



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 2

2nd Session

Number 7

VERBATIM REPORT

Monday, February 19, 1973

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900

1901

1902

1903

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

HON. F.D.MOORES (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute at this time to Mr. Harold Mifflin, who passed away yesterday at the age of 62. In the passing of Harold Mifflin, Newfoundland has lost a well-known and great son. His activities in the fishing industry have made him a recognized leader. I pay tribute to his dedicated promotion of the salt fish industry and his outstanding service with the Fish Trades Association and the Newfoundland Association of Fish Exporters.

On behalf of the government I move that this House go on record as recording its sympathy on the death of Mr. Mifflin, and that this expression of sympathy be communicated to his family.

HON. E.M.ROBERTS (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my colleagues I am happy to second that motion and to associate ourselves with the sentiments advanced by the Premier. This is the second time in as many days in this House that we have been called upon to note the death of a prominent citizen.

Mr. Harold Mifflin was a relatively young man. Bishop O'Reilly had lived his three score and ten and indeed was a year or two beyond that, whereas Mr. Mifflin was I believe sixty-two at the time of his death. I think he was probably well-known to most members of the House. He was not only a leading figure in the salt fish industry as the Premier has reminded us and in the fresh fish industry, through the family enterprises, he took a leading part in the community life of Catalina and of the whole area, that whole tip of the Bonavista Peninsula. I believe he was, for a number of years, Mayor of Catalina. (Am I correct?) and he served in a number of other civic capacities.

I had the pleasure to know him fairly well over the years. He was the sort of man of whom Newfoundland could be proud and I am sure

all Newfoundland will mourn his loss. I believe his widow survives as well as his brother, Mr. Justice Mifflin of the High Court. I would hope the Clerk will send resolutions to both of them. I assume the motion will pass unanimously.

Motion, that the House go on record as recording its sympathies on the death of Harold Mifflin and that this expression of sympathy be communicated to his family, carried.

PETITIONS:

MR. F.J.AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Arnold's Cove. The prayer of the petition is for the upgrading and paving of the road from the Trans-Canada to the Town of Arnold's Cove.

The petition itself is signed by over 500 individuals, Mr. Speaker, and the prayer of the petition reads as follows; "We the undersigned residents of the Town of Arnold's Cove hereby affix our names on a petition. The request is for the upgrading and paving of roads in our town. This request applies not only to the main road which is under the control of the department but also local roads and branch roads which provide access to the various sections of our town.

Some of these roads are under the control of the Town Council of Arnold's Cove. The condition of the roads in this municipality is one of the most pressing and hazardous problems which confront the residents. In several places the sides of the roads have become dangerously eroded and culverts have been broken down. Eroded roads, broken culverts, plugged drains and potholes all play a contributing factor to making our roads impassable."

Then they find out, Mr. Speaker, and I will not delay the House with all the details, but they bring or ask to have brought to the attention of this honourable House two very important factors which

merit consideration from the Department to which this petition will relate and that is the pronounced increase in the population of this municipality. In fact, Arnold's Cove in 1961 had a population of 213, in 1966 a population of 378 and in the last census, in 1971, it had a population of over 919, which shows an increase of over two hundred percent since 1961, and in the last five years another increase of one hundred percent in population.

This pronounced increase, Mr. Speaker, results from a large number of people moving from the islands in Placentia Bay and also, of course, from individuals seeking or obtaining employment at Procon. Because of the increased

population and also because of the proximity of the town to the Come-by-Chance complex, it is imperative that the road in this municipality and in particular, of course, this main road from the Trans Canada to Arnold's Cove be upgraded and paved.

I ask that this petition be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. S.A. NEARY: I support the petition presented by the hon. member for Placentia East on behalf of 500 residents of Arnold's Cove to have their road upgraded and paved from the Trans Canada Highway down through the community. The irony of all this, Mr. Speaker, is that Arnold's Cove is a community that never should have been. The people moved in from the islands in Placentia Bay against the wishes of the resettlement people and it is probably a good thing that they did because they have built up one of the most prosperous communities, I suppose, in that part of Newfoundland. Now, of course, it has become all the more important because of the construction of the oil refinery at Come-by-Chance. I think it is a very reasonable request, Sir. Unfortunately, the Minister of Highways or the Minister of Transportation and Communications is not in his seat today but I am sure the petition will reach his desk. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the government will see their way clear to grant the prayer of the petition.

On motion petition received.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

HON. A. J. MURPHY (Minister of Social Assistance) Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table a copy of the Child Welfare Amendment Regulations, 1972.

NOTICE OF MOTION

HON. T. A. HICKMAN: (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act."

QUESTIONS

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways but he is not here. I assume he is in Corner Brook attending -

AN HON. MEMBER: He is snow bound.

MR. ROBERTS: He is snow bound. Well that is appropriate -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I assumed he was in Corner Brook at His Excellency's funeral. Perhaps in his absence the hon. the Premier could take the question as notice. I doubt that he has the answer but he could find it out. By way of explanation, Sir, I have had a number of phone calls from the Community of Hampden. Apparently the community has now been cut off by road for four days. The one tractor in the area, I am told, is at The Beaches which, as the Premier knows, is a community not far from Hampden. It is out of fuel. There is no fuel in Hampden. I am told that the nearest fuel depot is Deer Lake. The people are wandering what can be done to give them communications. The matter has become more urgent. There was a death there. The doctor, Dr. Misik, an employee of the Department of Health or the Minister of Health, died and I gather it was a fairly grim task of moving his remains to Deer Lake and on the town for burial. As always there was a pregnant woman who was coming into labour and it took eleven hours to move her to, I assume, Corner Brook. The problem is a real one. I wonder if the Premier (I realize he can only take it as notice) would find out and perhaps let the House know.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition said, I will have to take it as notice but in the meantime, in the absence of the Minister of Highways, my office will follow through and find out what can be done so that the Minister of Highways will be in a position to answer the question on tomorrow.

MR. P.S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. Is it correct that the minister

Mr. Thoms

now has in his possession the Cook Report and if so could the minister inform this House if and when this report will be presented to this House?

HON. E. MAYNARD (Minister of Agriculture and Forests): Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is correct that I have a draft copy of the Cook Report. It has not been done up into final form. I assume it could not take any more than two or three weeks before it could be presented to the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Energy would indicate to the House when he plans on making a statement on the situation at the Buchan's Mine?

HON. L. BARRY (Minister of Mines and Energy): Mr. Speaker, I had this ready for this afternoon when an opportunity arose. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Bell Island requested information concerning reports with respect to the phasing down of Buchan's Mine. I believe this is the tenor of the question. I assume this arose from the newspaper reference and radio reports.

Mr. Speaker, as I am informed this is a perennial question that has arisen many times over the past years, the question of

how the Buchan's Mine would continue to operate and presumably in the past as today the matter has revolved around the ore reserves available to the mine. The information supplied me by my officials is that there are proven reserves in the Buchan's Mine for another five to six years. In fact there is a continuing exploration programme in effect there and really it is only when the reserves are proven and there is no exploration programme that you can get any idea of when the mine will close. The exploration programmes in the past have managed to find additional reserves. We are hopeful that the exploration programmes in the future will find other reserves and really that is the only information I could give. Other than that the officials of my department will be in continuous touch with the company so as to obtain adequate notice in the event that there is any change or any foreseeable time when the mine will be phasing out.

MR. S.A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. minister a supplementary question? Does the hon. minister know or is he aware and perhaps if he is not he could find out from his officials if exploration and diamond drilling at Buchans has been discontinued because I think this is how the rumors started that somebody found out that the exploration in Buchans had been discontinued?

MR. BARRY: No, the information that I have from my officials, Mr. Speaker, is that the exploration programme will be continuing at least for another year and the way it is worded here, another year or so. So that is about all I can say. I can check and if there is anything different to report I could report back to the hon. member.

MR. NEARY: Well I would appreciate it, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. minister would double check and I thank him for answering the question. I would like to direct a question also to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. I would like to ask the minister what time the minister or the government intends to table the Hattenhauer Royal

Commission Report on safety and health hazards at the phosphorous plant in Long Harbour.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to rule this question out of order since I feel it could be placed on the Order Paper. I do not think the answer is an urgent one that requires the answer at the present moment. So I feel that this question should go on the Order Paper.

MR. P.S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation. Could the minister inform this House as to what has been the rate of increase in the Hoyles Home each year since 1966?

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member's question can be placed on the Order Paper as well.

MR. E.W. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. the Premier? Is he in a position to inform the House if there are discussions going on between the government and Spencer Lake regarding the development to take place at Bay d'Espoir and if so, what kind of developments are proposed?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, to answer that, sometime ago I was involved in discussions along that line. Since that time for some months I have not but I understand that the Minister of Industrial Development has

MR. MOORES: had discussions. At what level they are right now, I do not think they are certainly at any conclusive stage but if he would care to bring the House up-to-date on where they are or whether he thinks it is in the best interest at this time to carry on negotiations privately, I think I would ask him to reply to the question.

HON. WM. DOODY, MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: Sir, the discussions are on on-going with the Lake Interests with regard to the Bay D'Espoir development. They are not sufficiently concrete at this time to be able to give a definitive answer to this House. We have had proposals which we are considering. We are discussing them with the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Association. We want to get the federal people involved in this. It is a pretty large and far-reaching area of concern that would be of tremendous benefit to that area of Newfoundland if indeed we can get it moving. I undertake to keep this House informed of progress when we have anything tangible to report.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable the Premier. Would the Premier indicate to the House if the government or the Premier have had any discussions with the officials of the phosphorus plant at Long Harbour concerning production problems or lack of production? If so, will the Premier indicate to the House what action is going to be taken about these problems? If there will be an increase in the work force or if there will be a cut back in the work force or just what the situation is? If the Premier has the information, I would like for him to give it to the House?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that the same information might have been in the honourable member's question before and as such should very well go on the Order Paper.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation. In view of the report which the minister tabled in this House, I believe it was on Thursday, would the minister consider subsidizing the rates that are now paid by eleven, at least eleven of the occupants which are I believe \$617 per month?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I do believe the honourable gentleman's question is one, very specifically and clearly of government policy which I think would be precluded as a question in this area -

MR. ROBERTS: On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is completely wrong. The citations in Beauchesne say that an oral question on the precedents may be allowed if it contains an area of government policy that is very large. I mean, it is quite in order for Mr. Speaker to rule that the question should be for the Order Paper. It is quite in order for the honourable minister to decline to answer - both of those. But the honourable gentleman from St Mary's is completely out of order if he thinks a question may not be asked on a matter of government policy. As a matter of fact many of the questions that are asked are a matter or are directed towards the matter of government policy. If the question period is not, Your Honour, to be allowed to deal with matters of government policy, then let us end what would then be only a charade. If we are going to develop a meaningful question period in this House, let us not have this nit-picking from the honourable gentleman from St Mary's.

