

*Wm Rowe*



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume 1

1st Session

Number 10

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: It is indeed a honour for me to welcome to the honourable House sixty grade XI students from Laval High in Placentia with their teacher Reverend Brother T.D.Connors. We trust that your visit is interesting, informative and most educational.

PETITIONS

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition from the people of Port au Port the preamble to which is as follows; whereas education at all levels is one of the most pressing problems and challenges facing Newfoundland and whereas Stephenville has facilities especially dormitory space quickly adaptable to the needs of higher education, be it for academic or technical training or both, we the undersigned hereby petition the honourable Minister of Education and the House of Assembly to immediately commence a comprehensive study of Stephenville's possible contribution to higher education.

This petition is seconded by the hon. member from the District of St. George's.

Mr. Speaker. I would like to give briefly some background on the higher education dilemma or problem that has been racking the West Coast for the last three or four years. First of all, the dormitory buildings to which this petition refers are going to come up for discussion later on this week. They are two large buildings built by the U.S.Air Force in the early 1960's. They have a value of approximately \$8 million. Sometime ago they were sold - sold to Canadian Javelin for \$250,000 of which \$100,000 was paid. I hope to hear more about that later on this week.

In 1967, shortly after the Ernest Harmon Air Force Base closed, a very comprehensive brief was presented to the House of Assembly or presented to government, which is presently gathering dust on the eight floor. I hope to resurrect that one as well. It was presented by the Stephenville J.C.'s. Between 1970 and 1972, Stephenville and Corner Brook

May 3, 1972, Tape 233, Page 2 --- apb

engaged in verbal hickering over the site for the junior college for the West Coast. This bickering has gone on much too long and recriminations have been sometimes very severe.

In October, 1971, the then Mayor and present Mayor of Corner Brook and the Chairman of the Harmon Corporation, who were running in Humber East - Humber West, announced that a junior college would be placed in Corner Brook. This came -

MR. STAGG:

I had mixed emotions about that. The encumbent in Port au Port at that time must have been overtaken by chagrin as well. Anyway I thank Messrs. Warren and Murphy for what they did for me last October. In 1970 briefs were presented to the government and to Memorial University by the various peoples on the West Coast. This brought about a great deal of controversy between Stephenville and Corner Brook, a controversy that I think we could well do without.

The people of Stephenville want our facilities used. We have a great deal of facilities there. It has been a policy of people who have not visited our community to pooh-poooh our facilities and say that they are not adaptable or they are not really there but they are there and they are worth an awful lot of money. We do not particularly care if it is an academic institution or a technical institution or whatever but we do want them used. The move would be an aid to education and the economy of Newfoundland. Stephenville has been the topic of conversation, saying that we are costing the rest of Newfoundland an awful lot of money but we would like to save Newfoundland a lot of money as well, and we have the facilities there to help save Newfoundland a lot of money.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby request that this petition be tabled and that it be referred to the department to which it relates. By the way, there are approximately twenty-eight hundred names to the petition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, if I may. The prayer of the petition, as I understood it and perhaps the gentleman for Port au Port would correct me if I am wrong, was that a study be made of this question. Was that the prayer of the petition? Well obviously that is a very good thing and we are all for it. I

MR. ROBERTS:

may add and I think the honourable member made much of this point in his presentation and I think - if I could coin a well-known cliché, "The time has come" when really a decision must be taken on this question both as to the location of, (I do not want to use the term 'community college' in anything except the very broadest sense) as to the location of these facilities, and not just Stephenville and Corner Brook but on the whole of the Island and in Labrador. Also a decision as to the form or the type or the nature of these facilities, whether they are to be branches of the university and in effect junior universities or whether they are to be a broader type of facility.

I hope that before the session ends we will get a statement from the Minister of Education on it. I think it is a very important question and one that cannot wait very much longer and until such time a study obviously is a good thing, the more information we have the better. The honourable gentleman is modest but I think I should point out for the other members of the House, Sir, that when the honourable gentleman was (and he may be still) active in the Stephenville Chamber of Commerce he put together a very good brief on this point and he was assisted by Mr. James Campbell, a gentleman with whom the honourable gentleman is familiar and with whom he will become more familiar doubtless in the next round. But I would commend that to all honourable members of the House, Sir, as something that should be studied. This is an important question and the petition is a means of raising it. It is one which the ministry will have to take a position on sooner or later. I hope there is a lot of discussion in the House before the position is taken and I am sure there will be a lot of discussion after it is taken, both in the House and outside. We will support the petition with pleasure.

On motion petition received.

MR. E. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Lower Is'and Cove, in the historic District of Bay de Verde, for the upgrading of the secondary roads in that community. I support this petition because these roads are in a deplorable condition and at times they are impassible, owing to the ditches being filled, causing the water to flow over the roads.

In supporting this petition I pray that the petition will be granted.

I move that this petition be accepted by this House and forwarded to the department to which it relates.

MR. S.A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the petition which was just presented by the honourable member for Bay de Verde. As honourable members of this House may well appreciate the fact that we have a very special spot in our hearts on this side of the House for the District of Bay de Verde, we hope that the tempermental Minister of Finance will see his way clear in this construction season to see that the prayer of the petition from the people of Lower Island Cove is granted.

On motion petition received.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of St. Barbe North from the communities of Plum Point to Eddy's Cove.

The prayer of the petition, Sir, is that the people in these communities protest the condition of the road from Plum Point to Eddy's Cove East on the northern peninsula. They have been pretty poorly maintained to the extent that the vehicles travelling over them are damaged. They feel, Sir, as taxpayers that they have a right to a decent road maintenance in return for the payment of

MR. F. B. ROVE: these taxes.

Now, Sir, I know very well what the problems concerning the roads are in that particular district. I spent three weeks a short time ago in that area and I have been receiving constant phone calls from St. Barbe North in the past few weeks. The problem seems to be that the grade of the road itself is below the water table level of the bogs in the area and consequently this time of the year, with the freezing and the thawing, we have these massive water holes and flooding conditions particularly around the culverts in that particular area. These water holes, Sir, are just not smooth things, they are sometimes one and a two foot drop off the edge of the ice in certain places and school buses are quite often held up and the students in the area are delayed in getting to school or they do not get to school at all.

I would also like to point out, Sir, that the nearest hospital in St. Barbe North is in St. Anthony, in the District of White Bay North, and the hospital to the south is down in Norris Point and the people depend on the highway in that area for getting back and forth to the hospital. As well, Sir, the only way they can get fresh food and mail and oil to the homes in this district is by way of the road.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this petition be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. ROBERTS: The remarks made by the hon. gentleman, my colleague from St. Barbe North, I think said just about all that needed to be said in support of this petition, I would like to add my own voice and I hope that the Minister of Labour will add a word or two because I suspect it effects his district, especially the people who live in the Port Saunders, Port au Choix, Hawkes Bay area because they too must use this road at least until such time as the ministry build the hospital that I understand is to be built there.

The Northern Peninsula Road is the life-line of the district and I have no hesitation in saying that it is the worst road in the province, bearing in mind that we still have areas with no roads at all. It has had a very severe winter and as the member for St. Barbe North says, the road from Plum Point north to St. Anthony, the road with which I am intimately familiar, as I have been bounced over every inch of it, was never really built as a road, it was built by the Highroad Department, their own forces so called, over the years and really needs to be completely rebuilt.

I hope this will be a priority item with the present administration. They will have three or four years to work at it and if we start to work at it now, if the work started this summer, they should be able to get a good start on it. There are 35,000 people on that Peninsular, Sir, and they are entitled to road facilities just as much so as the people on the Burin Peninsula from which we formerly heard so much from the member for Burin. Now that that project seems to be well in hand or coming in hand, let him lend his voice for this. The only thing I would add is that I am told that people in twenty separate communities signed this petition, in all just about 500 citizens, electors, in St. Barbe North signed the petition, I tell you that there are 35,000 people on the Northern Peninsula, Mr. Speaker, who support the prayer of the petition as do I.

On motion petition received.



MR. THOMS (P.S.): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Indian Bay, Bonavista Bay. Mr. Speaker, the prayer of this petition is that this Assembly will provide for the Town of Indian Bay a water and sewer system.

Mr. Speaker, some of the honourable members here, I am quite sure, are aware of the conditions in Indian Bay at the present time. The Community of Indian Bay sits at the mouth of the river. This is one of the best salmon rivers that we have in our district; as a matter of fact I believe it was one of the best salmon rivers in the whole province. This is a straight piece of road and less than 1,000 feet of water and sewer would take care of this problem. This community has been recently incorporated and the people of this community feel that they are entitled to this facility as well as any other town, city or village in the Province of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I whole heartily endorse the prayer of this petition and I ask that this petition be placed on the table of this House and referred to the Department to which it relates.

On motion petition received.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on behalf of the people of Petit Forte, Placentia Bay. The prayer of this petition is very brief. It is a petition for electricity for the community. It is signed by I believe every resident of the community. This, Mr. Speaker, would involve probably the supplying of a lighting plant for the community. When we stop to think how we take for granted the electricity in the urban areas of our province and in the areas of our province where electricity has been for twenty, thirty, forty years, we may find it hard to believe or hard to put ourselves in the position of people who are still without the proper lighting facilities. So, Mr. Speaker, I wish to support this petition. I think it is something that every Newfoundlander is entitled to. I ask leave of the House to table the petition and to refer it to the department to which it relates.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Speaker, of course, on this side we wholeheartedly support the prayer of the petition presented by my hon. friend. At the time that the other administration left office I believe that over ninety-nine per cent of the homes -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROWE (W.N.): No, no, Mr. Speaker. It was stated quite explicitly, quite plainly - I am surprised at the hon. minister who is a lawyer that he is not using his aptitude in the House today, Mr. Speaker. It was stated quite explicitly that over ninety-nine per cent of the homes in the province have the benefit of electricity. There were still several thousand I would imagine who do not have electricity. (I do not have the figures with me). It was certainly our intention to complete the job had we been given the opportunity, I am sure that the present administration, now having been given the opportunity to bestow further benefits on the people of Newfoundland, will not hesitate at all to accede to the

Mr. Rowe (W.N.)

prayer of the petition presented by my hon. friend.

On motion petition received.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

HON. J. C. CROSBIE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table an amendment to the College of Fisheries Pension Amendment Regulations, 1971, required by the law. I would also like to table, Mr. Speaker - I am required under section(35), paragraph (2) of the Revenue and Audit Act, Chapter 31, Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, as amended, to table the figures, within fifteen days after the opening, the figures which represent loans which have been paid in part or in whole under the Loan and Guarantee Act for the fiscal year, 1971-1972. I will read the list, Mr. Speaker, because these were loans that involved the previous administration. Corner Brook

Amalgamated Regional High School Board of Education, \$60,748 in connection with a guaranteed loan to that Board. Corner Brook Ski Club, \$25,278 that is a loan the previous administration repaid and the interest on it. Harbour Grace Recreation Centre Limited, \$30,095.79 and a guarantee for that centre. Hotel Buildings Limited, \$1,009,617.89 These bonds have been guaranteed by the Government of Newfoundland, we pay the interest and principal. Hotel Holdings Limited, Corner Brook \$20,552 they are not paying their principal or interest. Javelin Paper Corporation Limited, \$9,017,232. A. Northcott Limited \$23,555.55. Paragon Hotel Limited, Grand Falls, \$35,973.20. we guaranteed the principal and interest, no payments are being made. V.P. Spencer, Limited, \$24,823.85. We have to continue paying that each year, Mr. Speaker, for the next fifteen or sixteen years while Mr. Spencer enjoys the hotel, having gotten back for \$50,000 while we pay off some \$300,000. We should have a royal commission on that one. All of these will be looked into later on. These are the amounts.

MR. E. ROBERTS: There is an agreement between the government and Hotel Holdings Limited. Not Hotel Holdings Limited, the one in Corner Brook. Bill Hann's firm, Hotel Holdings. I wonder if the honourable gentleman would table a copy of that agreement for us, if at the same time perhaps he can let us know whether the agreement has been honoured or not.

