man who is now his leader what he was in all along, what he was in under Frank Moores was not sound, energetic leadership at all. His friend the Premier was looking forward to it, Mr. Speaker, - ah! they are getting touchy.

MR. HICKMAN: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: I would love to hear the hon. gentleman for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) read ad nauseam the delightful advertisement from the hon. the Premier. It is one that certainly has caught the imagination of the people of Newfoundland. And as desirable as it is to hear it I do submit, Mr. Speaker, that that historic document is far removed from the very confirmed principle of this

MR. HICKMAN: bill namely the right of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to guarantee loans to corporations.

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

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): On the point of order, hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. The minister again, Mr. Speaker, proves that he is fully entitled the honours which are his. I will come back to that at some other appropriate time.

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

I submit that this one being a money bill I have some range but certainly, Mr. Speaker, since I am preambing to get to a matter which is at the heart of this bill namely fiscal responsibility then I submit, Mr. Speaker, that while I ought not to dwell on this at any particular length that it is a fair way to get to my goal.

MR. SPEAKER: My ruling on this point of order or is the point identical to the one I made several times earlier this afternoon with respect to the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) when he was speaking in the debate. The principle of the bill however one puts it is: it relates to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and his authority to guarantee loans or other forms of indebtedness approved by government appointed boards or commissions and it is necessary that hon. members relate to that principle in their participation in the debate. I would ask the hon. member to relate his remarks to the principle of the bill.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, that I shall do and of course fully intended to do. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) could find something better to entertain himself with than these meaningless points of order I know this is a tender subject for him but I say to him candidly he is going to blow whatever chance he has got for the

MR. SIMMONS: 1979 award, he has the 1978 award and the 1977 award, but he is due for the 1979 award and once you get it three times you keep it. And he should be very careful because I am told that those who choose are about to make the 1979 nominations for the Fearless Fosdick award for the best performance by a bungling cop, and he should watch it if he wants to be in line for the nomination. Mr. Speaker, the minister being a modest man, I am sure the Fearless Fosdick award is not one he wants to be known too widely around this Province so I shall in the interest of helping him, not spread it too widely.

Mr. Speaker, the bill, itself, which was my opening statement, is really a contradiction in terms because it defies everything this administration since it came into office in 1972 has said it stood for - does not defy what it stood for, because it stood for everything it said earlier it was not going to stand for. And now we have the documentation from the present Premier, the documentation that he even did not think it was sound administration. He even did not think it was the businesslike decentralized administration that was being talked about back in 1972. And he is now in his next step forward. He is now dreaming towards the day when they are going to have sound administration under his leadership. You do not have to be much of an expert, Mr. Speaker, to conclude from that statement that he is admitting they did not have it at the point in time when that was written. You do not have to be much of an expert to conclude that he is implying very clearly that the Moores administration was less than honest, less than energetic, less than businesslike, less than sound - not that I disagree with him on that conclusion, Mr. Speaker, but I find it appalling that the present Premier would be associated with that kind of an admission, that he has been involved in unsound, dishonest, unenergetic, unbusinesslike administration. I can see the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) would be tender on the point, but he has so many reasons to be tender these days, Mr. Speaker, that I suppose you can find some sympathy for him.

MR. SIMMONS:

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is an absolute disgrace. What does it do? It brings to government, it legitimizes in government the old clique relationship, the clique relationship which worked very well under the former Premier, but which now, Mr. Speaker, is going to be institutionalized. The clique - it is an old expression - I do not know the words, but the essence is if you are not in a clique, start your own. And the Premier, of course, was not in the old clique. He chafed at the bit for not being in the clique, but he was not in the old clique, nor was my good friend from St. Mary's (Mr. W. Carter) in the clique. The difference between him and the Premier is that he did not chafe at the bit. He had the good sense not to want to be in the clique. The Premier chafed at the bit because he was not in the clique. So now he is setting up his own little clique. And if you want a loan from Fisheries Loan Board, if you want a cent from any Crown corporation, if you want a government guarantee for some funding, who approves it? Is the minister responsible? 'No,' the Premier says, 'that is dangerous. That would be dangerous, because then I would be giving some patronage into the hands of the fellows who ran against me in the leadership. I would be giving the Minister of Fisheries some patronage possibilities. I would be giving to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) some patronage possibilities. I want to centralize it a little more than that. I want to have my patronage in the hands of somebody I can trust - my good old Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins).' He does not know much about the rules of the House but he knows a lot about patronage - at least he must to be given this kind of a trust. I can only conclude the Premier knows what he is talking about. I can only conclude the Premier is sure of what he is talking about and what he is doing here when he puts in the hands of the Minister of Finance this kind of thing.