I think his point of order is specious, Sir.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, before your ruling if I may, again I think a consultation with authorities will show that questions which are anticipatory of government policy are in a somewhat different category. Naturally both the honourable gentleman and I both await your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: I think this is quite correct, questions that are said to anticipate government policy are out of order. I think the honourable gentleman's question was such.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the impending negotiations between the union and the company

at the phosphorous plant in Long Harbour. I wonder if he would be in a position to make a statement which I consider to be urgent, as to whether or not there has been any negotiation between the government and the plant concerning production problems at Long Harbour?

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member for Bell Island in raising the question. It requires basically the same answer as before, and thus could be put on the Order Paper.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs, a Bill, "An Act Respecting An Administrator For Lake Apartments" carried.

MR. SPEAKER: When shall this bill be read a second time?

HON. F.M. ROBERTS (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we do want to know exactly the reasoning behind the bill, which of course the minister, in second reading, I assume will explain. If that is so, and if it is what we understand it may be, we are prepared to consent on our side to allow it to go winging through today. We certainly do agree to second reading, in any event.

On motion bill ordered read a second time now, by leave:

HON. T. HICKEY: (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT): Mr. Speaker, the principle of this bill is to provide for the administrator for Lake Apartments. The reason for the bill coming before the House is because of the situation which exists in that apartment building at the present time. I could give detailed information, Mr. Speaker, as regards to the operation there, but there is a case before the courts and that I believe precludes giving certain information for fear it would prejudice one side or the other.

However, I can inform the House that the situation is such that it is urgent. The tenants are unable to decide to whom they should pay their

rent. The tenants have been, certain tenants have been threatened. They have been harassed. There is a state of chaos existing at the moment.

This bill all it would do and it provides that it be done only in this particular case, it is not as though it were to remain a statute or apply to any other. It is a one time issue so as to speak. It provides for the appointing of an administrator to receive the rents, to hold such rents in trust, to administer the normal affairs of that apartment building, to use what monies that may be necessary, from the rents collected, to provide for normal maintenance and services.

Mr. Speaker, it is only out of the urgency of it that the bill comes before the House. We attempted to sort this matter out by other means and as I said, because of the fact that the case is before the House, that the case is before the courts rather, that was impossible.

I might also point out that one of the claimants in the case before the courts made application and the courts refused that application. My understanding is that it was refused on the basis that it might prejudice the case.

So, we have no alternative if we are going to protect the rights of the tenants but to take this step which we hesitated in taking but it has reached the stage where the hydro may be cut off at any time, where people are being threatened with eviction and certainly the rights and the general well-being of the tenants is not being protected and I feel that the only responsible move is to move in this direction. It is with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I move second reading.

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

MR. P. WELLS: The minister having introduced this bill and explained it, I feel that having perhaps more factual knowledge than any other member of the House about this particular matter, because I happen to be acting in the case before the courts, I think I ought to speak.

I think I ought to make clear at the very outset that the principle and the matters set forth in this bill do not confer any advantage on any party before the court. Therefore, I have no hesitation in speaking on the bill.

The gist of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that there is an action before the Supreme Court of Newfoundland which is going on at this time and is to resume again shortly, to decide who owns Lake Apartments, because that fact has been disputed for some months past.

As the hon. the minister has said, the fact that there is a dispute has put hardship on the tenants of Lake Apartments, Limited. I

think we have got to - we are at the stage at the moment where approximately eighty-five percent of the tenants are paying rent to Lake Apartments, Limited. The other fifteen percent are paying rent to the other purported owner. This is an intolerable situation. A lot of tenants or a certain number of tenants have decided and I cannot blame them in the circumstances, that they ought to pay no rent at all. Of course that is also a ridiculous situation because there are heavy mortgage commitments to be made on this apartment building. Also, Newfoundland Light and Power have to be paid and the other people who provide services have to be paid, snow clearing, etc.

I feel that although the case, the actual hearing of the case in court may well conclude within a matter of three or four weeks, it may be the judgement may not be rendered for a matter of perhaps months because it is a very complex matter. I feel on the question of principle of this bill, I feel there is not any doubt that it ought to be passed. I can see no case or no way there it can confer an advantage on either of the parties before the court. It simply protects the tenants in that they can then pay their rent to the administrator who would be appointed under the act. The administrator could then pay the mortgage payments which are quite hefty and have to be met from the rents. The administrator can provide for snow-clearing, for payment of Newfoundland Light and Power, all these bills which must be paid in a regular fashion otherwise the apartment grinds to a halt and the persons who suffer most in that case would be the tenants. So, I have no hesitation in supporting the principle of this bill, Mr. Speaker.

It occurred to me just before the hon. minister introduced the bill, and I will deal with this in detail when we come to clause three, that I think perhaps something should be added.

Yes, that is a point that I would deal with too when we come to clause by clause consideration of the bill. The other point is at the

end of clause three subsection one, all matters arising during the period of the administration and I would add, and any actions now outstanding against any tenant for non-payment of rent shall be stayed until the determination of ownership by the Supreme Court.

The reason that I would ask the House to include that section is

this, that I understand, even as late as this morning, that certain actions have been taken in court against tenants for non-payment of rent. I can appreciate the position in which the tenants find themselves, being sued and not knowing to whom they should pay the rent and in fact the court having great difficulty in determining the outcome of such an action anyway. I think that all actions for payment of rent should be stayed, actions that is by any or either of the claimants. But of course, if the administrator (and this is implicit in the act anyway) as appointed by the minister wants to take action for rent, of course he would have every right to do so.

I will, in some detail, when we come to that particular clause deal with it and propose that that also should be added. I think the honourable Leader's point about negligence, that could be something else that could be considered also. I would like to stress to the House that for the sake of these tenants in Lake Apartments, I feel that this bill ought to be passed and an administrator enabled to be appointed.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, from our point of view, we have no objection to the bill and we are quite prepared to support it having heard the explanation of the minister and even more helpfully, the honourable gentleman from St. John's South.

I know nothing at all about the affairs of Lake Apartments Limited or whatever the company is actually called other than what I have read in the newspapers. I may say that it is one of the more interesting and Graustarkian cases of which I have read in our courts in sometime. I have no idea what the rights and wrongs of it are and in any event that is not our function as a legislature. I am naturally somewhat reluctant in ordinary circumstances to see the government or this House act in respect of any individual action before the courts.

February 19, 1973, Tape 157, Page 2 -- apb

I think it is a precedent that should be approached very warily because it would be very easy to get to the stage where any contestants in an action before Her Majesty's Court could come to us and ask us to resolve it by legislation.

I see the Minister of Justice is nodding in agreement. I think that it is a principle that we could all agree on quite heartily. In this case however, there does not seem to be any other way out of it. Perhaps we should have generic legislation of this sort. As I understand it, all we are being asked to do here, we have a case where two parties claim each owns all or part of the estate, the Lake Apartments Limited or whatever the company is called. There is quite a considerable squabble as to who owes and who owns how much, what and to whom. The tenants are caught in the middle. I assume the tenants are quite willing to pay their rents if they could only find somebody who could receive the rent and give them a good receipt therefor. Also, as the gentleman from St. John's South has pointed out, somebody must pay the various mortgagees.

I assume that it is Central Mortgage. Does Mr. Bootwals hold a number, a whole series of mortgages, the second to the sixteenth inclusive or to that effect? He puts them forth as mortgages. Also of course, for the utilities, the hydro and what have you. We go along with it. I do hope it is not a precedent. I do hope that we do not get into this sort of situation again. If we do in Newfoundland, perhaps the government would wish to look at generic legislation. We are now getting a number of apartment buildings around. We have had the "trot around the block" with Mr. Craig Dobbin's enterprises, where the honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and latterly the gentleman from St. John's East Extern, the Minister of Provincial Affairs, sort of looked at something for months and in the end, much like "Humpty Dumpty", came out about where they started.

We are going to have more and more problems with apartments in this province because we are going to have more and more apartments. I assume the Landlord And Tenant Act will be back on the Order Paper this session if it has not made its appearance yet. But it is - is it back?

I am sorry. We need not have given it a second reading in a fit of weakness but it is basically a good piece of legislation and we may need more along these lines.

The only other point I will make is to follow up the point made by the gentleman from St. John's South, Sir. As I read section (3), although there are specific words it may touch the principle of the bill and I put it forth in that hope. As I read it, and I do not claim to be that learned in the law, the administrator, the gentleman acting as administrator can act negligently but as long as he does not act maliciously he is held harmless against any action. I do not agree with that. I think anybody should be required to act as a reasonably prudent man would in the circumstances and if whoever is to be appointed the administrator acts negligently then I think he should be prepared to take the consequences just as any other citizen would in the normal course of any business dealings.

So perhaps at committee stage we could look at that in addition to the point the gentleman from St. John's South has made about actions being taken in respect of grants that are claimed to be owed.

The only thing I would ask, Mr. Speaker, is if the minister in closing the debate, whenever that comes, could perhaps indicate what type of administrator he intends to appoint. I am sure he has given it some thought. Would he appoint a lawyer? Would he appoint the Registrar of the Supreme Court, I do not know if that is possible or not? I am concerned about the question of fees to make sure they are reasonable. I assume they will be borne by Lakeside Apartments Limited. These are points which should be dealt with as we do not want large fees being run up by somebody who is not qualified, we do not want large fees being run up by anybody. I think it would be helpful if the minister could assure us as I am sure is the case that he has a qualified administrator in mind whom he intends to appoint.

MR. NEARY: Another \$20,000 a year job.

MR. ROBERTS: No, it should not. That is the whole point it should not be another \$20,000 a year or even a \$10,000 a year job. Also since the fees in the long run will come out of the estate, out of Lakeside Apartments Limited - Well, I will yield to the hon. gentleman for St. John's South.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the hon. gentleman for St. John's South continues maybe the hon. members have noticed a group of students in the public galleries on my left. I intended to welcome these earlier but it was not possible for them to arrive. Amongst this group are twenty-five students from Neepawa Area Collegiate of Neepawa, Manitoba. This group with their teachers, Mr. and Mrs. Peter Isaac, are guests of twenty-four student city schools here. It is indeed a pleasure on behalf of all members of this hon. House for me to welcome you here today and trust that you will come back and see us again sometime.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour would perhaps like to remind the students in the galleries that our clock is a gift of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba when we became a province. I guess that is why the buffaloes are there, it is Manitoba's provincial symbol.

MR. SPEAKER: That is right. That is correct.

MR. R. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, on the point raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, it is not covered in the act and I am sure the minister will make it clear. My thinking in this matter, after it was raised, was that all costs, of course, of this would be borne by Lake Apartments Limited or by whomsoever owns the apartment after the court decides that. I certainly should not imagine and should not think that this ought to be, in any sense the cost of this borne by the public of this province.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the hon. gentleman. I was not saying that but I want to make sure the costs are reasonable because it is like arguing

over a well. In the long run it is what is left in the estate that pays for it and we have all heard about and perhaps it has not been a practise but we have seen cases where when the various parties into the well were through there was nothing left for whoever got what was there.