I realize it is not a thing he can do quickly, but if we would look into it perhaps when we come to his estimates we could have a little about it. I think he would be as interested as I will be in the information that he will produce.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly would. I would like to table something on a few more of those too when I get the chance.

MR. ROBERTS: All for it. All for tabling them -

MR. CROSBIE: I would also like to table a copy of the management contracts having reference to Hotel Buildings Limited, & Atlific Newfoundland Limited. These are in connection with the Holiday Inns. These have been kept secret

for some reason by the previous administration, but this government sees no reason why they should not be tabled.

Management Contract Sept. 29, 1966, between Hotel Buildings Limited and Atlific Newfoundland Limited. This provides for the operation of the Holiday Inn Hotels at St. John's, Clarenville, Gander and Corner Brook, by Atlific Newfoundland Limited, which is a subsidiary of a Canadian company that has the Holiday Inn franchise. The terms and conditions are all mentioned herein.

MR. ROBERTS: What was the date again?

MR. CROSBIE: Sept 29, 1966.

MR. CROSBIE: The agreement is for a period of twenty-five years, so contrary to some speculation in the press it could not be taken over by the government. I do not want to go into details, just the major part. Under the contract Atlific are paid an annual management fee equal to four percent of the gross revenue, plus ten percent of the net profits before depreciation and interest and bonded debt, plus one-half of one percent of gross revenue from the Atlific Executive Offices primary accounting and reporting covering the premises.

That agreement is here and then there is a second agreement signed by Atlific and Hotel Buildings. The second agreement is dated September 29, 1966, between the then Premier J.P. Smallwood, Hotel Buildings and Atlific. That covers - no this gives an option. This is the option agreement. Atlific (Nfld.) Limited is given an option to purchase from the government or from Hotel Buildings Limited the various Holiday Inns Hotels, exercisable within the twenty-five years at a purchase price that would be sufficient to pay off the indebtedness incurred by the government or Hotel Buildings Limited in erecting the hotels.

The third agreement is November 28, 1967, entered into by the Minister of Economic Development, Hotel Buildings Limited and Atlific. This extends the option agreement also to the hotel at Port aux Basques. The hotel at Port aux Basques is also included in the five hotels operated by Atlific on behalf of the government. The Government of Newfoundland had to pay off the hotel at Port aux Basques and it has been given to the Holiday Inns to manage.

The fourth agreement is November 28, 1967, and that includes the hotel at Port aux Basques and the general management contract. These will be tabled if anyone is interested and wants to look at them.

I might just say, Mr. Speaker, that the Churchill Falls Tavern is in premises rented from the Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation Limited. The Churchill Falls Tavern is operated by Atlific and Hotel Buildings Limited. The rental is one twenty-fourth of fifty cents for each pint bottle of beer sold or fifteen thousand dollars per year,

whichever is the lesser.

MR. ROBERTS: Let us guess which it is.

MR. CROSBIE: Every time you drink a bottle of beer up there you are paying part of the rent.

MR. ROBERTS: The fifteen thousand surely is the one, because there would be more than seventy-five thousand bottles of beer sold a year in Churchill Falls.

MR. CROSBIE: We pay a management fee to Atlific of three percent of the gross revenue. The House might be interested in knowing what Atlific has paid us since this operation started. Atlific has paid over to Hotel Buildings Limited since they started to operate, or at least since 1968, a total of \$2, 575,000.

MR. ROBERTS: Those are net operating profits and then Hotel Buildings picks up the...

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, this is after deducting their management fee and so on.

MR. ROBERTS: Does the minister have the cost to the province since 1968 of these...

MR. CROSBIE: I think so, yes. That is what I was going to try to give now. They have paid us a total of \$2,575,000. Five hundred thousand in 1968-69, the same in 1969-70, five hundred and seventy-five thousand in 1970-71 and \$1 million this year, 1971-72.

The debt position is that the Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation advanced \$6,450,000 towards the cost of the buildings and the government guaranteed \$9 million in debentures and a U.S. bond issue also to go against the cost of the buildings. That is a total of \$15,450,000 in principal. Since then we have had to pay with respect to the NIDC, \$876,370. (eight hundred and twenty-six thousand, three hundred and seventy dollars) principal and \$1,362,130. in interest. Up to last...

MR. ROBERTS: That just about takes care of all the payments received from Atlific.

MR. CROSBIE: Right. Then the province has paid with respect to the \$9 million in debentures, we have repaid nine hundred thousand of the

May 3, 1972, Tape 239, Page 3 -- apb

bonds and we paid in interest to December 31, 1971 \$3,058,381.

If you add that all up, you will see that we have paid in interest \$4,420,000 in round figures. We have paid off in principal, \$1,746,000 which total \$6,166,000. We have received from Atlific \$2,575,000.

MR. ROBERTS: In effect, that is the subsidy on the Holiday Inns.

MR. CROSBIE: Right. To date, as the hon. member says, the hon. Leader of the Opposition says, the difference would be the amount we have subsidized or the amount that these buildings are costing the province and the people of the province.

MR. ROBERTS: About \$4 million eh?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, I have that too. The management fees paid to Atlific (Nfld.) Limited from 1966 -67 to date totalled \$772,184. In 1966-67 (I will just give the round figures) \$37,000. 1967-68 \$135,000, 1968-69 \$187,000. 1969-70 \$196,000, 1970-71 \$215,000. That does not include whatever it is this year, but up to then it was \$772,000.



MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if it is in order, may I ask one or two questions? Again the hon. gentleman may wish to take them as notice.

These orders were passed in 1966 and the then cabinet will have to answer for them of course, but could the minister tell us under what authority those contracts were entered into? Were they Order-in-Council, or was there Legislative Authority?

MR. CROSBIE: I have not had that checked, Mr. Speaker, so I am not sure which.

MR. ROBERTS: Well if the hon. gentleman perhaps could take that as notice, Mr. Speaker, and on the assumption that they were under Order-in-Council, because I am quite certain there was no Legislative Authority, perhaps the hon. gentleman could check with his colleague, the Minister of Justice. Although the hon. gentleman does not need advice on a legal question, he can answer this himself, but I have always understood Sir, that no contract of more than one year's duration could be entered into by the Government of this Province without prior or subsequent Legislative ratification. If there is no Legislative ratification here, the contract may be invalid, if so would the hon. gentleman undertake to check that with a view either to renegotiating it or amending it? These are costing us in the order of \$1 million to which we will add on the municipal taxes paid the other day, or to be paid, as announced by the minister the other day. The subsidy will be quite large and continuing. Perhaps we could get a better deal than that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: We will certainly look into it.

MR. DAWE: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Companies Act," a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Prisons Act, 1969."

HON. A. J. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on tomorrow I will introduce a bill, "An Act For Registration and Regulation Of Automobile Dealers, And The Salesmen Of Such Dealers," also, "An Act Respecting The Registration And Regulation Of Collection Agencies," and "An Act Respecting The Registration And Regulation Of Credit Reporting Agencies." These have been in the wheels for some time.

HON. J. A. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, it has become obvious during the past year that our people are intensely dissatisfied with our school bus transportation policies. Hon. members may recall that when school reopened last fall, there were many public demonstrations and numerous complaints were registered from all parts of the province.

Under existing school bus transportation policy, school boards are granted 100% of the cost of transporting all students who reside more than one mile from school, except in Labrador West where the transportation of all students is financed during the winter months, regardless of the distance they live from school. In addition boards are reimbursed for the total cost of transporting severely handicapped children. School boards arrange transportation routes, call tenders and let contracts in accordance with transportation regulations. There are two weaknesses inherent in this policy - one is that there seems to be insufficient reason to keep the cost of school bus transportation within predictable limits and consequently costs are escalating each year, the other is that it is extremely difficult to prevent students who live just under a mile from travelling on buses that are financed from government funds, and complaints arise when the mile limit is enforced.

After preliminary discussions with the main parties involved, I am recommending a complete revision of the policy underlying the financing of school bus transportation in this province. Instead of paying the total cost of bus contracts, I am recommending that we provide a per pupil grant on behalf of each pupil who resides more than one mile from school and who is transported. It would then be in the interest of school boards to arrange transportation as economically as possible since they

MR. CARTER: would be able to use for other purposes, any monies not expended on transportation and boards themselves would be free to determine the extent to which children who reside less than a mile from school could be accommodated.

More specifically, Mr. Speaker, my recommendations are as follow: (1) that we allocate the school boards each year a grant of \$100 on account of each pupil who resides more than one mile from school and for whom transportation is provided. Furthermore, that we allocate \$40 per student, for students who live more than one quarter of a mile from school, in regions of the province where the mean temperature falls below zero degrees, (2) - that we provide 100% of the cost to a school board for the transportation of pupils fully certified by a qualified medical practitioner to be physically or mentally handicapped and to be unable to use regular transportation services. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that this provision is built into existing regulations, (3) - that we provide on account of high school students who are attending vocational schools, the less of (a) \$100 for each pupil transported or (b) the net cost of such transportation to the school board. This is a new policy which is being introduced in anticipation of the integration of vocational and academic education for certain high school students in the province. Mr. Speaker, I now propose to take the necessary steps to see that this new transportation policy is ready for implementation at the beginning of the school year, September 1972. I beg leave to table this report, this statement, and there are copies available for the press.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, is a question in order to the honourable minister on this? I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, if there is an increase in the per pupil grant for bus transportation or not?

MR. CARTER: No, Mr. Speaker, this is the same as last year. But it is a slightly different formula that is all.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, is it government policy, I am not quite sure from listening to the minister's statement, he said he proposes to recommend. Now that could mean one of two things. Let us be clear. Is he announcing in behalf of the ministry a new policy with respect to these regulations?

MR. CARTER: Yes, I am announcing that we are going to put regulations into effect to affect the proposals we have -

MR. ROBERTS: It is not only a recommendation?

MR. CARTER: No, no. It is a decision.

MR. ROBERTS: A meaningless decision - a decision anyhow.

#### QUESTIONS

HON. F. D. MOORES (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, regarding Question No. 11 asked by the honourable the member for Bell Island, to the best of our knowledge, checking with the various departments of government, the answer to (1) and (2) is, no, we have not had any representation from any people. The answer to (3) - does not apply. It is not relevant, No" being the answer to (1) and (2).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable Premier a supplementary question? Did not the Chamber of Commerce in Gander come to see the honourable the Premier or the government recently about this matter of making St. John's an International Airport?

MR. MOORES: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I certainly did not meet with them, as much as I would have enjoyed doing so. They may have met with the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, If that is the case, that information has not been passed on. But I have not met with them and no way have we had representation in this regard and as it is basically a federal problem I doubt if we would have very

MR. MOORES: great influence one way or the other at the present time.

But the answer to the question, to the best of my knowledge, is No.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, would the honourable the Premier try to determine from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who has not been in his seat for several days now, if he has had any representation, and table the information in the House?

MR. MOORES: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if we find that we have had representation from Gander it will be tabled in the House.

HON. R. L. CHEESEMAN (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): Mr. Speaker, in answer to Question No. 12 from the honourable the member for Bell Island. The answer is (a) a meeting has been held with plant operators to endeavour to get an early start up date. (b) No. (c) Government are not the employers.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, could not the honourable Minister of Fisheries get the information from the honourable the Minister of Labour?

HON. W. W. MARSHALL: (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that is not in the nature of a supplementary question. The honourable Minister of Fisheries has answered the question and that particular type of supplementary question is improper. I mean it can be perfectly assumed when the Minister of Fisheries is answering that he is answering on the part of the government.

MR. NEARY: What is the honourable member trying to hide?

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. W. N. ROWE: On Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave of the House to direct a question to the honourable Minister of Community and Social Development concerning a matter which I spoke to him briefly about, privately, two or three days ago. I was wondering if the honourable minister's department either by itself or in conjunction with the Department of Education is planning

MR. ROWE, W.N. to help financially the museum at Hibb's Cove and the associated music school to enable those institutions to continue their operations this year?

