



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume 2

2nd Session

Number 14

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL



The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

PETITIONS:

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the residents of the Great Northern Peninsula. Sir, this must be one of the greatest petitions that was ever presented before this House and I will read the prayer of the petition since it is so eloquently stated.

"To the honourable Speaker and members of the honourable House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador; this petition of the undersigned citizens of the Great Northern Peninsula, humbly sheweth that the Northern Peninsula Highway no. 73 is the essential means of communication available to the 35,000 Newfoundlanders who live on the Northern Peninsula.

"That every citizen must use this road for access to medical services and all other social facilities including schools, that the greater part of the food consumed by these citizens is moved by service transport which uses the road, that the greater part of the goods consumed by and used by these citizens is moved by service transport which uses the road, that no part of the road is adequate to serve the purpose for which it is now being used, that this causes great inconvenience to the citizens in addition to increase in the cost of living and substantially reducing the level of social services available to them and that the implementation of the paving and reconstruction programme throughout Newfoundland in the past few years to so improve roads elsewhere that your petitioners believe it is now time to implement such a programme for the Northern Peninsula Highway.

" Your petitioners therefore pray that work begin immediately on the reconstruction and paving of the Northern Peninsula Highway and your petitioners further pray that the work begin in 1972"(this petition was organized in 1972 but I did not get an occasion to present

it before this time)"your petitioners further pray that the work be carried out in segments distributed along the Great Northern Peninsula in such a manner so as to benefit all the citizens equally during the construction period and your petitioners further pray that the Government of this Province assign to this project a priority."

Now, Sir, this petition is supported by approximately eight-four hundred people in sixty-four Communities in three Provincial Districts of St. Barbe North, St. Barbe South and White Bay North. There are actually 7,354 signatures and 1,030 other citizens indicated their support in other ways. Sir, this petition is also endorsed by the Corner Brook Chamber of Commerce, The Deer Lake Chamber of Commerce, The Humber Valley Development Association and the Mayor of Deer Lake.

Sir, this highway would reduce the cost of living on the Great Northern Peninsula dramatically, it would reduce the hardship experienced and the expense incurred in

the provision of normal services and would increase the economic development of the Great Northern Peninsula tremendously. Particularly in the area of tourism it is the gateway to Labrador, L'Anse aux Meadows and to the IGA centre in St. Anthony.

Sir, the Great Northern Peninsula Highway is the life line to the people living along that coast. This is obvious now at this time of the year when the highway is completely blocked and we have an emergency situation existing on the Great Northern Peninsula Highway, and such a highway would probably offset the problems that are existing there at the present time.

I could go into the details of the emergency situation that exists there at the moment. I asked the honourable Minister of Highways if he would declare a state of emergency there last Friday, in Friday's sitting. That has not been set as far as I know and the helicopter was flying over the building the other day as I walked in through the door and I think I would like to suggest to the honourable Minister of Highways that we might jump aboard that government helicopter within the next day or so and go up there and take a first hand look at the situation.

Sir, I give this petition my every support. I ask that it be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS: (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman for St. Barbe North does not need to detail it, but that petition was signed by almost every citizens in almost every community in my constituency of White Bay North. That in itself, Sir, is enough to bring me to my feet in support of it because it does represent the very strong feeling of all of the people who live in the communities from Englee, Bide Arm, Conche, Main Brook and Roddickton all the way to the communities north of St. Anthony and St. Anthony itself.

Even if it were not for that expression, does the honourable gentleman have the numbers of people from my constituency?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: It is 3,000 or 4,000 or 5,000 citizens, Sir, in White Bay North who signed that petition. Even if it were not for that I would be supporting this petition wholeheartedly because to me the Northern Peninsula Highway, the highway running from Deer Lake north to St. Anthony running down through Bonne Bay and along the Straits and down into White Bay North, that road must become the priority of the road reconstruction and paving programme of the government of this province be that government formed by the party presently in power or be it formed by any other party.

The Northern Peninsula Highways, Mr. Speaker, is the last great stretch of road on the island part of this province that has to be rebuilt in many parts, and paved in its entirety. As of today, with the exception of one mile of pavement in Raleigh and 5.2 miles of pavement around the Community of St. Anthony and in each case through the populated parts of those settlements, there is not one inch of pavement north of Deer Lake. When one crosses the Humber River it goes up through Reidville, crosses the old bridge, across the Humber River, it heads north, it is 300 miles to St. Anthony, Sir, there is not one inch of pavement.