MR. WELLS: Well, if that happened in a case like this, whichever party was held to have ownership, be seized of the apartments, would have the right to go to court to have the size of the bill adjudicated upon if there were any fees.

MR. ROBERTS: It was that right to go to court to try to determine things arising out of Lake Apartments Limited that got us into this in the first place, Mr. Speaker. The whole point about Lake Apartments is it is obviously, from reading the newspapers, such an incredibly - you have mortgages, second mortgages and promissory notes and shares being issued or not being issued, You know it is worthy of a corporate law course.

MR. WELLS: If the hon. leader could yield for a moment I think and I propose to have something to say about this perhaps in the throne speech debate. The sort of thing that allowed this to develop is section (5) of the Conveyancing Act. In my view that is something that we ought to take a look at because it seems to me that we ought not in this province, as things become more complex, apartment buildings, large mortgages etc., there ought not to be the right to go by way of the Conveyancing Act or foreclosure. The right should be limited to foreclosure in my view because it was the use of the Conveyancing Act, whether it was justified or not, which led to this sort of thing happening.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the hon. gentleman and I do not agree on a great deal but we certainly I think agree.

Mr. Roberts.

I cannot speak with detail on the Conveyancing Act. My one acquaintance with it was a brush during the exams administered by the benches of the law society. I came off ahead but I will not say how much ahead, enough ahead that they have admitted me to the bar. The point is and I think it is a very sound one that our law in Newfoundland is not sufficiently sophisticated to deal adequately with these problems because up until very recently we did not have them, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure where the honourable gentleman and I got in our - all I was doing was closing the few words I had to say and to ask the minister, when he closes the debate, (I assume he has an administrator in mind when one drafts the bill and has it brought in and all these things) perhaps he could indicate to the House whom the administrator is to be and any other relevant terminology. Is he to be paid by the day? How is he to be paid? In the long run it will be the tenants who will pay. There is nobody else in this with any money except the tenants and whoever collects what, when, from whom or how, it will be the tenants living in those apartments now or in the future who pay whatever the costs of this are. There is no suggestion to my mind that it would be from the public till nor should it. We will support the bill. It is an unusual one but under the circumstances it seems to be justified.

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I can inform the Leader of the Opposition that we do have an administrator in mind. However, there has been nothing settled in terms of a fee. I can clear the matter of as to who should pay the fee. Of course, it would be paid by the apartment people, whoever the owner will be determined to be. I would suppose that it would be paid by the court, when the case is disposed of, as opposed to being paid by any one else or to be taken out of the monies that are collected. I feel

Mr. Hickey.

that the proper way to do it would be that the bill would be presented to the court rather than the firm paying themselves. On the matter of the fee, we are presently getting what is considered to be an accepted rate from a trust company who are experienced in this kind of situation and who manage apartments and so on. I would suggest that he would follow this figure.

MR. ROBERTS: Is the thought to put a trust company as administrator?

MR. HICKEY: No, it was not intended that we appoint a trust company, Mr. Speaker, for the simple reason there are a number of things that have to be done. There would have to be a fair amount of time spent initially to attend to a number of things. I felt that a large trust company would not necessarily be required. Most of those people are very busy. My main concern is that some kind of decent service is provided to people who live in that building and that a number of the real problems should be sorted out immediately. I will say that I had a small accounting firm in mind. I feel that they would do a creditable job there. I do not think it is a job for a large trust company.

MR. ROBERTS: Could the minister name the accounting firm?

MR. HICKEY: No I am not in a position to name them, Mr. Speaker, because as I said the matter of fees has not been settled. Therefore, I feel that it would be improper for me to name them at this time.

With regard to the involvement of the administrator, it would be as simple a matter as I have indicated when I opened the debate, that the rents would be collected, the services restored and any urgent matters of maintenance be attended to. It is not the intention to ask the administrator to get involved in previous disputes with any of the tenants or previous disputes that the tenants might have had with either of the claimants who are before the court. It would be a simple matter of administering the affairs

of this apartment building from the date of appointment up until the time the matter is sorted out by the court.

There is one other point, Mr. Speaker, that I want to make and that is that the reason for the urgency of this matter; in addition to tenants paying to two different prospective landlords and some tenants not paying any one, there are other tenants who have retained lawyers, who are paying the rent to those lawyers, I would ask the administrator to collect this rent that is now being held until the disposition of the case. There are bills, charges, accounts which are outstanding and this is what is making the situation rather difficult at the moment.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting An Administrator For Lake Apartments," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House now by leave.

MR. ROBERTS You can have leave only on the condition that the honourable gentleman tell us whom he has in mind. I am not saying that there is anything wrong but we do get inherently suspicious at this state. I can understand the honourable gentleman not wishing to name an individual or firm until he has sort of consummated an arrangement with them but I might add that his administration have appointed Mr. Nutbeem and only now has Mr. Nutbeem's salary been negotiated, a fortnight later. If the bill is urgent we will consent on our part to committee at this stage, on the condition the minister tell us whom he proposes to name. Surely, there is nothing to hide.

MR. BARRY: My information is (Interruption)

MR. ROBERTS: I do not feel any need to give any explanation for my conduct to the hon. gentleman from Placentia West.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I shall anyway.

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

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would be satisfied, if the minister named perhaps as a generic term, like a chartered accountant or a lawyer or somebody of this sort, not the individual's name, because obviously that would have to be cleared,

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WELLS: If it is a recognized chartered accountant - I mean after all, to name someone who might turn it down -

MR. ROBERTS: It is a mountain out of a molehill. Cannot the minister go out on the telephone and

We could come back to this later today at committee stage it will take ten minutes to put the bill through. The administrator presumably, I do not know if His Honour is in town or not. The minister is not hiding anything I am sure, well, let him tell us.

MR. HICKFY: Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated why I am unable to say who the administrator is going to be or may be. I have no assurance that the gentleman or the gentlemen who I am going to ask to act as the administrator will accept. I have been unable at this time to determine the fee to be paid. Surely no one is just going to say; "Indeed we will administer that apartment building. We do not care how much you will pay us, maybe pay us five dollars."

Mr. Speaker, if the passage of this bill depends on my being out on the spot to give information or to act hastily or to act irresponsibly, that I have no intentions of doing it. If the honourable gentleman on the other side wish to hold up the tenants in Lake Apartments for another day, well then that is fine by me.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is the one who wants haste. This bill has sat on the Order Paper since Friday. It was not called for debate on Friday.

AN HON. MEMBER: Thursday.

MR. ROBERTS: Thursday, it was on Thursday. The honourable gentleman has obviously no desire for haste. The honourable gentleman is the one who was in here asking us to wave the rules of this House. Well, we are prepared to wave - he is trying to hide something. Well then fine we will wait the extra twenty-four hours, if that is what he wishes to do. But let him not accuse us of delay, Sir. We stand ready on our part to expedite this by agreeing to wave the rules. But if he is the one who wants the haste, it was the honourable gentleman who came in and wants to put this through in one day, in all stages, Your Honour, not us. We are willing to have it go the normal course. But if he thinks it is urgent, let him do what little is necessary to make it urgent. We can adjourn until

later this afternoon, come back at a quarter of six on this matter, put it through by six o'clock. If it is that urgent. But let him - a shame! Ah, listen to it. Listen to it. The little fella. Right, it is petty. We are being asked to waive the rules. Well what is he trying to hide? This is the government, Mr. Speaker, this is the government -

MR. HICKEY: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I take exception to this phrase "what am I trying to hide." The honourable gentleman has a bad mind. He drinks, sleeps and eats corruption those days. When he looks at his family, does he think of corruption? He must, because he thinks about it when he looks at everybody else. I have no intentions of being forced to make a decision which I am not able to make, I am not ready to make at this time. Does the honourable gentleman realize that I only gave notice on Thursday, that on Friday I was unable to bring this bill before this House because the honourable gentleman and a few more were discussing a matter of urgent public importance namely; the steel mill. What is he talking about? I have nothing to hide. But I am not going to be pushed in a corner by making a decision that I am not ready to make. I will make it when I am ready.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Does the honourable gentleman have leave -

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the government heartily endorses the position taken by the hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment. We will not be pushed into anything and therefore we will withdraw the request. We shall proceed in the normal course of events and we will look forward to passage of this bill at the earliest possible opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER: Will this bill be referred to a committee of the whole House on tomorrow? Agreed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bonavista North.

MR. P. S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, may I first before I go into detail congratulate the honourable member for Port au Port for his appointment

as Deputy Speaker of this House. It is indeed a privilege to see you sitting in the Chair. I feel assured that you will carry out your duties as your duties ought to be carried out.

It is a little disappointing though, Mr. Speaker, to see that the former Deputy Speaker or that the Deputy Chairman of Committees was not elevated to this post. I thought for sure that the honourable member for St. George's would be promoted to this post. I trust that does not throw any possible influence upon the member in question. I hope it does not indicate that this government feels that he is a little incompetent like the rest of the ministers are.

MR. NEARY: He is not a member of the Bar Society.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat a little disappointed and I thought it should have been in order for this honourable House at its opening to at least recognize the passing of one of the greatest Canadians that we have known, of course I speak of the honourable Lester Pearson.

Mr. Pearson's death most definitely was a loss to all Canadians. He was an outstanding Canadian, a true Canadian, he was a national figure and indeed he was a prominent international figure. Last Friday, the fifteenth, was the eight anniversary of Canada's present flag. I thought for sure someone on the government side of this House would indeed recognize that date and pay tribute not only to Mr. Pearson but to the fact that we do at this date possess that flag.

Mr. Speaker, may I make a suggestion to you or to this House? Would this House consider bringing into this honourable House the Canadian flag? Maybe at the same time we could also bring in the Union Jack.

AN HON. MEMBER: A good idea.

MR. THOMS: Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it would be a worthwhile tribute to the former Prime Minister of Canada, Lester B. Pearson.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne does not really call for much comment, because there is not much there to comment upon. The mover and seconder of the Speech from the

MR. THOMS: Throne did as admirable a job as they possibly could, but I was very disturbed, very disappointed, at the comments from the member for St. John's South.

Mr. Speaker, his comments really disturbed me as I am sure they disturbed most Newfoundlanders. If this honourable House will allow me, I would like to refer you to the comments which the honourable member had made, and I read from Hansard of January 31, 1973 on page 15, last paragraph.

"In the 1960's I believe that our greatest obstacle to progress was a fear of government, a wariness of government, a fear that to offend the government would be to impair one's chances of a job."