HON. A. SENIOR (MINISTER OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT): Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the honourable member that this matter has been looked into by the department of government concerned, the Department of Provincial Affairs. I now have the recommendation on my desk which I received late yesterday afternoon and to this date we have not reached a final decision. I will be pleased to advise the honourable member when that decision is reached.

MR. P. S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources. In view of the fact that the veterinarian who has been practicing in Central Newfoundland has resigned, is it the intention of the government to replace this veterinarian and, if so, is there any prospective replacement ?

HON. C. V. DOODY (MINISTER OF MINES, AGRICULTURE AND RESOURCES): Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the fact that the veterinarian has resigned and we are taking active steps to have him replaced as soon as possible.

#### MOTIONS

MR. W. W. MARSHALL: On motions, Mr. Speaker, the honourable the member for Bell Island in whose name item (5) stands has kindly consented to third reading of certain bills. So I call instead Orders two to six.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend, Revise And Consolidate The Law Respecting Children Of Unmarried Parents," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend Revise And Consolidate The Law Respecting The Welfare Of Children," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Social Assistance Act 1971," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Social Assistance Act, 1971," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend Revise And Consolidate The Law Respecting The Adoption Of Children," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Adjourned Debate, Motion No. 5 (Resolution).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, last week when I started to wind up the debate on this resolution, I omitted to congratulate all the hon. members who participated in the debate. I want to pay a special tribute to the hon. member for White Bay South who in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, made one of the finest speeches I think I have ever heard made in this honourable House. It was truly, Sir, a Liberal speech. My hon. colleague, the member for St. Barbe North, made an excellent speech, an excellent Liberal speech, Mr. Speaker, and I want to congratulate them for it.

Mr. Speaker, I was rather disappointed that more members from the opposite side of the House did not participate in the debate. The hon. the Premier is developing a reputation in this honourable House as being the "hon silent Premier." I was hoping, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I would much rather be the silent Premier so when I say something it is worth listening to, than having to put up with this unadulterated nonsense.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know where the point of privilege is?

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. MOORES: The point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. member made an accusation and I am just trying to help him out with an explanation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Point of order.

MR. MOORES: That is all right - well a point of order, if it will help our hon. friend with his Liberal interpretation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I may carry on my little speech without interruption, the hon. the Premier will have to learn the rules of the House. He may have to learn the hard way, Mr. Speaker. I do not know whether he will be here that long. I do not know whether the hon. the Premier will be here that long or not.

I was hoping that the hon. the Premier would participate in this debate to show some leadership to the hon. members on the opposite side of the House. The first speaker from the other side, the hon. member for St. John's South, lead off the debate, Mr. Speaker, by accusing members on this side of the House of pushing socialism. Now, Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that the United States and Canada are the bulwarks of the free enterprise system and have made greater strides and greater advances in social legislation than Russia has managed since 1917 or China which is the world's other great socialist strong-hold even contemplates today.

The hon. member for St. John's South, Mr. Speaker, told us that we are not elected to promote socialism. Now, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that we were elected to this honourable House to serve the needs of our people, all our people. Mr. Speaker, if these needs involve the collecting of money through taxation and the distribution of it to the less fortunate and to the



MR. NEARY:

needy people of this province then I would say, Sir, that we are at least in part providing a part of the most important responsibilities for which we have been elected to this House of Assembly in a democratic manner.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, in my remarks last week I said that I did not think I was elected to promote the cause of socialism. I have no idea why the honourable member was elected.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, all the members of this House know how the honourable member was elected. We know, Mr. Speaker, first of all we saw him up in Bonavista North then he was racing back and forth across this island and finally he decided to take a safe seat in St. John's South.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: That is why, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is becoming known as the roadrunner.

Now I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the honourable member for St. John's South and I would like to remind the honourable member that we were elected to this honourable House not only by the people who represent the well-to-do people of this province, not just for the millionaire people, not just for the lawyer people, either, Mr. Speaker,

MR. MOORES: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: If the honourable Premier would just hold his cool. One of these days I fear he is going to have a massive coronary in this House, Mr. Speaker. I was about to say, Sir, that neither were we elected in this honourable House just for the recipients of social assistance but I want to remind the honourable member for St. John's South that we were elected for all the people of this province.

MR. WELLS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we were elected to

MR. WELLS:

represent individual district.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member may be under the illusion that we represent individual districts but when we enter this House, Sir, and we take our seat in this honourable House then we represent the people of Newfoundland as a whole, in total and not in little segments and districts. The honourable member, my learned friend, the great authority on constitutional law should know the difference of that, Mr. Speaker, and I will not even charge the honourable member for that little piece of information.

Mr. Speaker, here is a gem, here is an intellectual statement if I ever heard one, made by the honourable member for St. John's South. He says, "I am confident" (and this is straight from Hansard) "I am confident we will have a government that will through the Federal-Provincial Department find out what is available from Ottawa and tell Ottawa something of our priorities." I can only presume from this statement, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member is referring to the minister and the new Department of Inter-Governmental Affairs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, ever since the honourable Premier created and the government created this post I -

MR. MOORES: The House created it, not the government.

MR. NEARY: The government have created it, Mr Speaker. The House merely confirms what the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council has already done. We have not voted on it yet, Mr. Speaker, and I would doubt very much if we have a sufficient number of members on this side of the House to overrule the government. So we can assume that the government have taken a unilateral decision and have created this Department of Inter-Governmental Affairs and I for one,

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, would like for the honourable Premier to explain to the people of this province just what a Minister of Inter-Governmental Affairs does. Does it mean, Mr. Speaker, that this minister is a liason officer between the province and the Government of Canada? Does it mean, Sir, that the honourable minister is the representative of this province with the Government of England, with Westminster? Is that what it means, Mr. Speaker? Or does it mean that this minister is responsible for seeing that the people of this province can get to see ministers when they come to Confederation Building, Sir, or when they call on the phone to make an appointment or when they write a letter asking for an appointment with a certain minister? Is this the responsibility of the Minister of Inter-Governmental Affairs, Sir?

Sometime when the Honourable the Premier, when the Honourable the Premier breaks his oath of silence, Sir, I would like for him to explain just what it is this minister does and what this department is supposed to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I move on to a statement that was made -

MR. MOORES: Before any new government department can be established legislation must be brought into the House of Assembly, irrespective of any pre-conceived ideas the minister had. I know he dealt with it within a cabinet that made unilateral decisions that may not have been -

MR. NEARY: A point of order?

MR. MOORES: The point of order is this, that the honourable gentleman is talking about a subject that could not be explained until the legislation has been passed at which time it will be explained adequately.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is not a point of order - the honourable Premier could have explained it to the -

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I think the honourable member should be speaking to Resolution No. 5.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I understand that in closing the debate on the resolution that I have a fairly wide latitude. However, Sir, here is a statement that was made by the honourable member for Burin, who just left his seat in this honourable House, the Minister of Justice.

Sir, the honourable the Premier seems awfully concerned where we are going to get the manure to grow mushrooms on Bell Island. Well, Sir, before I am finished this afternoon, before I am finished Sir, this afternoon the honourable Premier will know where the manure is coming from.

Here is a beautiful statement Sir. Just listen to this Mr. Speaker. You will hardly believe your ears. He says, "a simple fact that not all of our economic problems, not all of our employment problems can be attributed totally and completely to the geographic situation of this province." Mr. Speaker, what a joke. My answer to that gem of wisdom Mr. Speaker, produced by the honourable and learned and intellectual member for Burin is; so what? Is it not true that this same thing applies

in any part of Canada, any part of North America or any part of the world for that matter?

Mr. Speaker, if I were the honourable gentleman I would check with Mr. McLean before coming into this House and making such nonsensical statements. There are the ones who are getting the high salaries and the big pay in this province for writing speeches for the honourable gentleman.

AN.HON.MEMBER: The government made-work programme by -

MR.NEARY: Help yourself, Mr. Speaker, You talk about self-help projects - you talk about self-help projects Mr. Speaker, it has been help yourself with this government since they took over on Jan. 18.

Mr. Speaker if I may -

MR.W.ROWE: On a point of order - would the Speaker mind giving a ruling that the prime rule of order in debates in this House is that any member speaking is entitled to be heard in absolute silence in the House, would the Speaker so rule?

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent point of order. I am glad that the honourable member raised it. If the honourable the Premier would just keep his cool, if the honourable the Premier would watch his blood pressure, Mr. Speaker, let me carry on in silence. I guarantee this that I will show them how debates take place in this Honourable House. Maybe we can get the honourable Premier to break his silence at last.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for Burin, the Minister of Justice, also made the following statement. All these statements Sir, are taken directly from Hansard. This is what the honourable member said: "Newfoundland today is facing unemployment and has faced an unemployment situation that to say the least is staggering. It is," he said, "because the honourable members colleagues in Ottawa with malice aforethought and with cold, ruthless calculation made a policy decision a few years ago that in order to fight inflation in Canada ...<sup>n</sup> that this is what caused the unemployment in Newfoundland."

Mr. Speaker, I say this is a particularly naive statement. The honourable member knows full well, Sir, that prior to Confederation and the coming into Newfoundland of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and the unemployment insurance benefits nobody in Newfoundland even thought of fishermen or bush workers as unemployed in their off-season. They simply worked hard enough, Mr. Speaker, and produced enough in their on-season to sustain them quite well at a pre-Confederation material standard of living.

Now, Mr. Speaker, even today with the sophistication of modern statistical methods and devious definitions we still have a higher unemployment or a higher employment rate and a greater, an infinitely greater rate of per capita productivity than we ever dreamed of twenty years ago, Sir, or even five years ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to a statement that was made by the honourable Minister of Finance. Speaking in the resolution, the honourable minister called it, he said, "Well, it is 'gobble-de-gook'." He said; "How can you skim off monies from the oil refinery etc. when they are not taxable?" Now obviously, Mr. Speaker, the honourable minister was not listening to what I said in my remarks when I was introducing this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, on this point I would say that the honourable Minister of Finance above anybody else knows perfectly well what I meant. There is a basic principle involved here, Sir, of taxing businessmen, industries and individuals that can be taxed so that the government can get revenue. Most of this, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, will come from the mainland of Canada when you are talking about taxing business and industry. Most of this I would submit Sir, the larger part of it will come from the mainland of Canada especially from the heavily industrialized sections of the country.

But, Mr. Speaker, the honourable minister should know full-well that the income tax, the gasoline tax, the sales tax and all the other revenue

that will come to the province as a result of building this great oil refinery at Come by Chance and on all the other developments that are taking place in this province today as a result of the initiative that was taken by the previous administration, that all these projects will generate new revenue. In my original remarks, Sir, last week I referred to this, that is why the honourable member picked me up on it because I especially mentioned the oil refinery at Come by Chance.

Sir, as a result all the individuals that will be employed at Come by Chance, both in the construction stage and when the refinery is finished will contribute either directly or indirectly to the Treasury of this Province. There will be other benefits, Mr. Speaker, to both the business community and to the provincial treasury as a result of supplying of goods and services to the oil refinery.

You see, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that every time we mention the oil refinery in this honourable House the blood pressure of the Minister of Finance goes up.