Of course, one of the decisions any Premier has to make when he appoints the Minister of Finance is this,

MR. SIMMONS:

shall I appoint somebody who can do the job or somebody who cannot do the job? And there are advantages either way. Some Premiers have been known to appoint people who cannot do the job or people who will not do the job as the case may be. Perhaps we have this kind of a minister here, a minister who either cannot or will not do the job and therefore the control comes a little closer to home particularly if the minister is just a rubber stamp minister, a minister who says, "Where is it. The Premier said I had to sign it. Where is my pen? Move the paper to the correct position and tell me when to drop the pen." The rubber stamp type of minister. Has the Premier appointed here, Mr. Speaker - which kind of minister has he appointed? The minister who can do the job and therefore got the appointment or the minister who cannot do the job and therefore got the appointment? Or the minister who will not do the job and therefore got the appointment? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this bill allows unconscionable centralization of fiscal authority within government. Fiscal authority should rest with this House. Under certain circumstances and certain times it rests with Cabinet but under no circumstances, Mr. Speaker, should it rest with one particular minister. I can see an argument for it resting with one of a variety of ministers but when you take Fisheries Loan Board loans and you take municipal loans and you take guarantees of fundings for various other departments and give one person the final authority, no, Mr. Speaker, it is wrong. It flies in the face of everything this administration has been talking about, about decentralizing authority and bringing democracy into her.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this bill has not much to do with democracy. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps to be honest with the House the government House Leader or the people who assign numbers and identifications to these bills might start a new system and might have as their day one, March 17, the day of the Leadership Convention, or March 18,

MR. SIMMONS: the day after and refer to them as day one, day two and day three. Because I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a bill right out of the Leadership Convention. This is a bill, Mr. Speaker, which seeks to centralize the government into the hands of a few in line with the new policy of the new Premier.

They were wondering, Mr. Speaker, a few days ago when we had that brilliant Cabinet appointed why the Cabinet got big after all the Premier said about small, why the Cabinet got big, why it got to seventeen. Simple addition, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), one. The Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan), two.

MR. R. MOORES: One and a half.

MR. SIMMONS: We cannot get into fractions here, it is too complicated for me. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter), three perhaps three and a half, three certainly. The minister who guards the Minister of Fisheries - you ever notice where the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doody) sits now? He is the guy who runs interference. There is some fear that the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. W. Carter) might come over here and he sits there all the time guarding the Minister of Fisheries. And the instruction from the Premier, "Do not let him out under any circumstances. He might follow his conscience and go over to the Liberal side of the House. So keep him inside all the time." The member for Bell Island, number four.

AN HON. MEMBER: Harbour Main - Bell Island

MR. R. SIMMONS: Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. W. Doody). I have not heard him talk about Harbour Main for so long I thought he was just representing Bell Island now. The member from St. Barbe (Mr. E. Maynard) - by seventy votes the member for St. Barbe but that is another issue. The Minister. That is five. That is five candidates in the leadership. Is that all of them over there so far? And then, of course, if you do some further addition you will find that another three over there supported candidates other than the Premier. The Minister from Gander, number six; the Minister from Pleasantville, number seven. I am missing one. You will find him. Look around for me fellows, he is there somewhere. Eight ministers in that Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, none of whom the Premier could give the flick of course for political reasons, eight ministers were either candidates or supporters of candidates other than the Premier. There is number eight, the Minister of Justice.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Education.

MR. R. SIMMONS: The Minister of Justice. No, the Minister of Education at the time had his bread buttered on the right side. He covered himself admirably, better than he is doing in his district right now.

Eight. Eight of them were either candidates for the leadership or supporters of candidates other than the Premier.