Mr. Speaker, I wonder was he thinking about the two jobs that were lost when the Tories took over on January 18, 1972, when the honourable member's Minister of Provincial Affairs immediately fired two members, two people from this building, Mr. Cousens and Mr. Fitzgerald. Was that what the honourable member for St. John's South was thinking about, Mr. Speaker? Impair one's chances of a job." Whose jobs were impaired?

The member, Mr. Speaker, goes on to say, "would also impair a businessman's bid for a contract." Today we do not have any bids for contracts, "a labour union's right to exist or impair the chance of an industry to grow and prosper." These fears may have been irrational and of course what he is really saying -

MR. MURPHY: Ask the member for Bell Island about the -

MR. NEARY: As the minister about the case tractors.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, did something I say irritate the honourable member for St. John's Centre or did I touch a sore spot.

MR. NEARY: You touched a nerve.

MR. THOMS: He who shouts loudest is guilty. It is so, and the honourable member shouting is evidence of that this evening. He

MR. THOMS: also goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, that these fears may have been irrational. Really what he is trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that these fears are senseless and unreasonable and that is the only word that I can possibly agree with him on. They were senseless and unreasonable.

Mr. Speaker, a little later on during the day, we also got the words of wisdom from our honourable Premier, who I am very sorry to say is not this afternoon in his seat. It is too bad because I am sure he would enjoy this.

The Premier says, Mr. Speaker, as was mentioned by the member for St. John's South, "there is one thing that has been accomplished this year that had never been done before and that is a feeling of democracy in our province, this Island of Newfoundland and the Mainland of Labrador, of freedom of speech, of freedom of people, where they are not afraid to criticize the government," Can you imagine that? "Where they are not afraid to criticize anything nor anybody. There is a freedom in this country, and that is something that was not here before." Amazing words, Mr. Speaker, amazing words indeed when we think about what went on here last Monday in this honourable House and the press release that the Premier of this province made, amazing words indeed.

They are also more amazing when you think back only a few months ago and you find that one of the reputable citizens of our province was sitting in a chair on the eighth floor of this building and was hoisted by the police on orders from the Premier, or was it the Minister of Justice? When you think, Mr. Speaker, that just last week a group of citizens from the Town of Bonavista, who were definitely a well-disciplined orderly group -

AN HON. MEMBER: Seventy per cent females.

MR. THOMS: were watched over by a contingent of police here in the lobby of Confederation Building. Is that what the Premier is talking

MR. THOMS: about when he says, "freedom of speech," "freedom of our people." Can we from now on, every time we get a delegation at Confederation Building, expect them to be met by a contingent of police? Are we talking about a democracy or a police state?

Then, Mr. Speaker, to go back a little further -

MR. CROSBY: Back to the IWA.

MR. THOMS: Let us go back to it. You will have your chance to speak and you can speak.

what you like then. Or are you going to speak?

MR NEARY: What about the steel plant? Let us go back to the steel plant.

MR SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member for Bonavista North will refer to another honourable member as honourable member -

MR THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I say that the hon. the junior member for Harbour Main will have his time to speak. He will have a full ninety minutes of it if he can find anything to say in this ninety minutes.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about democracy of speech, democracy of our people, freedom of our people, freedom of speech, freedom to criticize and when we think about the members of the Tory Party searching personal files in this province of ours, when we think about the police robbing personal homes, bank offices and all the rest that went on, how can a Premier justify such words as freedom of speech and freedom of people. This word freedom from fear, Mr. Speaker

HON. LEO D. BARRY: (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. The honourable member's reference to robbing by the police force is a reflection on civil servants or persons who cannot answer for themselves, and should not be permitted.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is not a point of order.

MR. THOMS: I did not say robbing, I said searching. If I said robbing, I withdraw it. I meant searching.

MR SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member may rephrase his statement if he wishes. If the word robbery were used, he may wish to replace it.

MR. THOMS: I rephrase the question and I place in the word "search".

Mr. Speaker, this old question of fear, being afraid of the government, afraid of the minister, being afraid of the Premier, this is just a continuing programme by the Tory Party of Newfoundland to try to discredit the previous administration. There one and only aim is the previous premier. If all the members of the Tory Party in this House, Mr. Speaker, could even be as equal to a small finger

of the previous premier they would be indeed worthy of their existence.

Mr. Speaker, their fear that has been imbedded in the minds of people of the province today is quite evident, quite evident indeed. Mr. Speaker, it is so evident that it even made one of our television commentators say just a little while ago, "it is getting a little scary around here these days." Now, Mr. Speaker, when this turn of events comes about things are really getting bad. Never in Newfoundland's history have our people been afraid of politicians, premiers, the press or anyone else. In Newfoundland we fear God and we have no other fear.

Mr. NEARY: What about the welfare officer down in Burgeo?

MR. THOMS: Yes, tell us about the poor little welfare officer?

Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, the Premier made a statement and this statement was followed up in this House of Assembly by a most vicious attack, and irresponsible attack, a vicious and vile attack by the member for St. John's East.

Mr. Speaker, in this country of ours where we are supposed to have freedom of speech and freedom of people, we also have what is called freedom of the press.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have our news media and I assure you they must have a very difficult job, difficult indeed. The job of our news media is to report, to report the news, to report the weather, to report anything they see fit to report. It is also their job to provoke a discussion if necessary. It is also their job to amuse if necessary and at sometimes they even irritate us or annoy us but all in all, Mr. Speaker, their discussions, their irritations, their amusements, it is all information.

The newspapers relay to us information that we could never possibly get in any other way. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I as a member of

this Assembly going to be irritated because of what some newspaper said or because of what some radio and television network said, well really, Mr. Speaker, I should not publicly say anything at all because where you have different reporting, quite different no two stories are going to come out exactly the same and no matter how many different stories come out, I am going to be able to pick out something within that story that I do not agree with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the long and the short of this whole controversy between a portion of our news media and any other member of this House or any other segment of our population is simply this: if you cannot swim get out of the water and if you cannot take criticism get out of politics.

Mr. Speaker, I am just a little saddened this afternoon when I see that the hon. Premier is not in his seat. As a matter of fact, well maybe we should get him. It is really too bad because really, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this Province has quite a lot to answer for, quite a lot indeed.

During the early part of last year, Mr. Speaker, our Premier took part in some discussions. I believe it was in Halifax. His discussions centered around the off-shore mineral resources of the Atlantic Provinces. The Premier came back to this province and he made a statement, Mr. Speaker, to this hon. House, on Monday, June 19, 1972 and on page two of that statement, the fifth paragraph, I would like to quote for you.

"The second benefit is the joining of the Province of Quebec with the Atlantic Provinces in this matter and the common decision of each of the five provinces that further meetings should be held soon."

I would like to repeat this sentence, Mr. Speaker, "the second benefit is the joining of the Province of Quebec with the Atlantic Provinces in this matter and the common decision of each of the five provinces that further meetings should be held soon."

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to understand how the Premier could make this statement. It is very difficult indeed. I would like to think, Mr. Speaker, that our Premier was ill-informed or misinformed or that maybe some of his minister, or minister or someone else had misinformed the Premier. Because, Mr. Speaker, this statement is not true. This is not a true and factual statement. I would not say it is a lie because that would be unparliamentary. Because it is not true that this is not the first time that the Province of Quebec had taken part in these discussions. It is not true whatsoever. Quebec was involved in the offshore discussions ever since 1964. Maybe the Minister of Economic Development, Mr. Speaker, is correct. I trust he is.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: Four years after what started?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, the discussions with the Joint Mineral Resources Committee have been going on continuously since 1964. Is this not correct? Mr. Speaker, the discussions of this committee had involved the Province of Quebec way before 1972. Is this not correct? And if this is correct, then the Premier's statement is wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: I have read it twice for you, you should have heard it.

Mr. Speaker, prior to January 1972 the chairman of the Joint Mineral Resources Committee was the hon. William Callahan of Newfoundland. Prior to him was the Minister of Resources from Quebec, I believe his name was John Paul Allard. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this is evidence enough to prove that Quebec was involved in these discussions before the Halifax meeting of last year. I want to make this abundantly clear because it gives an indication that we were not talking with the Province of

Quebec. We were.

MR. BARRY: The Premier was saying that there was an agreement at that time to operate in a joint approach to the federal government.

MR. THOMS: The Premier stated, in his statement, the second benefit is the joining of the Province of Quebec with the Atlantic Provinces.

MR. BARRY: That is right. A commitment there, that is a lot different than the initial discussions held, trying to work out something.

Mr. CROSBIE: With the previous minister available, there was no such common approach.

MR. BARRY: There was no common approach. No joint approach until that statement.

MR. THOMS: Well, Mr. Speaker, it appeared both in the news media of this province that this was the first time that Quebec had join such discussion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Please do not call the Premier to account for the news media - he has made that quite clear.

MR. THOMS: This is the statement I am referring to.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it abundantly clear that the five Atlantic provinces have been involved in these discussions for quite some time. I may also add that considerable progress was made. Mr. Speaker the discussions previous to January 1972 several of these discussions took place in relation to drawing up the boundaries between the five Eastern provinces. Mr. Speaker, this was done and agreed upon by 1968.

MR. DOODY: Did your administration take responsibility for these boundaries?

MR. THOMS: They were back to 1968.

MR. DOODY: Well did the previous administration take responsibility for the definition of these boundaries? I am asking you now.

AN HON. MEMBER: How much did you give away on that?

MR. DOODY: Now answer the question. You can make an accusation, answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Would the hon. the Minister of Industrial Development take his seat.

MR. DOODY: I am sorry , Your Honour.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, any minister of this crown, or this government or anyone of this House of Assembly will have their time to speak and they can ask questions and they can get answers at that time. They can make what accusations they like, but the very fact remains that these discussions were carried out before. These boundaries were drawn up and agreed upon by the five Atlantic Provinces.

Mr. Speaker, the old question of offshore mineral rights have been brought to the forefront time and time again. Mr. Speaker, the previous administration took the position that in Newfoundland's claim to offshore mineral rights, that we claimed one hundred per cent of any benefits that were derived from these offshore minerals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems unfair that we should give up any of this claim or give up any of this right or even that we should talk about the flexible, about the one hundred per cent ownership claim of the offshore mineral rights. The present government's policy apparently is somewhat watered down when you think about the policy of the previous administration.

We have. Mr. Speaker, territorial rights over all the minerals on the Continental Shelf. We have legitimate claims to these rights. They are ours. We should not give up one per cent of our rights. We should stick by this argument and claim one hundred per cent of the rights of all offshore minerals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some people may not think that this should be so. Some people think that maybe, just maybe that the federal government should have some portion of our offshore mineral rights. They may say that this is the first time that we have had such a case as the offshore mineral rights in Eastern Newfoundland. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not the first time. We have mined minerals under the North Atlantic for years. I refer of course to the Iron Mine of Bell Island. We mined iron ore three and a-half miles out under the sea bed off Bell Island for at least seventeen years after Confederation

and the federal government had no claim whatsoever to any of these minerals nor did they collect any royalties. I say the same principle that applied on Bell Island also applies

on the Grand Banks of both Labrador and Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, while I agree that the Federal Government has certain jurisdiction, the Federal Government's jurisdiction starts at high-water mark and goes out over the floor of the ocean. The federal jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker, is all around the offshore drilling rigs and the Federal Government should control and regulate these drilling rigs. But, Mr. Speaker, once that drill strikes the bottom of the ocean you are in provincial jurisdiction. If you were not in provincial jurisdiction on Bell Island, you are not on the Grand Banks.