MR. NEARY:

I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman was one of those who accompanied the hon. Premier on Sunday afternoon to the site of the oil refinery at Come-by-Chance, when Procon sponsored an open house. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman was in that party and that he did put his hand in the wound and that they can now report to the hon. member for Gander, the hon. absent member for Gander who was so vocal in his protest against the oil refinery a couple of years ago, that there is equipment on the site, that construction is going ahead on schedule and that there are Newfoundlanders employed on the project and that there is revenue at this moment coming into the Treasury of the Province from the project. It is helping us to look after the needy people of the province and to help look after all the other services that are being carried on by government.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will not hear the Minister of Finance make any more wild statements like that one but just carrying on in his address, Sir, here is a beaut! (You would hardly believe that it came from the Minister of Finance. You would hardly believe it, Sir.) He says: "if oil and gas are discovered off the coast, perhaps if we can get better use of further power in Newfoundland and Labrador, our new development corporation" ("perhaps" he says) "in five, six, eight or ten years, we will have unemployment rates and so on that will be more in line with the rest of Canada." Mr. Speaker, this is very true but if we are to pay attention to what the experts, economists and scientists are telling us today and those of us, Sir, who do any reading at all or do any research at all on the subject of unemployment or follow closely the trend of what is happening in the world today, then it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that unemployment is going to get progressively worst. Sir, this is not the fault of the Tory Government. It is not the fault of the Liberal Government. It is not the fault of an N.D.P. Government. It is not the fault of a C.C.F. Government or Social Credit Government.



Mr. Neary

It is just a fact of life, Sir. Unemployment is going to get progressively worst and more and more people, Mr. Speaker, will have more and more leisure time on their hands. Unless, Sir, we lay the foundation now for the decade ahead, our people will become viewers instead of doers. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that I have to tell the hon. members of this House what happened to the Roman Empire when the people became viewers instead of doers.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: It was not "McLeans."

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we are told by the experts, Sir, and the statistician - if the hon. member would just listen, he might learn something. Mr. Speaker, in this debate we have seen the grossest example of ignorance, when it comes to unemployment, that I have ever seen displayed in this House. The hon. well-to-do members just do not understand it, Mr. Speaker. They do not. They do not want to. The corporation lawyers could not care less, Mr. Speaker. If they would just be a little bit patient, pay attention to what I am saying, maybe they will learn something this afternoon.

I was about to say, Sir, that we are told by the experts and the statisticians and the economists ( If my hon. friend from Bonavista South does not believe this, he can go out and check the facts. I did not make it up. All he has to do is drop off a note to the United Nations. They will even write his speech for him if he wants it, but they will not read it for him, Mr. Speaker. He will have to read it himself ) that by the year 2000, which is less than thirty years from now, seventy-five per cent, Mr. Speaker, of the population of Canada will be paid for not working. Even a higher proportion of people in the United States will be unemployed. So, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Minister of Finance states that perhaps in ten years from now, we may have unemployment rates and so on that will be more in line with the rest of Canada, you know, Mr. Speaker, in his simplicity he may be right.

Mr. Neary.

By that time we may have fifty per cent on unemployment. But this, Sir, in my opinion, will not solve the problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Finance who had quite a bit to say in this debate made another startling statement. He said: "If any special works programme is the kind of special works programme that we have had in association with the Government of Canada in the last several years, I for one think it has to be much more deeply thought through, because the Government of Canada are in the habit of initiating programmes without consultation with the provinces."

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member if he were sincere when he made that statement, would vote for this resolution. The passing of this resolution, Sir, in my opinion would eliminate the problem that the hon. minister of Finance raised in his remarks. If the province, Sir, wants to pull back or pull out of any of these make-work projects and they wish to protect their own income, then may I suggest to the hon. Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, that we may have to use a little more imagination in developing make-work projects. We may have to use our creative minds, Sir to think up projects that will be within the ground rules that the hon. minister spoke about. This, Mr. Speaker, is one of the main reasons for this resolution so that we may pool the best brains on either side of this House and come up with a realistic year-around make-work programme, cost-shared by the federal and provincial treasuries.

Mr. Speaker, in my Address in Reply to the Throne Speech, I indicated that if this government are going to live up to the expectations that they have created in the minds of the Newfoundland people over the past four or five months, then they will have to use the human resources on either side on this honourable House and not just those on the opposite side who are elected by around fifty per cent of the voters of this House.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Finance in his remarks also advised the House, and members or any thinking member of this House must have

Mr. Neary

been completely startled and caught off guard by the hon. minister's statement. This is really priceless. You would hardly credit it to the hon. Minister of Finance here. Listen to this, Mr. Speaker: "I am advised that automation does not necessarily mean increased unemployment because in this province it is the service sectors of our commercial life that are increasing fastest." Mr. Speaker, it is obvious from this statement that the hon. minister is completely out-of-touch with reality. Is he trying to tell us, Sir, that the unemployment figures we see and hear so much about, especially from the "silly six" in Ottawa - is he trying to tell us that these figures are not true?

MR. NEARY:

Is this, Mr. Speaker, is this what the honourable member is telling us, that the figures that we see quoted in the press, that we hear on radio and that we hear on television and that we hear discussed so much from one end of this country to the other, Mr. Speaker, is the honourable Minister of Finance telling us that these figures are not there? "It is not true," he says.

AN HON. MEMBER: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: If the hon. member for St John's Centre does not want to listen to me, I suggest he go out and dive in his swimming pool...

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

MR. NEARY: If I may carry on Mr. Speaker. . .

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should retract that statement about the hon. members that we have in Ottawa today, the federal members. They are not silly, Sir. He should retract that statement.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I were the hon. member I would just sit and be quiet and listen and he may learn something.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite true to say that employment is increasing in Canada but so is unemployment. Sir, I did not make this up. Does the honourable member for St. John's South think that I just dreamed that up, I just picked it off the top of my head? You know what the honourable Minister of Finance says he said, "Well look, let us wait a couple of years. Wait until all programmes start to take root, wait a couple of years." Mr. Speaker, I would say that is poor consolation for the heads of households of families in this province today who are unemployed when they come knocking on the door of the honourable member for Bonavista South looking for a job or the honourable member for Green Bay or the honourable member

MR. NEARY:

for Bay de Verde or the honourable member for Trinity South but maybe not the honourable member for Labrador West. The honourable member for St. John's South has quite a bit of unemployment, the honourable member for Hermitage and Fortune Bay and the honourable member for Placentia East. The honourable member knows all about unemployment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: When they come knocking on the door looking for a job, is this what they say, "Wait two or three years. Oh, wait four or five years. you know resource development will take care of all this. Mr. Speaker, are the honourable gentlemen on the opposite side so naive as to think that the people of Newfoundland are going to be so gullible as to swallow that excuse? Certainly not. The Minister of Finance says, "We hope that if we take a bit of a different direction, if we concentrate on resource developments with the new development corporation, using that it will help to overcome the problem, but we do not expect anything to happen in the next year or two." Making excuses all ready, Mr. Speaker, making excuses for not being able to fulfill the promises that were made to the people of this province over the last four or five months.

I would get the impression from what the honourable minister said, Sir, in this statement that the government is going into labour-intensive resource development and, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion and any member of this House who is thinking at all knows, Sir, that there is no such animal today. Mr. Speaker, unless the honourable members on the opposite side want to bury their heads in the sand and think that little Newfoundland is different than any other part of the world and that we can have intensive resource development in

MR. NEARY:

this province when we see the reverse, Sir, happening in the rest of the free world today, they are doomed, Sir, before they start.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of common sense how can these labour intensive industries that the honourable Premier and the honourable Minister of Finance and the other honourable gentleman are talking about, how in the name of common sense can they compete? Perhaps the honourable Premier could tell us that when he rises to speak in the Throne Speech Debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, here is a dandy and I am going to leave the Minister of Finance for a moment and I am going to go over to a quotation, to a statement made by the honourable member for Hermitage, the honourable Minister of Fisheries. He says, referring to my remarks in introducing the resolution he said. "Strong words" (etc.) "Strong words," he said, "An attack on private enterprise."

Mr. Speaker, what garbage. My proposal, Sir, if the House were to vote in favour of it, would be a boom to private industry in that it would not only relieve conscientious businessmen like the honourable gentleman and the honourable member who sits to his left, would relieve these honourable gentlemen of any feeling of sympathy that might cause them to countenance featherbedding on their payrolls but also through distribution of purchasing power, Sir, create consumer level to customers, I am sure the honourable member for Fortune Bay would welcome this news and all the other well-to-do, well-heeled businessmen on the opposite side of the House. This would be good news, Sir, that if they vote in favour of this resolution, which I hope they will, that it will increase the purchasing power. It will put more purchasing power in the hands of the consumers and, Sir, if that would not benefit private enterprise then I do not know what would. I think, Sir, that they

MR. NEARY:

would all benefit, right from the prime producers right on down to the retailer.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member who made that statement, Mr. Speaker, should very well know that good government never attacks although it may regulate the private enterprise system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am just about coming to the end of my remarks but before I wind up, Sir, I want to get back to the honourable Minister of Justice, the honourable and learned and intellectual Minister of Justice. Here is a quotation he made: "What we will do is encourage any Newfoundlander, any Canadian or anyone else who is prepared to come into this province and invest his money in developing." Mr. Speaker, I cannot quarrel with that. I would praise the government for its intention to follow in the footsteps of the twenty-three year old Liberal Government in the effort to attract industrialists, entrepreneurs and investors to our province.

But I also, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat what I said in introducing this resolution, that no industrialists, no entrepreneurs will come to our shores just to provide employment. He will come, Sir, to process, as Your Honour rightly pointed out in that wonderful speech that Your Honour made in this House yesterday that differed from his colleagues. You know, Mr. Speaker, when the honourable member for Placentia West spoke in this House yesterday

MR. NEARY: I thought about a remark that my colleague here on my right made in his Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne when he said; 'You have P.C.'s and you have Tories on the other side of the House.'

Well, Sir, after listening Your Honour's speech yesterday or the member from Placentia West, you also have Liberals on the opposite side of the House. Sir, if I may say so and I do not want to embarrass Your Honour, if I may so, Sir, the member for Placentia West made one of the better speeches that has been made in this House so far in this session. It was a great Liberal speech, Sir. All the other speeches that we have heard so far from the well-to-do members on the opposite side of the House were Tory speeches. You could see the battle lines developing, Sir, you could see the difference in the philosophy. You could see the difference taking place between Liberalism and Toryism, Sir. It is a matter of record, Mr. Speaker,

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. What has this to do with the Select Committee to look into the unemployment situation in this province, speeches in the House?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, if it be one, I would ask Your Honour for a ruling. The hon. gentleman is merely commenting upon a speech made by the member for Placentia West, a very good speech in which the hon. member for Placentia West touched precisely upon the point which is relevant to this, namely: should the government have a responsibility for providing work or should they not?

The hon. gentleman from Bonavista South, Sir, I suggest has raised a specious point of order. He would do well to withdraw the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: (Garry) Far be it from me to curtail applause for the hon. member for Placentia West. However, I should point out that there is a limit to which the hon. member can range in his speech. If he could remember that he must keep it within the bounds of relevancy, then I do not think that there is any problem.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was about to make a comparison between Liberalism and Toryism, Sir, as it effects the resolution. Sir,



it is a matter of public record and anybody within listening distance of my voice, Sir, can go out and check this any time they want to. It is a matter of public record that the Tories have opposed every social reform that has been brought in in Canada in the last one hundred years. It is a matter of public record, Sir, that they opposed the old age pension. The Tories opposed the family allowance, the Tories opposed social assistance, the Tories opposed veteran's allowance, the Tories opposed M.C.P., the Tories opposed industrial development in this province, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. the Premier is taking great pride in going down to officially open the Churchill Falls project on June 15. Mr. Speaker, does Your Honour remember what the Tories called Brinco in this House when it was formed? They called it 'Bunco.' The hon. Premier will not call it 'Bunco' when he is invited to speak at the opening of that great project that has created so much employment in this province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. A.J. MURPHY: The hon. member will give a ...

MR. NFARY: There it is, Sir, there it is. There is the difference. It is unfolding before our very eyes, Sir. I am prepared to bet Your Honour at this moment, at this point in my speech I am prepared to bet Your Honour, if we are allowed to gamble in this House, five cents that every member on the opposite side of the House will oppose this great reform that is recommended in this resolution, the appointing of a Select Committee to investigate the feasibility of having year-round make-work projects.