Now, Mr. Speaker, put yourself in the position of a Cabinet consensus. If there is eight against you how many do you need to beat it? Nine. Eight and nine make seventeen. The Minister from Harbour Grace should know that particularly well. The Minister from Harbour Grace is the luckiest man in this world that eight and nine make seventeen. He is thankful that eight and nine make seventeen. He is thankful. He is

MR. R. SIMMONS: grateful that it takes nine upon top of eight to make seventeen. I will tell you here is what it has got to do: It has got to do with putting the control, the effective control not in the hands of this House or in the hands of Cabinet as a whole, and Cabinet as a whole represents a fairly broad perspective and I have a lot of faith in a number of the people in the Cabinet but they have been short-circuited, Mr. Speaker. The other five candidates who ran for the leadership identified with and promoted a number of views that I can identify with, but it has been seen to that they will never have a chance to have these views succeed in Cabinet including the view that the Minister from St. Mary's has as I have on this bill about openness in Government, about decentralization. But he has no choice in the matter because Cabinet solidarity and secrecy tell him to keep mum, Walter baby; keep mum, do not say a word, bite your lip as long as you can; if you catch Bill off guard sneak out behind him and run over to the other side. But he has to keep in mind that the Minister from Harbour Main-Bell Island is a watchful guard. He does not sleep on the job, and he is going to have a job getting out around the Minister from Harbour Main-Bell Island. But one of those days conscience will become the over-riding concern for the Minister, I am not suggesting it is not now but there comes a crisis period on these matters, and conscience will become the only concern and we will have a member over here.

I say to my colleagues perhaps running for the leadership - I have already invited the member for St. Mary's to run for the leadership, he has the posters. It seems a sin to throw all of these posters away and perhaps he will run for the leadership.

MR. R. SIMMONS: This bill is wrong and the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. W. Carter) knows it is wrong. He might not be able to say so unless he resigns from Cabinet but I predict he will do that one of these days fairly soon, Mr. Speaker. I predict the member for St. Mary's - The Capes will be resigning from Cabinet fairly soon. And then, Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of dissenting, it is a matter of standing up for what he believes in. It is a matter of saying to himself, "I have had all I can take of this." He is going to say it. He is saying it now, quietly.

AN HON. MEMBER: He looks upset.

MR. SIMMONS: Of course, he is upset. When you are going through an agonizing decision you are upset.

MR. DOODY: You are not worried about me, he might trample me to death trying to get over there.

MR. SIMMONS: I am worried about something even worse, he might bring you with him.

MR. DOODY: I have some posters left too.

MR. SIMMONS: I hear you have a good band too.

MR. LUSH: His posters are marked.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Premier you will notice is wearing - I should give him particular credit today because he has done a maganimous thing - Our Leader here did a courageous thing today and is -

AN HON. MEMBER: Your Leader.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, our unanimously acknowledged leader -

MR. SIMMONS: acknowledged leader, the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe), the now and future leader of the Liberal party, and he did a courageous thing today but the Premier did a courageous thing too. You will notice the badge he is wearing is "Back a Fighter". He has decided that he is going to take the calls of our leader throughout this Province, throughout this Province so our leader can be properly vindicated and I thought the "Back a Fighter" badge was appropriate but I did not realize we had officially released the badges yet, 'Bill'. There is a leak somewhere. There has to be a leak, almost a downpour, I would say.

Now, Mr. Speaker, not on a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, but is it, you know, parliamentary, I am not saying it is undignified, I know the answer to that question, is it parliamentary to chew one's cud in one's seat in the chamber.

MR. DOODY: I have been doing it all afternoon.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, I am sure.

MR. F. WHITE: If he was going to school, he would be thrown out.

MR. DOODY: It is parliamentary.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, while the minister continues to chew his cud, I would suggest he is doing something he knows how to do and he should not make the mistake of trying to work his brain at the same time.