MR. L. BARRY: Nonsense! You are in the same jurisdiction when you are on the top too if you have to be on the top to exploit the bottom.

MR. THOMS: No not at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: All the way down.

MR. THOMS: Provincial jurisdiction starts at the ocean floor only. Above the ocean floor you have federal jurisdiction.

MR. BARRY: Why are you giving away most of our jurisdiction to the Federal Government by that statement?

MR. THOMS: I am not giving away any jurisdiction to the Federal Government.

MR. BARRY: The government cannot accept that position. We have to fight...

MR. THOMS: The North Atlantic, Mr. Speaker, is federal jurisdiction because it is international. The ocean floor on the Grand Banks is provincial jurisdiction.

MR. DOODY: There might be untold riches in the water out there. We cannot afford to give it away.

MR. THOMS: Maybe the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, will tell us about all these untold riches. But, Mr. Speaker, on the bottom of the North Atlantic, particularly on the continental shelf, once you strike

the bottom you are in provincial jurisdiction. You do not enter provincial jurisdiction until you strike that bottom. The moving sea is federal jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, this is one thing that our Provincial Government should keep in mind, when they are negotiating, if they are negotiating with the Federal Government.

MR. DOODY: Are you saying that we need the Federal Government's permission to go out and get it?

MR. THOMS: The Federal Government can have permission to go out put whatever they like on the surface of the water.

MR. DOODY: Do we need the Federal Government's permission to go out and put what we want on the surface?

MR. THOMS: You are within the Federal Government's jurisdiction when you are on the sea, most definitely.

MR. BARRY: That is with respect to shipping and navigation.

MR. THOMS: With shipping, oil transportation and the rest.

MR. BARRY: But not with respect to exploitation...

MR. THOMS: Not with respect to the drilling, but once that mineral comes above, into the ocean, you are in federal jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, before January 1972, we heard that the "Tory Party" if elected, were going to draw up all different kinds of regulations to regulate the offshore drilling, to regulate the offshore exploitation. But, Mr. Speaker, at the present time there is no government in the world that have more rigid regulations than the Federal Government of Canada. They have the best rules and regulations for offshore drilling that are possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh no! Nonsense.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, this is why the present administration has seen fit not to draw up any regulations.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Why have the Federal Government...

MR. THOMS: Put it on the Order Paper, that is what I was told this

afternoon.

MR. NEARY: Well done.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on our forestry. To date, we in Newfoundland do not have a proper forest management programme. We, to date, have no control of one of our greatest natural resources, the forests. We, to date, are going about harvesting our forests in a haphazard condition. We are in fact, in most instances, crucifying our forests.

Mr. Speaker, before the present administration took office, there was planning underway to control the harvesting of our forests, to have a proper systematic system to harvest the wealth of our forests. It was cast aside because of a political fluke, that happened last year.

Mr. Speaker, there was an agreement with the linerboard mill, Bowaters and Price Brothers and with the loggers of our province to throw all the forest assets which we have, that is all the forest-lands, to throw everything into one pool. Mr. Speaker, with this pool each of the parties would get together with the Provincial Crown Corporation and each would say to the corporation; "Look, I want 500 cords of wood this year." Bowaters would ask for so many, Price would ask for so many, the linerboard mill would ask for so many, different sawmills would ask for so many more feet of wood. Mr. Speaker, under this proposed co-operation the corporation would tell the various interests where to cut and how much they were to cut. Only under such a system, Mr. Speaker, can we control the forest products of our province.

This of course would take a great responsibility off the two large paper industries in our province. Of course, this would mean increased stumpage. An agreement by these people for other royalties or taxes as you may call them and the monies collected from these different royalties or taxes or stumpage would be spent back into the

forestry itself. Every cent taken out would be put back in.

Mr. Speaker, it would go in for access roads, forest improvements, thinning and reforestation and many other things. Only under this system, Mr. Speaker, are we going to be able to properly manage, control and harvest our forests. It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that this proposed co-operation was another casualty of our political fluke.

Mr. Speaker, leaving the forestry but staying within the forest, I am almost compelled to say a few words on the Gros Morne National Park. Mr. Speaker, this park has been kicked around from daylight to dark. Nothing really substantial has happened to the park this past fourteen or fifteen months. One of the main excuses that have been brought forward for not passing over lands to the Federal Government, is that the present government just do not know where the different lands are. That is, they do not know where Bowater's leases are, where Price leases are or private lands.

Mr. Speaker, if they would only take the time to go down to the basement of this building, they would find maps that are there indicating the boundary of the park and indicating the various leases and timber leases within the park boundary. From such a plan, Mr. Speaker, within a matter of days you could pass over the necessary lands to the Federal Government for this park. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that much work had been done on this, even down to the square miles of land that are within the park boundary.

Mr. Speaker, within the park boundary there are seventy-six square miles of Bowater's timber leases, thirty-eight square miles of Reid lots, 7.5 square miles of mineral grants. There are 290 acres of surface grants and leases. This is roughly, Mr. Speaker, 120 square miles.

MR. NEARY: Are you charging the minister for this information?

MR. THOMS: No, I did not charge anyone for this information.

Mr. Speaker, I note that the park itself is approximately

700 square miles. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is very easy, very simple and can be done within a matter of a few days, to pass over whatever land is necessary to be passed over so that this Gros Morne National Park can become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, this park has been going on or trying to go on for some time. To date we have only eighteen people employed on the park, when we should have around two hundred. Last year, Mr. Speaker, the total payroll for that park should have been about \$2 million but it was practically nil. This, Mr. Speaker, is a gross neglect on the part of the present administration. This has certainly retarded the growth of this park and certainly influenced drastically the economic conditions of the West Coast Area.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard Ministers of the Crown speak of delays, more delays and more problems, but still they have not yet come up with a proper procedure to get this park started.

I believe it is about time for the present administration to get off their big fat fannies and do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that there was a report done on the Gros Morne, the benefits, its potential, its cost and its impact upon the economy of the area. It was to give an evaluation of the benefits and costs of the proposed park and this, Mr. Speaker, was supposed to have been done by Hildebrand, Young Associates, if I have the name correct. As far as I am aware, Mr. Speaker, this report has been submitted but this report has not yet to date been made public.

Mr. Speaker, in the estimates which were brought forward last June in this House there was an allotment in there of \$200,000 for the improvement of blueberry lands in the Province of Newfoundland, \$200,000. It is going to be very interesting, Mr. Speaker, when the estimates come about to find out where this \$200,000 was spent.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: Maybe they all went along with the restructuring programme. Mr. Speaker, my District of Bonavista North is one of the greatest producers of blueberries in Eastern Canada and I mean Eastern Canada. In Newfoundland last year over fifty per cent of the blueberry production was produced in the District of Bonavista North and that the hon. minister cannot deny. Now, Mr. Speaker, the blueberry industry is a base industry. It is where the base dollars come from. There is no service industry attached to it whatsoever. It is all base money and of the two million one hundred thousand pounds that were produced in Newfoundland last year exactly one million fifty thousand pounds were produced in the District of Bonavista North. Mr. Speaker, this House allotted \$200,000 to be spent on the blueberry industry of Newfoundland and to date to my knowledge I can only find where there was \$2,000 spent in the District of Bonavista North. Now, Mr. Speaker, where the

other \$198,000 was spent is going to be a very interesting answer.

AN HON. MEMBER: Harbour Main.

MR. THOMS: I would not doubt that. I would not doubt that a bit.

AN HON. MEMBER: I will not do any good. The hon. member will not pay his nomination fees the next time.

MR. THOMS: But, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that this is a total neglect of a viable industry by the present administration. One would almost think that they would like to see it go the way the STELCO plant went. Mr. Speaker, the blueberry industry in this province is barely touched. We have only scratched the surface and unless this government comes up with a good, sound policy of aiding the industry, of updating the industry, then I am afraid the industry will be like the others we have in this province, it is about to die.

Mr. Speaker, I feel I should at this time just touch on for a brief moment that fabulous and atrocious effort that this government made as far as restructuring. Of course, when I think of restructuring I think of what one of the college students told me the other day. He said, "Sure I could have done as good as that on a long weekend plus or minus a couple of days." Mr. Speaker, the restructuring of this government is really an outstanding work of art. This present government, apparently they have been quoted as saying that it took months to restructure, months to plan, months of research. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, to my knowledge, to date we do not have a deputy minister of Forestry and Agriculture and possibly we do not have an assistant deputy yet.

MR. NEARY: Another Tory hang-around get a job, maybe.

MR. THOMS: It is going to be interesting to find out who they are. Mr. Speaker, we had as the Deputy Minister of Agriculture one of the most able men in this province as far as agriculture was concerned, one of the most knowledgeable and most able and I am sure the former

Deputy Minister of Mines and Agriculture will agree with me, and that is in the person of Mr. Gerry O'Reilly. Mr. O'Reilly's knowledge of agriculture in this province is second to none and, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that he was again a casualty of the restructuring programme, not only he, Mr. Speaker, but part of that department. The previous department was made up of mines, agriculture and resources and, Mr. Speaker, within our resources we have the wildlife of our province. Now, Mr. Speaker, I fail to see how you can separate the wildlife of this province from the forest of the province.

MR. NEARY: If anybody can separate the wildlife, it is that crowd over there. They know all about wildlife.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it is lunacy to separate wildlife and our forestry. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, what department we put it under, tourism. What are we going to do? Give it to the Tourist Minister, so he can give it to the tourists? That is his only reason for existing, to please the tourists who come into our province. Mr. Speaker, I see a great danger here. I see a danger that the Minister of Tourism will undoubtedly lean towards the tourists who enter our province and that we will in some way, shape or form increase the volume of licenses, the big game licenses that go to the tourists who enter our province and believe you me the percentage of licenses that go to the tourists now, in my opinion, is too great and I am sure the previous Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources must agree with me.

MR. THOMS: While I agree, Mr. Speaker, that a certain percentage of these licences should go to the tourists, Yet I disagree with the present percentage. I believe it should be cut and cut drastically because even though some reports coming out of the wild life division seem to indicate that our game population, our moose and caribou population are holding their own, there are ever-visible signs to indicate the contrary, While I do not blame this necessarily on the previous minister or even the present minister, I believe he should take a very close look at the present population of big game in this province. It is certainly disappearing from the roads of our province. It is certainly disappearing from the wild accesses of our province. This is quite evident, quite evident to anyone who might travel the barrens or our forests.