Mr. Speaker, if I wanted to be partisan and I do not want to be in this speech, if I wanted to be partisan and I wanted to be selfish, Sir, if I wanted to be selfish about it, I would say to members on the opposite side of the House; "Vote against this resolution, vote against it." because, Mr. Speaker, it would prove, it would prove beyond any doubt to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that they are not concerned about the unemployment situation in this province that exists at the moment. It is here now, Sir, and if I were selfish I would say; 'vote against it.' I am hoping that the hon. members will vote in favour of it.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying a few moments ago, businessmen will come into this province for two reasons, to produce and to make profits. Automation, Sir, investment in sophisticated technology, advanced equipment is the secret to low-cost, uninterrupted production and maximum profits. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I suggest strongly and I submit to the hon. members of this House that the government is left with the problem of creating optional work programmes for its citizens. Work programmes mind you, Mr. Speaker, that must never compete in products or demands for skills with the needs of the private sector upon which the government must depend through taxation for its total financial resources unless, Sir, the government is prepared through Crown Corporations perhaps to go into business for themselves. I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, that even the inspired government that we have on the other side will want to do this.

The hon. member for St. John's South thought there was a failure of logic somewhere in my resolution. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, this is where the hon. member misunderstood the principle of the resolution that government should not become the producer of products and services that are provided by the private sector, but should provide work not provided by private enterprise, as a matter of principle, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, the kind of work that I am suggesting may be the kind (my hon. friend would be relieved to hear this) is the kind of work that may be considered to be uneconomical by private enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, to sum up, the hon. Minister of Finance thought that the resolution was introduced into this honourable House for debating purposes only. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon., learned and temperamental gentleman that my reason for proposing a Select Committee, was to remove discussion from the area of partisan debate in the effort that the members of this House would see the necessity to pool the best brains of both parties in this honourable House into an effort to cope with growing idleness, Sir, which in my opinion is one of the most morale eroding economic cancers that people are subjected to today. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to move this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. members have heard the motion, is the House ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion. Those in favour of the motion please say 'aye' those against the motion please say 'No'. In my opinion the 'no's' have it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Divide

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, not divide, Sir, just on division which means the fact that there were some for and some against will be recorded in the minutes.

MR. F. MOORES (PRIME MINISTER): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member knows enough, after all the corrections I have had to day. He speaks from his seat and not from the isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, the Standing Orders says the hon. gentleman speaks from his place. I have just moved this place to here for the time being. We will move it back in due course.

MR. MOORES: Back if it is appropriate.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion (6)

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have already conferred with the House Leader and he agrees that he will allow (representing the other side of the House) me to introduce this motion on behalf of the hon. member from Bell Island so that, with the provision that he can take a break now and have the opportunity to speak at a later point in the debate.

Sir, this motion which is put on the Order Paper by my hon. friend, the member for Bell Island, asks the House to appoint a select committee to investigate the present and potential dangers to human rights in this province posed by all organizations maintaining credit and personal information on individual citizens for other than their own confidential restrictive use. And that the said select committee recommend such additions to the human rights legislation of this province as are necessary to protect its citizens.

Sir, before getting into the substance of what I have to say,

I would like very much to commend the hon. member for Bell Island for putting this motion before the House today. Sir, it is something which is of the gravest possible importance to everybody in Newfoundland, indeed to every body in Canada and on this continent. This whole question, Sir, of invasion of privacy generally, not only in respect of credit reports or credit information kept by businesses, but this whole idea of invasion of privacy generally, invasion of privacy by private organizations, invasion of privacy by public organizations, for example, governments, police.

It is perhaps unfortunate, although timely, that on this very day that we are discussing this motion, Edgar Hoover in the United States, head of the F.B.I., passed away. I hate to say anything about the man who just passed away, but I would like to say in passing that that hon. gentleman perhaps represented, in the way that the F.B.I. as a government agency was used in the past number of decades represented one of the greatest invasions of privacy that the people of the United States have ever had to suffer.

The problem of invasion of privacy by private and public organizations, by the filing of information in computers for example, with astronomical numbers of people's names and personal information being put in these computers and spread all over the countryside. The invasion of privacy by electronic devices, cameras and by other bugging devices for example, all these things, Sir, this invasion of privacy point and has pointed for some time to the imperative need for controls by everybody -- by governments and by everybody in society, controls over the use of these devices and the use of files being kept on private individuals.

There has been much talk about this, Sir, much talk at various conventions. The lawyer's convention of a couple of years ago passed some resolutions in Canada on this matter. Much talk, Sir, but not very much action. When it comes to the question of invasion of privacy by public organizations, we are, Sir, for example, governments or the

police. we are, Sir, confronted by what might be described as an age-old confrontation, an age-old-dilemma which is confronting and has confronted civilization, namely the necessity, the gravest possible necessity of maintaining some kind of a balance between order and security in a nation and the freedom of the individuals which go to make up that nation. There have been in the past, Sir, and I am sure in the future there will be steps taken to curb, on the part of public organizations to curb the invasions of privacy that have taken place and that can take place with the very sophisticated electronic equipment and other facilities which are available to government, police and other public organizations in the nation today.

Sir, to come directly to the point which is involved in this particular resolution, we notice that the same dilemma, the same problem of trying to restore, trying to get a balance between order and security on the one hand and the freedom of the individual on the other— this same problem or this same dilemma does not exist in respect of private organizations, businesses and that sort of thing, or industry. For example, loan companies, credit agencies, shops and other credit granting agencies throughout the province and throughout Canada, it is not, Sir, when we come to look at these private organizations, it is not a question, not the great question of trying to restore a balance between order on the one hand and freedom on the other.

When it comes to the private organizations, Sir, these credit facilities and these shops and other businesses and other people who use credit agencies, when it comes to those types of private organizations it is a simple question of competing interests in society. The competing interests between one private group on the one hand and other private groups on the other hand. It is a competing interest between properly organized business on the one hand and unorganized or disorganized private individuals on the other hand. The question is, Sir, a simple one, it is whether one private group, for example, the organized business

and credit granting facilities and the other agencies which have grown up around that sort of thing, the question boils down to whether one private group like that is going to be permitted further and in the future to use the massive facilities which we have available to us today, to use those facilities for their own private protection of their own businesses. And to use those facilities, Sir, with an attendant great risk on the part of the individuals in our society, of their privacy of being invaded by the use of those facilities.

Because, Sir, once we grant the fact that this private organization or group of private organizations can use such facilities, can use electronic devices, can use credit reports, credit studies, once we grant that fact we also have to realize the grave risk that exists of mistakes being made, of errors being made and misunderstandings and misapprehensions and sometimes, Sir, although I hesitate to say this, the possibility of outright malice on the part of some people who might use those types of facilities.

Sir, we are talking about people who have credit reports made on them perhaps as a result of nothing more than hearsay evidence which is gathered together by the people who make that kind of a credit report, or a personal information report. We see, Sir, the possibility and the risk and I do not say insignificant risk, I think real risk of character damage and of destroyed reputations. I see the grave risk of a loss of a person's or family's credit rating. In some extreme cases I imagine the loss of a job or making it difficult for a person to get good gainful employment. Certainly, Sir, the grave risk of serious embarrassment to a man or a woman or a whole family in our society.

Sir, the resolution does state something to the effect that it exempts or accepts the use of such information by people or by

people, businesses for example, for their own confidential restrictive use and Sir, I would say that that would be bad enough, if we merely restricted the use of such information to a business, say, or credit agency so that they could use it for their own particular purposes restrictively without spreading it around, that would be bad enough if that were permitted to go on. But, Sir, and I think every member will agree, what becomes intolerable in the situation is when a credit agency or some group who are getting this type of information on people, are gathering information on people's credit ratings or personal characters, for that matter, when they are allowed to let this type of information be spread around the country to every other business for example or individual for that matter who wants to pay a fee in some cases, to allow that to be spread around, to let it be disseminated and sometimes allow it to proliferate, Sir, and to add on and add on and build up over the years. for this type of thing to go to hundreds and thousands of businesses and people all over the world, Now today with our sophisticated electronic equipment. Sir, when that sort of thing does happen, there is no hope if there is a mistake made on a man's character or a man's personal reputation or a man's credit rating. There is no hope of that individual ever again correcting misinformation or bad information or information which only tells half the story

MR. ROWE, W.N. and even, Sir, if it were possible for him under the existing law as we have today, even if it were possible for him to tract it down and correct it, the simple obstacle which he is up against is the fact that no member of society in ninety-nine percent of the cases even knows that this type of information is kept on in files or computers.

Sir, the question therefore boils down to one as to how we, the members of this House who make laws for Newfoundland, how we are going to deal with these conflicting interests, the conflicting interest, on the one hand businesses protecting their own financial investment by having credit ratings and personal reports on people on the one hand and on the other hand the right of individuals in society today not to have their privacy invaded at all and certainly not to have their privacy invaded in a wrongful manner which is going to do damage to their credit, their character and their reputation.

Assuming, Sir, without deciding, assuming that it is good generally speaking for society for these types of credit reports to be permitted at all, assuming that question is to be answered in the affirmative that it will be allowed, that businesses and other people will be permitted to keep credit reports and personal information reports on people—assuming that, deciding that - that particular question. We must remember, Sir, the purpose that these reports serve in Canada and in Newfoundland today, as far as businesses are concerned, Sir, as long as the greater proportion, ninety percent say of these reports are accurate, that is probably sufficient for their purposes. If there is an occasional report on the occasional person which is wrong, certainly no one wants to have wrong information, but if there is an occasional or odd report which is wrong, Sir, that is not so bad from the business point of view because they are talking about giving credit or granting credit to a wide variety of



MR. ROWE, W.N. people and as long as the credit reports are right most of the time and in the overwhelming majority of times then that serves the purpose of the business community. It is all right from the business point of view even though naturally they will strive for greater accuracy all the time.

Businesses are concerned really in general statistically accuracy in the general broad sense of the word. So that generally speaking the credit ratings and credit reports they have do not let them down. They are not, Sir, although individual members might be from a personal point of view, they are not interested necessarily in the damage that might possibly be done to an individual in society who is unfortunate enough to be among that ten percent or less, as the case might be, who does have a file kept on him which is highly inaccurate or which is a misapprehension or which is as a result of outright malice. This is the name of person, Sir, that we in this House should be concerned about, that individual, that perhaps small number of people in our society, but certainly an important number.

We all remember the story reported in a magazine some months or years ago, I do not remember when, of a man, a professionally trained man who went from employer to employer for a number of months or years looking for work and although he had excellent qualifications found himself turned down by employer after employer. It was only after he had gone to the twentieth or thirtieth employer looking for work, who happened to be an acquaintance of his, that he found out the reason for it. The reason for it was (he did not know up to that point) the reason for it was that some agency who had taken upon themselves the job of collecting information, personal information on such persons, had entered an erroneous, mistaken report on this man in their file. This was spread around throughout the country to all the employers to whom that man would be

MR. ROWE, W.N. likely to be going to seeking for a job. It was only after the most arduous activity on his part with legal help and legal suits that he was able to get this misrepresented information, this erroneous stuff kept on him on file, to get it changed and have the record set straight. He did not know for years that this information had been kept on him.

That is the type of person we should be concerned about in this House of Assembly, Sir. I am not too concerned and I do not suppose any honourable member here today is too concerned about a good credit rating being spread around about any honourable member or anybody else or a good credit rating being spread around about a person who in fact has a bad credit rating. Or a bad credit rating being spread around when the person has in fact got a bad credit rating, although a lot of people would give you argument on that on the grounds of invasion of privacy.

What we are worried about, Sir, is bad information being spread around the countryside about a person who in fact has a good credit rating or a good character or a good reputation. We are worried about that type of inaccuracy or that type of misrepresentation. The occasional wrong report which is received by the files and put into the computer which is of no real concern, as I have said, to the business groups or the credit-rating groups themselves, which is of paramount concern and important to the individual who happens to be damned before the eyes of employers or stores or businesses because of information which is erroneous.