I, Mr. Speaker, would like for a moment before concluding to find out if I can a question or two to the minister. The first question is: is the minister aware, and I say this not in any unkind sense to suggest that he does not have the ability, I am not suggesting that sense at all, but is the minister aware of the

MR. SIMMONS: implications of this particular bill? Is he aware that he may be being used in a very real way, that unwittingly he may be the instrument in one of the foulest attempts to grab power in this Province, to centralize power, to take it out of the hands of the House and the Cabinet and other members of Cabinet because apparently they cannot be trusted? I would rather see this power in the hands of various ministers, ministers responsible. I can understand they might want to check with the Minister of Finance, if he is the fellow keeping the books, at least he should know what the bottom line comes to, I suppose. I would hope they have some procedures over there for doing that, though one doubts it when one looks at the budget, when one looks at the estimates and when one looks at the Auditor General's comments on the estimates. As a matter of fact, I remember a couple of years ago on the Public Accounts Committee, they actually lost several hundred million. Well, they did not lose it in the sense of being without it, but they did not have a record of it. They just did not bother to write it down, you know. Can you imagine that? It is only a few hundred million, mind you. Remember the figure? It is only several hundred million. It was not any monumental - they just did not have it put in the right places, you know, Mr. Speaker. It was in the left pocket instead of the right, you know, that kind of thing, in the other suit type thing. Nothing serious, it was only a few hundred million. Certain amounts they had no record of deposits in banks. It was an absolutely monumental mess. Well, of course, the Auditor General has brought these matters to our attention.

I was saying a moment ago that in Cabinet when you have a group of 17 people, it stands to reason that however carefully they have been selected, and I submit kindly to my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition,

MR. SIMMONS: or my friend the Premier, that the options you have in selecting a Cabinet are not nearly as wide as you would have in selecting almost any other team. For example, if you are going to be a department head in an English department as the Premier was on one occasion and you are going to look for people to go on your staff in that department, you have available to you the whole pool of qualified English teachers who want to apply - hundreds of them out there - hundreds. If you select a Cabinet, how many people do you have to pick from? Well, that depends on how many people sit on your side of the House and by the way, and I should say in the case of this Premier, it does not only depend on how many people sit on this side of the House, it also depends on how many you called on this side of the House asking if they would like to go into the Cabinet. So his

MR. SIMMONS:

number was somewhat over thirty in this particular case. Keep that in mind. But, you know, he only had thirty-three people potentially to pick from. And that, you know, cuts down your options. Out of that you have got to get seventeen out of thirty or thirty-two. You know, the law of averages says that you are going to end up with a couple of people in Cabinet who perhaps should not be there on sheer ability alone. Of course we know they get there for other reasons too. But even that aside, Mr. Speaker, even assuming that all the members in Cabinet are quite competent to do the job, even assuming it is the best Cabinet, the best hand picked Cabinet ever, even assuming that the Premier picked them having in mind his own biases on matters of fiscal direction, even assuming all that the fact of the matter is that the law of averages also says that somewhere in that seventeen there is a fellow who has a different perspective on the matter. There are a few people who can bring different viewpoints to the issue of fiscal direction, what we should do with the money, how we should spend it, how we should raise it, what kind of controls we should place on it. That is why I believe that any Cabinet made up of honourable people as I assume this Cabinet to be by and large, any Cabinet with even a few honourable people in it is a fairly good guarantee that there are some controls over spending. I am not saying they will not make any mistakes but it is a fairly good guarantee.

But, Mr. Speaker, when you take away that kind of control and put it in the hands of one particular person however competent, however loyal, however honourable, you are opening up a real Pandora's Box, a real can of worms because then, Mr. Speaker, you are leaving that minister open for the worst kinds of pressures, undo pressures, unfair pressures, dishonourable pressures probably from other members of Cabinet and from the Premier. We know this bill, Mr. Speaker, for what it is. It is the next step in the post Tory Leadership plan to centralize authority in the hands of a very few. And they can wave their flags all they want about freedom

MR. SIMMONS:

and democracy. That is an old trick. Distract the troops! Smile at them while you kick them in the shins. An old trick, smile at them while you kick them in the shins. Talk about freedom while you take it away. Talk about openness while you put financial decisions in the hands of a very select few people. It is an old diversionary tactic, Mr. Speaker, the same old thing, smile at them while you kick them in the shins.

MR. HICKMAN: When the hon. gentleman is through smiling, would he close the debate?

MR. SIMMONS: The hon. gentleman has much more reason to smile than the Minister of Justice and I accede to his request and I take pleasure in acceding to another of his requests and adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER(Ottenheimer): The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at three of the clock and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved that this House adjourn until tomorrow at 3:00 P.M.. Those in favour "Aye". Contrary "Nay".
Carried.

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow at
3:00 P.M.