Therefore I say, Mr. Speaker, that this indeed is a bad move to place our wild life under the Tourist Department. There is a very great danger there indeed. There is a great danger, Mr. Speaker, and even in Labrador last year, they opened the season, I am not quite sure but I believe it was August 23, Just so that they could accommodate people coming in, just so that they could accommodate the tourists, who did not want to suffer a little bit of cold in September and October and so it was opened in August. This, I am afraid, is a very poor policy indeed. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this should indeed be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, within my district we possess thirty-three beautiful settlements. Not all of these settlements, Mr. Speaker, are what you call water and sewerized.

AN HON. MEMBER: Infrastructure.

MR. THOMS: No, they are not completely. You would not yet consider them completely part of our infrastructure, because there has been no infrastructure put in them. We need, Mr. Speaker, a vast programme of water and sewers. We need a vast programme of highways. Mr. Speaker,

MR. THOMS: it is disheartening to hear, only a couple of weeks ago, the Premier of this Province say that very little attention would he be paying or his administration be paying to such programmes as water and sewer and highways.

The basic need in Newfoundland today, Mr. Speaker, is still water and sewers and a good highway system. Unless our provincial government is willing to undertake a vast programme of water and sewer and highways, then life in Newfoundland will not rise to where it should.

Mr. Speaker, before the present government became - was elevated to power, the present Premier was going around this province promising many things. One of the things, Mr. Speaker, that he promised was free transportation on the ferries within our province. Mr. Speaker, this promise was made on Bell Island. I would like to read you one of the portions of his talk, he said, "all ferries operating within the province will offer free transportation if the Progressive Conservative Party forms the government after October 28."

This, Mr. Speaker, was made by the Leader of the Tory Party, at that time Mr. Frank Moores. Now it is some fourteen months since the Tory Party took office in this province and to date since they took office, we have not heard anything of ferry service in Newfoundland. We only witnessed the continued acceleration in fares on these services, continually climbing. Mr. Speaker, the cost of this is borne possibly by the lowest income people of our province.

MR. NEARY: No income on Bell Island.

MR. THOMS: If the present Premier had any interest at all in his heart for the people of Newfoundland, he would immediately try to overcome this difficulty which is beset upon our people. The price paid on this ferry service is somewhat outrageous. Subsidies are necessary not only from the provincial government but also from the federal government.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, promises were many before January 18, but the fulfillments of these promises have been very few since January 18. This winter we witnessed one of the greatest ice blockades in our history. Never before have the smaller islands around our province been isolated by ice as they have been this year, never have they been isolated for such a long period of time.

Mr. Speaker, the only transportation to these islands is by plane. This is possibly the most expensive form of transportation. I believe sincerely in my heart that this form of transportation should be heavily subsidized by either the provincial or federal government. I wrote a letter on June 14, 1972 to the honourable Ank Murphy, Minister of Provincial Affairs, June 14, 1972, requesting that the fares between the Island of St. Brendan's in Bonavista Bay and the mainland be subsidized. Mr. Speaker, it was only a simple request. It would not cost the provincial government very much but Mr. Speaker, To date that letter has not been answered.

MR. NEARY: What?

MR. THOMS: It has not been answered.

MR. NEARY: Not answered.

MR. THOMS: That is the arrogance of this present administration.

MR. NEARY: Resign. The minister should resign.

MR. THOMS: That, Mr. Speaker, is the thinking of this administration as far as the poor people of our province are concerned.

AN HON. MEMBER: We have to bring in government to the people.

MR. THOMS: If it were a request from some of the larger centres they would have been on their hands and knees. But because there are a few little people out on St. Brendan's Island, what does he say about them? Nothing, he could not care less.

MR. MURPHY: They should be looked after, if we had the way to do it.

MR. NEARY: Why did you not reply to the letter?

MR. THOMS: It is really immaterial whether they are Liberal or Tories, they are still Newfoundlanders and better than some people I know.

MR. MURPHY: Why did you direct your letter to the Minister of Provincial Affairs?

MR. THOMS: Because it is a provincial matter.

MR. MURPHY: It is a provincial matter.

MR. THOMS: Whom else was I going to address the letter to?

MR. THOMS: No, no, no. Here is the promise, the Tories are going to take care of the ferry service in Newfoundland. The two of them go together. Mr. Speaker, this is just another example of the arrogance of the history of the present administration. What do they care about the people of Newfoundland? They could not care less.

Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: This is arrogance for you.

MR. THOMS: You know, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs at the time would have even answered the letter or even if he were to give me an answer after the restructuring programme and said, "well, we do not have any money." If he had done it before the restructuring programme and told me what the restructuring programme contained, I could have showed him were he could have gotten enough money to subsidize the St. Brendan's fare, Little Bay Island fare and the Fogo fare.

MR. NEARY: And not forgetting Bell Island.

MR. THOMS: And not forgetting Bell Island.

Mr. Speaker, during the restructuring fiasco the present administration saw fit, in their great wisdom, I do not know how they came up with this idea, but they saw fit to retire at least four civil servants before the proper retired age had come about. These four civil servants, undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, were good men, I do not question that whatsoever. But I cannot for the life of me see what was the reasoning behind the present administration to retire these four gentlemen. One of these gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, will cost this government, the taxpayers of this province, in the next four years \$19,829 per year, which is a total in the next four years of \$79,316. The next gentleman, Mr. Speaker, in the next two years will cost the taxpayers of this province \$35,640. The third gentleman, Mr. Speaker, will cost this province in the next four years \$82,424. The fourth and last gentleman, Mr. Speaker, will cost the taxpayers of this province and St. Brendan's \$173,205, bringing a grand total for the four gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, to \$370,585.

Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. MURPHY: Would the honourable member permit -

MR. THOMS: No. You are going to have your afternoon to speak and you can speak all you like then.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. MURPHY: Absolute distortion of facts.

AN HON. MEMBER: Arrogance.

MR. MURPHY: Get it right in Hansard. Someone will read that some day.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, this is not a distortion of facts whatsoever. This is factual.

MR. MURPHY: No not at all.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable gentleman for Bonavista North does have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I trust the honourable member for St. John's Centre will recognize that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the air subsidies to these small islands, I am sure would be a trivial amount, not very much to give these people a proper connection with the mainland portion of our island. Mr. Speaker, because of the isolation this year every resident in St. Brendan's had to pay seven cents more on everything that they bought in the stores, because seven cents was the amount that was charged for air freight from Burnt Side to St. Brendan's, seven cents per pound. Everything that was a pound, they had to pay seven cents more on it. Mr. Speaker, this in some things could come up to an increase of something like thirty-five or forty per cent in the cost of living on St. Brendan's. Now this I am sure the previous honourable minister will agree with me is a serious matter because in this day and age. Mr. Speaker, it is not like it was in the old days, they do not store up enough in the fall to last all winter, they live from week to week and they have to be resupplied every week. When this ice blockade came about

the only way to supply the island was through aircraft. This indeed was a very, very costly thing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go on too much longer because the honourable members on the government side of this House are really getting a little jittery, I would hate to disturb too many of them because some of them, Mr. Speaker, have not had their nap yet this afternoon.

MR. NEARY: I would like to see the honourable member make a speech as good as that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: We will wait. We will see.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker

MR. NEARY: We have not heard him speak yet in the House.

MR. THOMS: This whole administration, Mr. Speaker, before it was elected was going to be the godsend to the people of Newfoundland. They were going to turn the province around overnight. There was going to be milk and honey all over the place, jobs here, jobs there, wages here, wages somewhere else, lot of jobs at STELCO.

AN HON. MEMBER: Cheaper beer.

MR. THOMS: Cheaper beer. Everything was going to be a beautiful thing, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. THOMS: But, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: What about the supervisor over in Bay De Verde?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Would the honourable members on both sides refrain from butting in while the honourable member is speaking or I will have to take further action.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If it were not for the Speaker of this House we would not get a word in edgeways here.

Mr. Speaker, we heard this Tory Party for years how they criticized the previous administration for not building roads, for not doing this and that, for not doing this and that. Then, Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden they got in power and things were different. Mr. Speaker, I do not know to this day but there are some ministers you cannot even get a hold off by phone. Many of them do not even answer their mail. If you phone up they are in conference or they are at a meeting, you cannot even speak to them. None of our community councils can get a hold of them. It is a sham, Mr. Speaker. Imagine being elected to govern by the people, and then not governing at all. Hoping that the problems of today will disappear! Apparently this is the philosophy of the minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: Why, Mr. Speaker, when our people of Newfoundland have advanced projects for this government to do, when they have come up with ideas to be brought forward and to be implemented, the only thing that they hear is excuses, more excuses and more excuses. They say; "Well, we cannot do that because of the previous administration." They say that the previous administration put this province in the hole. They borrowed too much money. They say, we cannot do that water and sewerage project, we have not got the money.

What I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, is what happened to the \$188 million that the Minister of Finance has borrowed this last thirteen months. What has happened to it? I am sure George McLean did not take it all.

MR. NEARY: He got a good slice of it.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous. There are monies in this province for everything else but for the things that our people would like to see come about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen of this province have been a sorry lot for a long, long time. They have tried to earn a living by the sweat

of their brow and by the courage of their hearts. They have challenged the North Atlantic to send towards them whatever it could possibly and they have accepted that challenge and met that challenge quite well. Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech debate of 1972 we heard that there was going to be a big fisheries programme. We really did not learn how big it was

Mr. Thoms.

before we got the Throne Speech of this year, when someone came up with the figure of \$40 million for a big dragger programme. Now, Mr. Speaker, it might be all very well to place upon the banks of Labrador and Newfoundland some modernized draggers. It might be all very well. Mr. Speaker, the backbone and the guts of the Newfoundland fishery is in our inshore fishery. It is the men who go out in the small boats, day in and day out, who are the real backbone of the Newfoundland fishery. Mr. Speaker, unless we pay more attention to our inshore fishery, I am afraid that we will have no fishery at all.

Let me give the hon. Premier (I am sorry to see that he is not in his seat this afternoon) a very good, constructive suggestion. Take \$20 million of the \$40 million and buy modern draggers with it. Take the other \$20 million and buy some ice-making machines and make sure you toss three of them down in Bonavista North. Take part of that \$20 million and provide more slipways. All over the coast of our island today, we have long liners frozen in the ice because our fishermen do not have the adequate facilities to take these boats out of the water. Let us install some big depots for our inshore fishermen, not these huge, great cadillac type depots but very highly sophisticated but small and modern depots, small units that can service a couple of hundred fishermen or more. When you do that, make sure you drop two of them in Bonavista North.