Nobody knows, Sir, and there is no way of finding out how many inaccurate or erroneous reports exist on people in Newfoundland today. No honourable member of this House knows at this moment whether his credit rating or personal character or reputation is reported accurately. Nobody knows. There may be mistakes made and nobody knows outside of this House if there is accurate reporting done, if reporting has to be

MR. ROWE, W.N. done, if there is accurate credit reporting or character reporting done on that individual.

But, Sir, we should have that information. We should be able to get that information and that type of information should be acceptable by every member of our society in Newfoundland.

Now, Sir, I do not pretend for one moment that it is an easy problem to deal with. We do have as I have mentioned these conflicting interests, the need for this type of thing, credit rating, credit reporting, if businesses are to carry on and flourish with a minimum of risk. We have the other interest, of a person not having his privacy invaded and not having his reputation or character impugned groundlessly.

Assuming, Sir, the need of such reports, the question is, how are we in this House or in the Parliament of Canada going to protect the individual citizen? What is the best method of approaching the problem to protect the individual citizen?

The motion, Sir, makes a step in the right direction. It asks for a select committee of this House to inquire into the whole problem and a select committee of this House would have incumbent on it the duty of looking at other legislation in other jurisdictions, of reading the reports of expert opinion, of receiving the information of witnesses and people who should know some of the answers to these problems, to hear reports of witnesses who might be called before it.

Sir, I do not want to anticipate at this time the job of such a select committee which I am sure will be passed by all members of this House or the setting up of such a select committee will be passed by all members of this House. I do not want to anticipate the work of that committee. But it seems to me on momentary reflection that what we need in the Province and what we need in Canada are better laws providing for easy access by individual citizens to files which might be kept on them by credit agencies or other such agencies.

We need, Sir, laws and regulations governing the collection of such information by credit agencies or by other people keeping personal reports on citizens in society. We need regulations to govern the collection of such information.

When I was practicing law, Sir, and any members of this House who might be unfortunate enough to be a member of that profession will remember coming across their desks, on numerous occasions, reports from certain people, whether it be insurance companies' credit reports, reports coming across their desk in respect of their clients, for example, or in respect of the person who they might be suing or defending against. Often this type of information which is contained in the file, is based on a report of say an adjuster, knocking on doors in the neighbourhood surrounding an individual in our society and collecting from neighbours and acquaintances information effecting the character, reputation, credit worthiness, and there are a number of other things, of the person under scrutiny or under examination. Information, Sir, which would be thrown out of any court of law, as the purest kind of heresy. Information and evidence, Sir, which would not even be looked at by a judge or by a good lawyer, as good evidence which could be sustained.

This is, in many cases, probably too many cases, the type of information which a number of these reports are based on. So, Sir, there is a need for laws and regulations to govern the collection of information on people, if we are to admit as a necessity the need for credit reports and character reports to be made in the society we have today.

We need, Sir, some laws and regulations governing the storage of such information, where it is stored, how it is stored, in computers, in files, whether it should be registered. For example, we need laws concerning the storage of such information and certainly, Sir, we need laws and regulations regarding the spreading of such information.

Should credit agencies here in St. John's or Newfoundland be permitted to send off, to another agency on the mainland information effecting a resident of this province? Should, on the other hand, agencies in this province be permitted to receive into their confidential files, information

concerning somebody else on the mainland or a resident of this province who might have been on the mainland of Canada.

We need, Sir, laws which govern and regulate the destruction of files which are kept on people in this province, after a period of time. For example, and this would guard against misleading information or erroneous information being kept in perpetuity and kept on and on and on, destroying a person's life for credit worthiness for years and years to come. Perhaps, Sir, laws and regulations which state that after a number of years, five years, six years, any files kept on a person in credit agencies or other business agencies have to be irrevocably destroyed and started afresh, have indeed got to be kept in business or in credit agencies today.

We need, Sir, laws and regulations governing the registration of agencies, to stiffen up laws and regulations governing the registration of agencies. Laws which require the names of individuals and workers and members of the staff in these agencies to be registered for public view as an added protection. Sir, we need laws and regulations providing for the investigation by a public body, by somebody acting for the Government of Newfoundland who in turn is acting for the people of Newfoundland. Investigation by a public body, as a result of any complaint received by an individual in our society that perhaps his character has been impugned or his credit worthiness has been destroyed by a credit report which he has reason to believe exists and which is erroneous.

Sir, I think perhaps that we need some laws and regulations which require files on residents, files dealing with the credit worthiness or reputation or character of residence of any person to be actually registered and kept in a building or institution, a public building or institution, near the place of residence of that resident or citizen of Newfoundland. For example there is no reason why a registry could not be set up in the Confederation Building, in Corner Brook, in Grand Falls, Gander and other larger towns around the province, especially in Labrador, as my hon. friend to my left will agree, the larger towns and communities

in this province to have files kept on residents of this province, put into these institutions, not that they can be open to public search by anybody who might want to go in, but if an individual desires to check on reports which are being used to either destroy or build up his reputation or credit worthiness, he can in fact go to a registry and see what is on file concerning him. Then if it is wrong or he has reason to complain, he then should be permitted to either appear before a court of law to have the thing remedied at no expense to himself, or to appear before a board which could be set up for this particular purpose to have the misinformation corrected.

Sir, there is no doubt about the need for heavy penalties if we are to provide against the violations of such a code to be set up in this province. Sir, there probably should be laws and regulations requiring, on request, a credit agency to divulge to a citizen what the source of their information on him is - by name. Why should anybody in this society of ours today be impugned in character or reputation or credit worthiness and not know who his accusers are or who is giving the misinformation on him. This, Sir, would certainly go a long way in curbing this information being spread. Because if a person is asked a question about another person, he will watch his step in giving such information if he knows that he would be liable perhaps to heavy damages as a result of a libel or slander suit being brought against him.

These Sir, and a hundred other matters are matters which are designed beautifully for this select committee which this motion recommends be set up by this honourable House. These and a hundred other matters should be looked into by such a select committee with a view to assisting the Government of this Province, I do not care what government is in, to draft good, solid, sensible legislation protecting the rights of individual citizens who might be damaged or destroyed by misinformation being spread about concerning their character or credit worthiness.

I support the resolution whole heartedly.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for White Bay South - Mr. Speaker I will be very brief in what I have to say. The hon. member will have his chance to speak. I want to thank the hon. member for White Bay South for introducing this resolution on my behalf and giving me a chance to recharge my battery. I want to congratulate him, Sir, for making another excellent and wonderful speech in this honourable House. Sir, as one of the senior members of this honourable House, it does my heart good to hear a member like the hon. member for White Bay South stand in this honourable House and make such an outstanding speech on behalf of the people of this province. I would think, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has a great career ahead of him in public life in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I was talking the other day to Ron Pumphrey that well-known moderator of VOICM's Phone Forum. Mr. Pumphrey is a gentleman who has had quite a bit to do with battling for the rights of people in this province. Mr. Pumphrey told me about a lot of the cases that he has had to deal with but I think the one that struck me more than all the others was one that affected a well-known man in this province (I will not mention his name. He is a well-known man. I think everybody probably knows of the case) who had his credit-rating destroyed in error because there was another man in the province by the same name.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this man went to the credit bureau and he pointed this out. He told these people that they had made a mistake. He identified the wrong person and they promised that they would correct the situation. Mr. Speaker, several months went by when the gentleman discovered to his amazement that the matter had not been corrected. The matter had not been corrected and his credit-rating was still being affected by this false information. As the hon. member for White Bay pointed out, once a chain reaction is started, Mr. Speaker, nobody knows where it ends - "around and around it goes and where it stops nobody knows." That gentleman does not know to this day, Mr. Speaker, if that situation has been rectified yet. On the other end of the spectrum, Sir, I heard of a man who could not get credit because he always paid cash. Just imagine, MR. Speaker, he had no credit rating! He had been paying his way all his life, paying cash!

Mr. Neary

Now he goes to buy a car and they say to him, "no, you are a poor risk. We cannot sell you this car on the installment plan. You do not have any credit rating." What kind of nonsense is this? Then you have the situation - the hon. member for White Bay South referred to, calling on the telephone. People will call up without identifying themselves looking for information about your neighbours. Mr. Speaker, I know this to be a fact. I do not know if hon. members' wives (in this honourable House) have had the experience or not or any of their neighbours on the street. Somebody will call up asking for embarrassing, confidential, private information about their neighbours. Do they pay their bills regularly? Are they a good risk?

Mr. Speaker, I submit to this honourable House that this has to cease. Anybody, Mr. Speaker, who saw the last edition of "Here Comes the 1970's" on television, must have been startled to learn what can be done with bugs today; what can be done with cameras; what can be done with telescopic lens; wire tapping; telephone tapping, etc. Sir, it is incredible. It is unbelievable the things that you can do with these instruments. There are people within listening distance of my voice right now, Mr. Speaker, that no full-well what I am talking about. I cannot say for sure that there has been bugging going on in Newfoundland. I cannot say it for sure, Sir. But I can tell Your Honour this, that there are people within listening distance of my voice who are experts on the matter, on the subject.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, that is a direct insinuation on everybody in this Chamber. I believe this thing should be straightened out now. I do not want to be under any suspicion that I have bugged anybody or anything else in this House. I do not think we should allow -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I could set the hon. member's mind at ease that it is not an hon. member of this House that I am referring to. I hope the hon. member for St. John's Centre will stop bugging me and let me



Mr. Neary.

carry on with my speech. I was not referring to any hon. member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that there is not one single member of this House who has not had the experience personally or has not had to listen to or has not read about abuses of human rights through the releases of information on individuals and families from the files, the secret files, Sir, as far as those individual families are concerned, maintained, Mr. Speaker by so-called "credit bureaus or agencies." Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, they should be called discredit agencies. Time and time again, Sir, the information which they release to their clients, in return for a good healthy fee I understand, has been found to be as falsely and mistakenly based as it is damaging to the reputation of the individuals whom it involves.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, like that of the hon. member for White Bay South is that these files are kept secret from those who they most concern and who, most suffer from the circulation of what is truly false and libelous information. I hope, Sir, that if the House will agree to set up this select committee that the proposed select committee look into the whole matter with a view to setting up a framework of proposed legislation that would be in keeping with the spirit of human rights legislation currently on the statutes of this province. It would protect all individuals against not only the invasion of privacy but against, Mr. Speaker, the assassination of character, often times as much a moral assassination as it is financial.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the hon. member for St. John's Centre is anxious to spring to his feet (or the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs) to get into this

MR. NEARY:

and I know, Mr. Speaker, that he will tell us about the motions that he introduced in this House this afternoon. I want to say to the honourable member before he rises in his place in this honourable House to speak, that members on this side who are elected in a free and democratic way by the people of this province certainly have a right to participate in any recommendations or suggestions that are made, and the honourable member is nodding his approval, that will result in legislation being brought into this honourable House to improve the Human Rights Legislation. I would say that it is not sufficient for any honourable member to bring in a couple of bills in this honourable House and just brush it off and let it go at that.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the honourable member will approve that the whole matter should be referred to a select Committee and not only decided by the fifty-two per-cent on the opposite side of the House that were sent here by the voters of Newfoundland.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, following the greatest menace to human rights in this province, a gentleman who has done more here in this honourable Chamber, and got away with it, to try to destroy people, and hear him get him and try to champion the cause of credit -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I demand, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member retract that statement because it is completely untrue.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Even if it were true he is not allowed to say it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is unparliamentary and the honourable member should retract it immediately. On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, I have stated my point of order and I have asked the

MR. NEARY:

honourable member to retract the statement because it is untrue.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member like to retract his statement.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, this afternoon this honourable gentleman made a statement about six honourable members of Parliament and called them 'silly,' in other words they have no sense. Now if that is not trying to destroy someone, their reputation. They are not fit to be in the House of Parliament if they are silly. Last year in this honourable House he had the nerve to get up and brand a group of employees of a certain station as a bunch of "fairies." Now if -

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

MR. MURPHY: Let me state my case, just a moment. You have been talking for two days -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could we have a ruling on the point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Would the honourable member like to rephrase his statement?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I hate to tell a lie but if I want to continue with my few words I will just say that the honourable member for Bell Island has done nothing whatever to bring forth a case of any evidence against anybody or any misrepresentations against anybody, nothing in the world.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Now the honourable member has put it in a different way but, Your Honour, he has not retracted the original statement and I demand, Your Honour, that the member for St. John's Centre retract the statement that he made. I want to point out to the honourable member in this House, Mr. Speaker, that the statement that I made that he referred to

MR. NEARY:

about a certain radio station in this city, I later apologized in this House for that statement and the honourable member, if he is an honourable man and a man of principle and honour that he pretends to be, then I demand that he retract that statement that he made. Sir.

MR. MURPHY: If the honourable member will retract the statement he made about the six members of Parliament in Ottawa, I will retract my statement.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not entering into a bargain with the honourable gentleman because in my speech the words that I used were not unparliamentary but the words that the honourable member for St. John's Centre used are unparliamentary. not becoming to this House and as the honourable member for Bonavista North says, He should be put in the penalty box and he should be made retract.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or he should be removed from the House.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Speaker, if I could have a word on the point of order. The question, Sir, is not what the honourable member for Bell Island has uttered before this House concerning anybody outside the House. Whether what he said was ill-advised or not, some may think it ill-advised, some may not think it ill-advised but that is not the question before the House. The question before the House that Your Honour has to decide is whether the statements made by the Minister of Provincial Affairs were unparliamentary statements and if they were, Sir, then he has to withdraw the statements made concerning the member for Bell Island.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair rules that the statement was unparliamentary and would like for the honourable member to retract his statement.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, on a direction from you I will withdraw these words. As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, after the motion was

MR. MURPHY:

moved and the honourable member for Bell Island spoke to it. I wanted to speak at the time to, I said I could avoid any further discussion on this particular bill because I gave notice today of a bill dealing with the selfsame matters that had been discussed. This bill was drawn, and I may bring the date, on January 7, 1972 but it just was not brought in because the motion was moved the past few days and I think the honourable members on the other side will appreciate that you just cannot draft bills in three or four hours.

So we are discussing this motion and I think it is a motion very well taken, the ideas behind it are very well taken and following the debate reference was made to character assassination. If you like, not only in credit but in many other ways and I have already referred to statements that were made in this House, whether you retract them or not, reminds me of the story of this lady who went to her minister and she said, "Look, I said something about so and so next door -" It was not a minister of cabinet; it was a clergyman. She said, "I said something about Mrs. so and so next door, what can I do to rectify it?" He said, "You get a bag of feathers and go out there in the door and throw them in the wind and when you have every feather back then you have undone the damage that you have done."

Now that is why I was so interested and his statement appealed to me. The member for Bonavista North the other day where he said the language in this House should be, at least, an example to other people. There are a bunch of young people here today and they heard today that Mr. Carter, Mr. McGrath, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Lundrigan, Mr. Peddle are silly persons, silly, absolutely silly, not absolutely but just silly. Now these young people were told that and here we

MR. MURPHY:

have six honourable gentlemen. In my opinion, in Ottawa and I include Mr. Jamieson, six from Newfoundland representing this province of ours who were elected by the people and I say this that in my opinion none of them are silly. I think they are good sensible gentlemen and I think that statement should not have been made in this House. He did not have to take it back. He just got -

AN HON. MEMBER: Has he been fined yet?

MR. MURPHY: The honourable member for Bonavista North is building a bull pen or a penalty box. But on this, and I think everybody is aware that I cannot discuss this bill in any detail at the present time as it has not been properly placed before the House, but I can assure the opposition and everybody in the House that this bill is fairly comprehensive. If the honourable member for Bell Island or White Bay South or anybody else wants to add something in this bill I am sure that they can get up and speak on it. They have the perfect right to debate it and discuss it the same as anybody else. It is one of many bills that have been brought in and there are others with regard to credit card granting and this type of thing and I think the honourable gentleman said this was in the machine before. I think, this government took over.

So as I say, to put off any further debate on the thing and I certainly hope that this will serve the purpose that this bill will be introduced as soon as possible. Members will be given copies and they will be allowed to read them and go through them, study them the same as anybody else and if there is

anybody that has anything to add to the Bill or anything else I am sure that this House is here to debate these Bills, do everything in their power to provide the best legislation we can. It is something that is always talked about the rights of creditors, the rights of this one, but everybody has a right and it is not only people that charge stuff but the guy who sells them has a right to find out if this guy is really, is he a good reliable gentleman in the life insurance business. We have the same thing we sell a lot of insurance on non-medical terms we take a statement from a client, he tells us this that and the other thing. Many cases after investigations are made we find that people have been misrepresenting the facts, so it is something that we have to consider in all phases of human justice and human charity. I think we have to look at the whole thing.

As far as we are concerned I think I speak on behalf of the government because after all government is introducing the Bill through my department. We are quite prepared to place this Bill there for complete discussion and to protect the people who are looking for credit. There are many phases there and I think they are pretty well covered by a lot of the members just what pattern should be followed. This is going to be looked after. But for Heavens Sake when we are discussing things let us discuss them and try to discuss them in a proper vein, the honourable member for Bell Island always seems to be a little bit to me off the way, I think he is the only person in Newfoundland that took the Dale Carnegie course backward. I may be wrong. I do not know if that is unparliamentary or not. But he certainly, I think he certainly did it. His remarks are anything but charitable towards other members or other people. Quite honestly he speaks at great length, he always manages to drag individual members into it I do not think there is a place for it. But honestly, in my opinion we can do without it, I think the newer members particularly are I do not think there is any great applause for this type of thing. We have

a lot of business to be done. We were sent here by our people to do the business of the House, as I said earlier, I mentioned it to the honourable gentlemen earlier in the day, I showed - yesterday the unfortunate thing I went over to show him the Bill when he introduced it but I told him today we could save a lot of debate because this Bill was coming before the House. So the only thing that I can say Mr. Speaker, is that this Bill is drawn up it is as comprehensive as the previous government could make it, we may make a few alterations but faithfully it is all set out in that so, I do not think it is necessary for any select committee.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like one brief comment on this resolution. As the honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs has pointed out to the House a Bill will be introduced encompassing the protection that has been referred to by the honourable member for Bell Island.

Now select committees make a great deal of sense in certain areas. Last year there was a select committee that was set up to bring back a report on a matter of great importance to the fishing industry. Select committees have been created again this year to study matters involving the functioning of this House.

But surely, Mr. Speaker, any issue that is capable of debate when a bill is before the House this is what the House of Assembly is all about. If the honourable members on the opposite side do not agree with the bill when it comes before the House, if they have any amendments or substance they will be given the kind of consideration that they deserve, and they will be implemented.

So, for that reason Mr. Speaker we on this side of the House cannot support this resolution. Now, Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet with the leave of the House I would like to make a very brief announcement, if I may of some importance.

I would like to inform honourable members that this afternoon the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities handed down their decision in the application by CN. for a rate increase in the passenger fares on the



busses operating within the province of Newfoundland. I am very pleased to inform the House that the government won its case. As you know Mr. Speaker, the government opposed the application, the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities have dismissed completely the application of CN and directed that CN pay the cost of the hearing.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable minister will allow, I am sure he would like the House to know that it was the previous administration who appointed Mr. O'Neill. I was Acting Minister of Justice at the time and if there is credit, and credit there should be in this particular case, to be given then it should be shared around in an unpartisan fashion, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the instructions were given the bill will be paid. So more power to the present administration. The glow of non-partisanship which suffuses the Minister of Justice, emanating ('emanates' might be the right word) an aura propels me into the debate. I have listened with a very great deal of interest to the speeches made by my colleague for White Bay South and my colleague for Bell Island in between the television cameras, and more and more this House is coming to exist, I decided, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of one minute on the television news. The honourable gentleman not been asked today, it is an off day, his photogenic colleague the Minister of Education is up there today.

But, Mr. Speaker, after listening to the speech made by the Minister of Provincial Affairs and the speech, short though it might have been, by the Minister of Justice, I do feel I should say a word or two, first of all on the question of a select committee.

Now both honourable gentlemen have been in this House as long as I have and the gentleman from St. John's Centre who is the Minister of Provincial Affairs has been in the House longer than I have. He may not be there for a longer time in total, but he has been returned by the people of St. John's and I believe on three occasions, 1962 -

MR. MURPHY: Four.

MR. ROBERTS: Four!

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I want it for the record. Four times. Four, well

MR. ROBERTS: the honourable gentleman has five fingers on one hand, so he is good for a fifth time after that he gets into trouble. He has been returned. He has been here since 1962 which makes him one of the veterans. Indeed only the gentleman from Fogo who is unfortunately absent today because of illness in his family, I may add for the benefit of the Premier, his son-in-law has not been to visit him recently.

MR. MOORES: I am sorry, I did not hear you.

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, I said, the honourable gentleman for Fogo is absent because of illness in his family, but I added for the benefit for the Premier that the gentleman's son-in-law has not been to visit him recently. I think the Premier knows what I am referring to, if not I will leave it to him to puzzle it out.

Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to hear the remarks by the Minister of Provincial Affairs because he has obviously missed completely the point of a select committee or the purpose of a select committee. He points out and although we cannot anticipate the debate which will come on, I believe, three bills of which he gave notice at three o'clock today, He points out that there are a number of bills on the Order Paper or which will appear on tomorrow's Order Paper which, to an extent we do not know - we have not seen the bills, but to an extent and possibly to a total extent will deal with the same subject matter as the Resolution which stands in the name of the honourable gentleman for Bell Island.

That is good and I congratulate the ministry on bringing in this legislation. I think it is good legislation and I was one of those who had a hand in bringing it up. I think it is time we had this in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, to say, as the honourable gentleman did and as his colleague the Minister of Justice repeated, to say that the introduction of a bill will serve to replace the purpose which a select committee could accomplish or indeed will obviate that purpose that, Sir, I submit is to miss completely the point of a select committee.

MR. ROBERTS: Now if you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, at the risk of telling Your Honour what Your Honour already well knows, a bill will come before the House and it will be debated in principle at second reading stage and at committee stage it will be debated in detail and clauses can be discussed, at third reading, as its first reading is usually a formality, unless there is a six months hoist or something along those lines.

Mr. Roberts.

That is fine. We can discuss the bill and we will discuss it. But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot in the House have before us witnesses or anybody who could make any contribution to the debate other than the forty-two of us in this House. Indeed that is the whole purpose of the House. There are only forty-two men who can sit within this bar. There are only forty-two men who can speak in this House. One of the things which my colleagues and I feel we should do in this question is take advantage of the expertise which exist outside this House. I think as a member of the House we should all be prepared to admit as much as it goes against our grain, that there are expertise in Newfoundland beyond the sum of expertise and knowledge which is captured by the forty-two of us here. The select committee will allow us to call these people, Sir. We could have witnesses. We could have the bill discussed. We could hear from the various trade associations in particular the credit bureau, the organization run very effectively by Mr. Stephen French, which is probably the primary organization in this field in Newfoundland. We can hear from various groups including the consumers. We could hear, if we wish, from Dr. Bhattacharya and the Human Rights Commission. The gentleman from Bonavista South should welcome it. I think he is treasurer of the Human Rights Commission. Is it secretary or treasurer?

MR. MORGAN: Treasurer.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I hope they have a lot of money. I know the hon. gentleman will guard it closely. But we could have these groups before us, Mr. Speaker. We could question them. We could ask their comments on sections in the bill. We could seek their advice. That a select committee will do, Sir. We cannot do that in the House as the hon. gentlemen will agree.