Mr. Speaker, another aspect of our inshore fishery which we have yet to embark upon and that is fish farming. All over the world today people are fish farming. They are doing it in Japan. They are doing a magnificent job in Mauritius. Why cannot we do it here in Newfoundland? We have some of the nicest inlets that you could possibly imagine in this world. We do not have to spend a yen on construction to

Mr. Thoms

create these because they are there. All we have to do is properly use them, properly manage them and properly farm the fish from them. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, this indeed could give a big boost to our inshore fishery.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as the fishery on the Grand Banks is concerned, I agree with putting draggers out there. We should be grabbing a certain percentage of the harvest of the Grand Banks. We most certainly do. I would certainly agree with this present government spending money to build these draggers. But remember, this, Mr. Speaker, the only benefits that will come from these draggers are a few fishermen who will operate them, but the greatest benefit will come to the fish merchants of this province, unless, Mr. Speaker, there is some system of rental put on these draggers so that a return from the fish merchants, the fish plants or whoever else the fish is caught for - unless there is some adequate return to the province otherwise really it is only giving someone else the fast buck.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our government have been encouraging the experimental, experimenting and seining of caplin on the Grand Banks. Now, Mr. Speaker, I agree with taking the caplin on the Grand Banks, because if we do not take them, the international countries will. Now, Mr. Speaker, the caplin on the Grand Banks represent the link in a long chain, from the plankton upon to the whales, they represent one chain. Mr. Speaker, the plankton is the smallest thing in the ocean. Of course, the whale is the largest.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is the whale the largest?

MR. THOMS: Yes, to my knowlege, the whale is the largest thing in the North Atlantic, that is unless George McLean learned how to swim this past couple of days or so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the caplin are the food for the other fish

above it in this long chain. Mr. Speaker, if we collect up all the caplin on the Grand Banks, we are going to break that chain. Once that chain is broken, it is going to be difficult to replace it. It is going to take tens of years to replace it. If we break down this one link of that chain, we also automatically break down the other links.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: No, we cannot get the caplin and the cod offal, unless - well we just take so many caplin.

AN HON. MEMBER: Can we have the whales?

MR. THOMS: Yes, we can have the whale. Most definitely we can have them, but we cannot take every whale. This would be very foolish, if that is what the honourable gentleman is insinuating. We must control our harvest, put a tonnage on all the harvest of the sea so that we can have all species of fish. We should not and we dare not destroy any one harvest.

AN HON. MEMBER: We have to get the co-operation of the other countries.

MR. THOMS: Naturally, we must get the co-operation and international co-operation. Of course, I believe most definitely that it is very important. We really cannot have any co-operation at all unless we have the good will of the good people of the United States. These are the people to whom we sell our fish. This is our major market. As a matter of fact, without that market our industry in Newfoundland would virtually collapse overnight. This is one of the reasons why I disagree with the Premier when he says that we should have further processing. We cannot have further processing. We must sell in blocks, because the States will not accept further processing.

MR. SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable member that he has approximately five minutes left.

MR. THOMS. What, Mr. Speaker, only five minutes left; I have just begun. Mr. Speaker, I trust that any negotiations which the provincial department of fisheries will be carrying on with the federal government, would bear this in mind. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying before, this present administration seems to be giving a reason why they cannot do anything in Newfoundland this past fourteen months and it is because of

the terrible mess they found themselves in and because of the actions of the previous administration. Mr. Speaker, this indeed is a very weak and a sick excuse. This is governing by excuses.

Mr. Speaker, in October, 1971 and March, 1972 we witnessed in Newfoundland two major political flukes and Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland are going to have to suffer for the next three or four years because of these political flukes. Mr. Speaker, I never witnessed in all my life such a bunch of misfits, such an arrogant pick of Tory misfits. I never witnessed such a clique of Tory misfits but, Mr. Speaker, I ask you when, oh when are they going to start governing?

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, first thing that I have to do is to concur with the hon. member for Bell Island. I certainly could not hope to talk that long, for as long as the hon. member from Bonavista North, and not say anything.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome to the House the hon. member for Labrador South. I might say, Sir, that I have a great deal of respect for his predecessor or the former member for that district. I still feel that the constituents of that area will be well represented by the new member even though he is sitting on the opposite side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be in order also to congratulate my hon. friend and colleague, the member for Port au Port, on his appointment to the position of Deputy Speaker of the House. As usual, Mr. Speaker, I think our Premier has made a very wise choice.

Sir, before commenting on the Throne Speech, I would like to make some reference to some remarks made by the hon. member for Bell Island on February, 12 past.

MR. NEARY: Tell us about the supervisor over in Heart's Content.

MR. C. BRETT: No, I will not, Sir. You talk to the minister concerned.

I would first of all, Sir, like for the members of this House to understand that I have no desire to keep this particular incident to

which I am going to relate alive or to start any undesirable dialogue with the hon. member. However, just to set the record straight and to inform my constituents of the real facts, I would like to elaborate for a few moments. I felt a little while ago that maybe I would not be able to say this because as I looked in the galleries I saw the hon. member, well I do not know if he is honourable or not any longer, but at least he is still a gentleman, I saw the gentleman to which I am going to refer and I had sort of second thoughts, but I notice that he has gone.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the position of the parliamentary assistant which was talked about by the hon. member for Bell Island and some of the newspapers, this job was created by the former administration for the member for White Bay North, at least the now member for White Bay North and the Leader of the Opposition was the first honourable gentleman to hold that position. The second hon. gentleman was Captain Uriah Strickland, my Liberal predecessor. Now, I would like to reiterate here that I have the utmost respect for this gentleman and this is no reflection on him in any way.

However, Mr. Strickland was the member for Trinity North for which he received his constituency pay of \$10,000, the same as I receive and other members in the House. His salary for parliamentary assistant, I think, was \$6,000. He was also appointed to the fire commission, the salary and again I stand to be corrected, I think it was \$6,000.

HON. MEMBER: No, No.

MR. C. BRETT: It was not?

HON. MEMBER: You better check it again. That is not right.

MR. C. BRETT: Well, all right, it was a salary.

HON. MEMBER: He was never in the fire commission.

MR. C. BRETT: All right a member of the Bell Island Transportation Commission.

MR. NEARY: Well that is about enough.

Mr. C. BRETT: The government subsidized. All right, the government subsidized.

MR. NEARY: The federal government subsidized -

Mr. C. BRETT: Public is right. All in all I would assume that this gentleman's salary was considerably higher than mine is at the moment.

AN HON. MEMBER: It could still be more.

MR. C. BRETT: He was. That is your opinion, Sir. However, Mr. Speaker, it appears that what is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander.

HON. MEMBER: No, there is no gander.

MR. C. BRETT: If I could say, Sir, I entered public life to make a contribution to my province. I was asked to accept the position of parliamentary assistant and by accepting the position I hope that I can make some contribution. If I state it was a marvelous intention. Okey, you do not have to listen to me, Sir.

HON. MEMBER: On grounds of good taste I prefer not to.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, my first comments on the Throne Speech are to praise my government and the restructuring programme. And I do not have a key in my back. The opposition's criticism to the programme was expected but as usual it was anything but constructive criticism.

My government, Mr. Speaker, sees the pitfalls in programmes instituted in a hasty fashion which perhaps solve present problems but do not necessarily allow any consideration for future repercussions. The establishment of planning task force subcommittees will do so much to alleviate the sour of the moment decisions and will allow for constructive and well planned programmes that will be greatly concerned with the future thereby giving our province a sound base of operation.

Mr. Speaker, the effectiveness of proper planning by the government can only result in long term benefits for the people.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the continuous cry of the opposition that this government has not done anything in the past year. I would like to

commend our Premier and the cabinet, or his cabinet on one of the best years this province has ever seen. I speak in general terms, Sir but I am thinking specifically of my district.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, that during the past year anyone who wanted a job in Trinity North could get one and the future looks even better. There was more road construction, Mr. Speaker, and paving done in Trinity North last year than in any previous year, other of course than election years when the opposition was in power.

Mr. Speaker, my whole district is prospering and what is more important, Sir, and I would like to stress very strongly to this House is that the people feel free once again, free to criticize or praise the government as a whole or any individual member they represent. If you like, Sir, there is a different atmosphere. Mr. Speaker, I commend our government for bringing this freedom to the people.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that our government has taken a common sense approach to our human resources. The thought that our human resources will be developed wisely and for the maximum benefit of our province makes one realize that our government is concerned for the welfare of its people.

The possible discovery of oil on our Continental Shelf will bring untold and undreamed of benefits to our people. Already the possibility of a commercial find of oil and gas has created negotiations for a new company in Clarendville that may do pipe fabricating for a Mainland firm. Sir, should these negotiations prove successful this company would hire more than twenty people. In connection with the possible discovery of oil and gas, I am very pleased to see that our government is taking steps to ensure that the very important fishing industry is not impaired. Also, that a satisfactory solution is being sought with the federal government, the Province of Quebec and the Atlantic Provinces, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, P.E.I. with regard to the ownership of mineral rights,

this asset to our province. I am encouraged, Sir, by my government's decision not to move hastily on the project and I am further encouraged by my government's approach which ensures that our province will derive maximum benefit based on terms most favourable to Newfoundland. This kind of thinking, Mr. Speaker, will produce the best results for our province. This is but one example, Sir, of the government's approach to the development of our province's natural resources. for only through long-term planning now can we develop our natural resources for the future in the best possible way.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. BRETT: We have to plan for the future, do we not? Mr. Speaker, I welcome our government's foresight in setting up a task force to formulate plans for better utilization of our forest. Somebody condemned this here a little while ago. It is a little disturbing, Sir, to any true Newfoundlander, to see millions of board feet of lumber imported into this province annually while we have the raw materials rotting on the ground. This brings home true to me, maybe more so than some because many people in my district make their living in the sawmilling and logging industry. I believe, Sir, that you will find many people in my district say that for the first time in their lives they have a government that is concerned with their future.

Our greatly expanded forest access road programme will prove very beneficial to several areas of my district and I am sure, Sir, that the loggers look forward in anticipation to great co-operation from this government. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that as a do-nothing government we spent \$600,000 last year for the provision of forest access roads, which is twelve times as much as was spent the previous year.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see our government's continued

intention to put special emphasis on the fisheries programme. Fishing is very important in many parts of my district particularly in the areas between Spillars Cove, Bonaventure, as well as the South West Arm Area. There is a desperate need in this area for better fishing facilities and most of them I know will come. I understand that plans are being made at the moment for the construction of a longliner slipway in a certain area and details of this I assume will be released as soon as plans have been finalized.