MR. MURPHY: Is this what the hon. member intended or had in mind when drafting this bill?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes that is one of the things we had in mind. There were a number of others, of course, Sir. But one of the reasons why we took the select committee route as opposed to moving a bill which we could have done - it is not a bill involving I submit the expenditure of funds. It is quite in order for a member of the House, other than a member of government, to move it. We had hoped to have groups come before us to discuss these problems, comment upon the legislation. I think this can only be done by a select committee. The Throne Speech and the Premier on opening day, and he has made the statement both before and after - I am not going to go after the Premier this time. I am complimenting him. He can relax for a moment or so. The Premier has time and time again enunciated the administration policy - we are going to go until 6:00 P.M. It is our day. We have a half hour but I will not take it all. Nothing is getting wrong with the Leader of the Opposition. He is enjoying his role and looking forward to a successful three or four year term here. I do not mind the hon. gentleman looking at his watch, Mr. Speaker. It is when he begins to shake it that I know someone on his side is speaking.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: If the hon. gentleman wishes to say something, I will yield. It cannot be any worse than the speech. Mr. Speaker, could we do without the -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, it is my colleague. They are not strangers in the House. They have to laugh with me. The hon. gentleman opposite has to laugh at the Premier's witticisms. He has more than I have to laugh at me now. Mr. Speaker, seriously, there

MR. ROBERTS: A purpose which a Select Committee can serve. The Premier in announcing the administration's policy has time and time again laid it down. We can only agree with this, it is right. The administration wished to involve people, to allow citizens to participate.

The other day the House Leader put on the Order Paper and indeed it has been passed by the House, a motion to set up a Select Committee and one of the jobs with which the committee is charged, one of the tasks referred to them by the motion constituting them is to set up a system of permanent committees so that members of the House can become more intimately and more effectively involved with legislation. We all know that the average member is not involved in any meaningful way in making legislation.

Mr. Speaker, all of these things can be accomplished by a Select Committee. They cannot be accomplished, I submit, by the normal process of having a Bill introduced and read at second reading, then put through committee in the third reading stages. They can only be done if we have a Select committee. That is one of the reasons, perhaps the chief reason why we chose, in drafting this motion, to make it in the form which it took, namely a Resolution that a Select Committee be Appointed.

I would ask the Premier, the head of the administration, if perhaps he would reconsider with his colleagues the statement of policy made by the Minister of Provincial Affairs and repeated by the Minister of Justice, to the effect that they . . . they the government, the members on the other side of the House, were not prepared to vote in favour of this resolution. This is not a partisan political matter, Sir, it is a matter that I submit is outside partisan politics. It is very much part of politics. It is not one on which a government scores points or an opposition score points, it is a matter which affects every citizen of our province.

I do not need to go on in detail, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman

from White Bay South and the gentleman from Bell Island made their substantive points in connection with the merits of the resolution. All I can say is that this is a matter which has concerned many of us for some time. There is a frightening amount of information being amassed now and I suspect properly amassed. The gentleman from St. John's South I suspect is also interested in this type of problem, because it involves a real civil liberties problem.

We now have in this province, Mr. Speaker, let me see - we each have a Medicare number, we each have a hospital insurance number or if we have ever been involved with hospitals in any way, in hospital or treated as an out-patient, there is a file, a record of that. It became quite necessary, Sir. We have a motor vehicle number, we have on the federal level social insurance numbers and of course the income tax people are amassing God alone knows what information about any of us. Fortunately, by law they are restricted to using that for tax purposes.

Mr. Speaker, there is an immense amount of information being accumulated by governments. All of it proper, all of it necessary, but it raises frightening implications, Sir. The computers are marvellous devices and one of the projects that the computer people look at is developing new systems. The other day the Minister of Supply and Services tabled the report of the Crown Corporation that has been set up - the Newfoundland and Labrador, (whatever it is called) Computer Services Limited, the corporation which administers the government computer work as well as the University's. The government's computer work includes the Power Commission and the Medical Care Commission.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite theoretically possible and it has been suggested that it may make a very great deal of sense to marry (and that is the technical phrase, I use it only as a technical phrase) to marry all of the information that is stored in the records of the Government of this Province. That



That will mean that one series of buttons to be pushed, the code to bring out of the computer the information will produce for each individual - a file showing his full medical history, at least since April 1, 1969, when Medicare became the law of the land, his hospital record since 1956, his driving record and Lord only knows what else? I suppose his social security assessments in the Department of Finance are codified if he has ever received a cheque from the Government of this Province, whether it be a salary cheque, and that includes about 20,000 people in Newfoundland, the Civil Service, the Public Service, the teachers, or if he is one of the 150,000... How many people have got a cheque from S.S.R. over the years? Half the population?

So if you add all the people who have received social assistance cheques, all done by computer, marvellous, sends them out more quickly. Sometimes it even sends them out more effectively.

So, Mr. Speaker, you do have a very real problem. It grows when you get into the whole field of personal information. How much information should a government have? For what should they use it? What controls should be put upon it? Should it be restricted? How? The Computer Corporation down in the basement at Elizabeth Towers, Sir, have double locks and time locks on all of their data. That is fine. Confidentiality is an important principle but is it confidential? What controls are there? If the confidentiality is breached, what remedies are open to the citizen? Do I, as a citizen, have the right to go to the authorities and say, "Please let me see my file? What do you know about me? What do you have about me? What are you told? The Credit Bureau, do I have the right to ask the Credit Bureau for all the information about me? If I do, is it a statutory right?" It should be. It is not a matter of grace from the credit granting or the credit measuring organization.

These are important questions, Sir, they go to the right of the whole civil liberties question as we understand it in Newfoundland. Our

civil liberties here, Sir, are not like some countries, a threat to them. It is not that we will be thrown in jail for speaking our mind or for having an assembly providing it is not a riot or an unlawful assembly. That happens in other countries. Just as in other countries, when you lose an election you get shot, here Mr. Speaker you just get put in opposition, sometimes it would be better to be shot I think. I will have to see about that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that how you feel?

MR. ROBERTS: How I feel? Having to face the hon. gentleman almost would make suicide preferable but not quite. When Tom Burgess represented Labrador West in his own inimitable way, he had a whole collection of crushers, I guess which my friend from Bell Island has now inherited, so he will have them and be around. The hon. gentleman looks crushed not crushing.

If I were as far out of this House here, as the hon. gentleman, I think I would learn and listen for a little while and then I would leap in, and welcome he be, and welcome he be. He adds something to the House, Mr. Speaker, I will not say what, because we do have parliamentary rules.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is an important matter, it is one that effects every citizen in the province. It is not a partisan matter. The gentleman from Placentia West who has a concern for civil liberties, I am sure he is as concerned with this as we are. I am not going to embarrass him by asking him to speak because right now the official line on that side is that they will not agree with this, Mr. Speaker, but I hope the Premier will reconsider it. I know the hon. gentleman is concerned. I am not trying to put him on the spot. I know the hon. gentleman from St. John's South is concerned and I believe the hon. gentleman from Bonavista South is also concerned. He has been very active in the human rights movement.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: If the hon. gentleman wishes, we could adjourn this debate and leave it on the Order Paper until next week. We could do that. What I would suggest is that in so doing the government undertake to consider, and that is all they could do, the House Leader could consider whether these bills could be referred to a select committee which could have orders to report back. We are going to adjourn in a couple of days until the end of the month. The two things are not mutually exclusively, Sir, indeed I believe they are quite compatible.

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. Leader of the Opposition like to yield for a moment?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. MARSHALL: We would be certainly quite happy and quite prepared, in accordance with the manner in which we are operating the House this year, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition would like to adjourn the debate now to consider this farther and when the next Private Member's Day comes up, we will certainly then be able to fully indicate as to whether or not we will support the motion. I think this is probably the better way. We just got notice of it yesterday and if the hon. member for Bell Island would concur with this procedure I can assure the hon. members on the opposite side that the motion will be given full and careful consider by us in conjunction with the legislation which we already have planned.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, that is a very generous offer by the House Leader. House Leader, if I may say, Sir, you are doing a grand job of running the House. I sometimes think the rest of us are superfluous.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are almost as close as Frankie and Johnnie, lovers.

MR. ROBERTS: All right, I will not attempt to sing, Mr. Speaker. Provided that the government will undertake that the bills do not go beyond second reading until they have reached a decision on this question.

MR. MARSHALL: This offer is made, Mr. Speaker, certainly with the upmost good spirit. We on the government side of the House for the first time in twenty-three years now operate from our caucus. We consult our caucus every week and I think it is the first time the government caucus in this province has really met for twenty-three years on a regular basis so we will be out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman is out order, I will just yield.

MR. MARSHALL: The honourable Leader of the Opposition, I can certainly give him the undertaking that the bills which were introduced today in first reading will not go past first reading until this matter, with respect to the appointment of the Select Committee, is determined. Of course, this matter is not for me to say, not for the honourable Premier to say, it is not for the honourable member for St. John's South or Bonavista South, as we operate as a government, a democratic government, Caucus meets, caucus makes these decisions and we will be only too happy - If the Leader of the Opposition will give us this opportunity we will show them democracy in action.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very generous of the

MR. ROBERTS:

gentleman who wears the seamless cloak, the coat of many colours, I am glad that his colleagues the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Provincial Affairs were not speaking ex cathedra as the honourable gentleman is. We will gladly agree to adjourn the debate.

Just to summarize it. We do think this is a matter which a select committee might look at and the reference of the bills to it would be a means of allowing witnesses to be called and other points of view to be heard. It might very well produce better legislation. It would certainly implement -

We have fifteen minutes, whatever you two have agreed to do. I do not know what you agreed to.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I do not intend to go on beyond what I need to. Hold on now, the verbal from the center.

MR. MURPHY: No, I was just - If the honourable member would permit me?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, of course. I have at least as much good will as the others have.

MR. MURPHY: I was just saying if we had a look at the bills and then act on them, I do not think they would bar us from developing the matter further even through a select committee and then the matter could be brought up, I think. But let us look at what is being prepared now.

MR. ROBERTS: He does not know anything about good will. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister of Provincial Affairs. I think we have made our point, a resolution which originally was doomed to defeat now has a retrieve and I think it is well and good. We think it is a good resolution, one that should be looked at and we are delighted the

MR. ROBERTS:

government have agreed to look at the matter. That being so and all the spirit of almost Christmas good will around here, I move the adjournment of this debate.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it is not our intention to keep the House any longer now because there are no more motions of private members and it is now six o'clock. However, before adjourning I think I should point out probably the time table for the next forty-eight hours anyway. We intend to adjourn until three o'clock tomorrow afternoon at which time we hope to bring on for second reading the act with respect to the Stephenville Linerboard Project. We will be meeting tomorrow night for a night session, Friday morning and Friday afternoon.

So with these words then, Mr. Speaker, I move that the orders of the day stand deferred and that this House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday at 3:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, it is not debatable, but I wonder if the House Leader, the government have been good enough to supply my colleague and myself with copies of the bill. They have done it on a confidential basis and as a result not even my colleague or I can discuss it with them before second reading, so if that were agreed, and further, could the honourable gentleman tell us when the printed bill might be available particularly the schedules. I do not care if they are printed but I would like to have a copy because if I can divulge, the guts of the bill is in the schedule not in the legislation.

MR. MARSHALL: May I inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons why we are not meeting tomorrow morning is purely and simply because we realize that the opposition would like to see the printed

MR. MARSHALL:

bill and the schedule. Unfortunately they will not be ready until about nine o'clock. Now at nine o'clock or ten o'clock tomorrow morning; we could theoretically bring it on at eleven o'clock but we do not choose to implement this procedure. We realize the opposition will want to encross themselves in it a bit more, as well as the schedules.

So in answer to the honourable Leader of the Opposition's question I can say early tomorrow morning at sometime between the hour of nine and ten o'clock when the printed bill is up we will get it to the opposition office forthwith.

MR. ROBERTS: In the meanwhile I will be able to look at the bill tonight. No, I have not spoken to anybody.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if that clarifies the matter for the honourable Leader of the Opposition I move then we do adjourn in accordance with the motion.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 4, at 3:00 P.M.