There is one particular point concerning the fishery that I would like to stress, Sir, here and that is that in my district there are three large modern fish plants and they are all within probably a mile radius of each other. Out of the three fish plants there is one that is operating, not really on a full-time basis, only on a seasonal basis and that is the fresh fish plant. I do understand, Sir, that one if not two draggers are to be added to the present fleet that unload their catches or ship their catches at this fresh fish plant and this, of course, will result in the possible opening of the plant on a year-around basis or otherwise. Well in any case it would certainly increase the number of people working there. The other two plants, Mr. Speaker, are salt fish plants and they are I would say the most modern salt fish plants on the Northeast Coast. As a matter of fact in this House this afternoon we heard the Premier

and the hon. Leader of the Opposition pay tribute to one of the gentlemen that owned one of these salt fish plants, in the person of Mr. Mifflin. Should these plants be reopened they would create something over three hundred permanent jobs in my district. Now suggestions have been made to the Department of Fisheries that midwater trawlers should fish out of Catalina thus reviving these plants. I am encouraged, Mr. Speaker, by the fact that the hon. Minister of Fisheries is seriously studying the prospects of reopening the plant and again this indicates my government's emphasis on the fisheries programme.

There is a desperate need, Sir, for wharf building and repairs in several parts of my district. However, after almost twelve months of trying to get through to the Liberal Government in Ottawa they are still turning a deaf ear. But perhaps now that we have a liberal representative for the Federal riding of Bonavista-Trinity-Conception, we can expect to see new wharves going up all over the place.

MR. NEARY: Guaranteed.

MR. BRETT: I hope so. Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BRETT: I bet it will be good. It will not be a liberal budget though.

MR. NEARY: Oh it will.

MR. BRETT: Yes, it will. Mr. Lewis's budget. Mr. Speaker, our government in the Throne Speech have reiterated their intentions to further develop the tourist industry. I laud the setting up of the Department of Tourism under the very capable ministership of the hon. member for Ferryland, unfortunately he is not here today. There is a desperate need for tourist development in the District of Trinity North, Sir, particularly in the Trinity-Port Rexton Area. I am very pleased, Sir, that the association for the restoration of the Deep Bight water

wheel are making some progress with their project and I hope we can see a small rest park created in the area in the not too distant future.

I feel, Sir, that the government's move to licence homes for tourist accomodations will do much to expand the tourist potential in my area. It is the type of programme, Sir, that will appeal to the people of Trinity North as well as bring added revenue to the tourist operators in my district.

Mr. Speaker, our government's concern for our natural resources is manifested in our rural development programme which is proving to be such a success, again under the leadership of the Minister of Rural Development, the hon. member for Trinity South. I fail to see how even the members on the other side of the House can criticize this programme. Hundreds of new jobs have been created. As a matter of fact I checked with the department before I went into this and they tell me that there have been 1,012 jobs created at a cost of \$1,567,000. I would say that it is comparably low.

MR. NEARY: Would you read out the list?

MR. BRETT: No, I do not have it, Sir. I am sorry.

AN HON. MEMBER: Would the hon. member like to have a list?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, I would.

AN HON. MEMBER: Would the hon. member get us a list?

AN HON. MEMBER: Have you asked for a list?

MR. BRETT: I am not the minister of a department, Sir. I am sure that you would get it from the minister concerned.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BRETT: You will get it from the minister if you want it.

In my district alone, Mr. Speaker, fifty-eight new jobs have been created.

MR. NEARY: Tell us where?

MR. BRETT: No, I do not think I should but assistance

was given to thirteen saw-milling firms, one farm expansion firm and one bar manufacturing firm, would you not love to know? The people of Trinity North are grateful, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity given them by our government to develop resource based industries. This programme, Sir, will be an on-going one.

Mr. Speaker, the establishment of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation by our government is another step in the right direction. We would like to assure you Sir, that there are many people in the District of Trinity North who have waited long and are still waiting for the corporation to get moving. The delay was not caused by us, Mr. Speaker, and it was most unfortunate that it was used as a political football for so long. I guess they were afraid in Ottawa that we just might get the credit for it.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note in the Throne Speech that our government is concerned about the basic health services in our province. In my district, Sir, there is a desperate need for a regional hospital. I have every reason to believe, Sir, that this will become a reality in the not too distant future. There is a need for doctors and for dentists. There is need for a doctor, particularly at Trinity which I understand will be taken care of shortly. There is only one dentist in the whole district, Sir, we need at least three.

The problem, Sir, is not one of cost. This government is prepared to cover their share of the cost and they will do so. The problem, Sir, is in acquiring the dentist or the body, if you wish, the person who will serve our people. I know that the Department of Health is working on this problem with the Dental Association and I have every confidence the problem will be resolved as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I would be remiss in my duty if I did not offer some words of praise, still speaking on health, for the people of Trinity North, in the Clarendville and surrounding areas, who, through their own initiative and without government assistance, constructed a very modern medical clinic. This clinic is presently staffed by two very competent doctors, a laboratory and x-ray technician. This clinic serves a very large area and is providing a much needed service to the people.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing, the most important thing that I would like to point out about this clinic is that, Sir, this is a prime example of what people can do without hand-outs from the government, when a lot of initiative and hard-work is shown by the people concerned. Mr. Speaker, the people of Trinity North are proud of that particular accomplishment. Too bad the honourable member for Bell Island left.

The honourable member for Bell Island, Sir, was very upset over the fact that our government has issued less short-term assistance this year than during the previous year. This, Mr. Speaker, is typical of the nature of things that usually upset him. He chose to take one part of the Throne Speech out of context and refer to that alone, Sir. What he did not say was that the saving was due in part to a programme begun in September 1972 to assist social assistance recipients to locate and take advantage of employment opportunity.

The special project, Sir, which was carried out in St. John's and Corner Brook, resulted in over five hundred social assistance recipients being placed in jobs. Perhaps, Sir, the honourable member for Bell Island would rather see these five hundred persons remain on welfare, quite possible.

Being a welfare officer, Sir, for ten years, I feel I can speak with some knowledge, probably a little bit more knowledge than the

minister, speak with some knowledge of the past welfare programmes in this province, Sir. To say the least they have been and they still are inadequate. I am very happy to see that our government is taking steps to bring in a more adequate incentive-gearred programme.

I am not suggesting, Sir, that you did not try to do this. It is a very difficult problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: Not at the moment, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I must make mention of our government's intention to pay close attention to our existing school curriculum, which Sir, and again I have some knowledge of this, is absolutely out-dated and as the Throne Speech indicates, must be more diversified.

In the field of education, Sir, I am sure the teachers of our province are pleased to note that during this session of the House, the government intends legislation setting up procedures for collective bargaining with the Newfoundland Teachers Association. Personally I am very

happy with this action on the part of our government, since I had the pleasure, Sir, of working with a large number of teachers for a period of three years.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition have been very vociferous over the lack of co-operation from the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In my opinion, the honourable minister has the task of administering one of the most difficult departments in government. He is doing an excellent job, Sir. To the best of my knowledge, no complaints have been received from Trinity North regarding this department. Believe me, Sir, we do have quite a number of municipalities. I am very pleased with this department. I am pleased that they have seen fit to continue three large water and sewerage programmes being carried out in Clarenville, Catalina and Port Union. I have no doubt, Sir, that other programmes of this nature will be started in the foreseeable future.

Another very important point in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, was the intention of our government to increase the maximum loan of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, from six thousand dollars to nine thousand dollars in rural areas. This, Mr. Speaker, is another step forward.

Many people, Sir, in my district, as I am sure they have in other districts, have taken advantage of this programme and since housing is a problem in rural as well as urban areas, this programme should do much to alleviate the situation.

MR. NEARY: That is an old Liberal programme. Are there any new programmes?

MR. BRETT: Well we increased it, did we not? Why did you not do it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The honourable member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I feel certain that most members on both sides

of the House are pleased with the governments decision to redistribute the electoral districts of the province. You know, Mr. Speaker, we do not have too many cabinet ministers, we have too few districts. Maybe this would solve the problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: Another joke.

MR. BRETT: Of course, from your point of view. There are, Sir, over 7,000 voters in the District of Trinity North, scattered over a very large geographical area. (That is a very interesting question). It is difficult, Sir, and I said this in my speech last year, although the honourable gentleman from Bell Island said he has not heard me speak in the House. I do not know where he was last year at the opening. It is difficult, Sir, I repeat, for one person to adequately serve such a large area and do justice to the people concerned. Redistribution will hopefully take care of such situations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that my district is anything but unique when it comes to the needs, the basic amenities. Sir, we need road construction in the areas between Trinity and Trouty, Southwest Arm, Random Island and the Smith Sound Area. We need water and Sewerage facilities in many of our larger communities. We need better fishing facilities. I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, but we have all heard them so many times in this House. Suffice it to say, Sir, that we have a government that is cognizant of the needs of our province and this government is formulating long-range plans to see that these needs are met.

Mr. Speaker, in closing and I did not talk for an hour and a-half, I could not possible conjure up that much wind, I would like to refer to my address in reply delivered during the first session of the Thirty-Sixth General Assembly on April 19, 1972. In that speech, Sir, I made reference to the beginning of a new era, a period of reform. I stated, Sir, that I was proud to be a part of that reform group. Mr. Speaker, I am still proud to be a part of that group. I believe, Sir, that our government is trying to establish an administration that will

hopefully yield the greatest quantity of happiness to the greatest number. We have been accused of being arrogant, but I feel that this is far from the truth. We as a government want to plan well to establish a sound and beneficial plan for continued progress in the future.

AN HON. MEMBER: You do not do anything but plan.

MR. BRETT: That is all right, give us time.

Our government is doing and will continue to do just that, (You had better listen to this, the honourable member for Bell Island) under the leadership of our respected and dynamic leader, (and I still do not have the key in my back) a leader, Sir, who has brought this province through a year when great obligations were placed upon the government when it took office, a leader who has shown his sensitivity with action to the rural parts of our province and the fishery, two vital parts of our economy so neglected in the past.

MR. NEARY: Do not choke on that.

MR. BRETT: I will not, do not worry.

I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to go forward under this leadership.

MR. MARTIN: I wish to move at this time, Mr. Speaker, that with the House's permission we adjourn debate for today. I have a few words to say on tomorrow which will take me a little more than the fifteen minutes left.

On motion debate adjourned.

On motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on certain bills, Mr. Speaker, left the Chair.

MR. F. STAGG (Chairman of Committee of the Whole):

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Assignment Of Book Debts Act."

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

A bill, "An Act To Amend The St. Clare's Mercy Hospital (Incorporation) Act, 1960."

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

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Companies Act."

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

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Quieting Of Titles Act."

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

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Justices Act."

On motion Clause (2) carried.

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

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Family Courts Act."

On motion Clauses (1) through (2) carried.

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

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Protection Of Animals Act."

On motion Clauses (1) through (5) carried.

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

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Employment (Notice of Termination) Act. 1969."

On motion Clauses (1) through (2) carried.

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

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bills No. 2, 20, 1, 18, 13, 6 and 17 without amendment and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted, bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do move that the House at its rising to adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER: On motion the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M.