There is a DREE contract, I believe McNamara or the successful contractors to pave approximately twelve miles between Port Saunders and the Port au Choix, Hawkes Bay Area. I think it is twelve miles, is it? It was in the agreement negotiated by my friend for White Bay South. I think the road is nearly ready for paving but no blacktop has actually been laid. As the Minister of Highways confirms, no blacktop has actually been laid, it will be laid this summer I guess or this spring.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the people on the Northern Peninsula have waited patiently and gladly, they restrained their enthusiasms. They have waited while the road along the Burin Peninsula was rebuilt and paved. There are about as many people living on the Burin Peninsula, Sir,

as there are on the Northern Peninsula. They waited while many other-trunk roads, the road to LaScie is largely paved thanks to -

AN NON. MEMBER: Baie Verte -

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry to Baie Verte, thanks to my friend for White Bay South. The road to Gander Bay and running out that way has been paved. The road to the Isles is being rebuilt and paved again more work to be done. But the Northern Peninsula Highway, Sir, is the last great stretch of road. What the people in my constituency want, what the people in St. Barbe North want, what the people in St. Barbe South I regret the member is not here today, I am sure what the people in Labrador South want is to have that road rebuilt and paved, Sir. That is the prayer of this petition. I support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. Speaker, a word of advice to the government: Ottawa will pay a large part of the cost of that road if only the government ask for it and negotiate it. They will pave the road from Deer Lake to the northern edge of the National Park. Now with their decision to go ahead at L'Anse aux Meadows, the culmination of six or seven years of negotiations, give them additional reason, they have accepted the responsibility for the Port Saunders, Hawkes Bay Area. If the government can only get organized and get cracking Ottawa will give substantial help towards that road, Sir, just as they helped on the Burin Peninsula Road, helped to the inconsiderable extent of one hundred cents on the dollar.

So I hope the present minister, Sir, will get moving on it. If not their successors most assuredly will.

Let me just add, Sir, the petition is very timely at this time. I will be asking some questions on Orders of the Day but the Minister of Highways I know is aware of the increasingly serious situation caused by the increasingly serious and continuing snowfalls in the northern part of this province. He may have a statement he can make now, if not I hope he will either on Orders, Sir, or in a responsible question. The problem

continues to get more serious. This petition just points out the importance of the road and the fact now that people have been isolated for four, five and six days and they are beginning to run out of some fuel supplies, they are beginning to run out of some of the less essential food supplies, only proves the importance of a road.

The time has come, Sir, and I think this road should begin immediately. I would like to see it begin this summer. I support the petition fully.

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to that support given by the member for White Bay North for the petition presented by my friend for St. Barbe North.

I think as we have heard that most all of the other trunk highways in the province have now been paved and it is high time that we got around to looking at that one on the Great Northern Peninsula. From my point of view and the point of view from the people of Labrador South there are a great number of reasons why we should.

In the first place, as has already been pointed out, the cost of living in that area and extending beyond that area into Labrador the cost of living will be made considerably less. The mail service will be improved, greatly improved. There will be a big boost to the tourist industry I am sure with the new emphasis being placed on tourism by this government that such a highway will boost the tourism industry to an extent where it is going to become one of the major industries in that part of the province.

As far as we are concerned on the other side of the Straits, it is going to give us the boost that we need for our own industrial development but I think it should go beyond that too, There is a feeling that somehow or other the two parts of the province are not tied quite closely enough together and the paving of a highway that would permit better communications and better travel between the two parts of the province would go a long way



towards eliminating a lot of that feeling of separatism.

I think the fears of the last couple of days up in that part of the province have also pointed out the necessity of taking a harder look at this whole idea of highways and highway maintenance. We have had the road closed in my part of the district for the last couple of weeks effectively closed and I will not lay the blame at the feet of the minister here today because it is a problem that has been going on for a number of years. I think the problem is in itself, is not only for highway construction, but for highway maintenance and clearing not enough of the budget has been cut out for that. Up in my area we have not had a highway practically all the year.

So while I support this petition today I would like to inform the members here present that it is not just the cost of putting the blacktop on this highway that we have to consider, it is the whole sociological atmosphere that is going to be changed in that part of the province and especially on the northern tip of the peninsula and in my district.

HON. DR. T. FARRELL: (MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION): Mr.

Speaker, I would like to say a few words in response to the honourable Leader of the Opposition when he asked for the report on the conditions prevailing on the West Coast today. I know everybody will understand when I say that the conditions in the Western Area of our province and in Labrador are the worst possibly in recorded weather history, I am not quite sure of that, but I am pretty close. There is no way of controlling or opening the roads at the present time. I will have later in the day for the Leader of the Opposition a more detailed report, this one

when it appears at nine thirty describes pretty well the conditions as I described them yesterday where a lot of the roads were closed and ploughs were not able to operate. The conditions are frightful.

I would like to mention at this time as well that I have made a commitment to the honourable the member from Labrador South that he and I will be going within the next couple of weeks, possibly around the middle of March, to Labrador South to have a look personally at the conditions there. I think that is a fair statement. Thank you. I would like to present this complete report later.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition presented by my colleague, the member for St. Barbe North. Sir, about four or five years ago when the House of Commons Committee on Transportation and Communications was travelling across Canada they came to St. John's and at that particular time I was responsible for transportation in the previous administration. We adopted, at that time, Sir, as a part of our policy, the paving of the Great Northern Peninsula but we went further than that, Mr. Speaker, we also adopted, as part of our policy, a permanent link and between the Island of Newfoundland and the Mainland part of the province. Then, Sir, to complete the job, a highway across Labrador as a continuation of the Trans Canada Highway.

We claim, Sir, that you should be able to drive from St. John's to Montreal or to New York on pavement all the way and right across the Straights of Belle Isle. Now a year or so ago, Sir, I suggested that a tunnel or a causeway be built across the Straights of Belle Isle, that seemed to capture the imagination of people right across Canada because of the unique way that I suggested it be built.

I suggested, Mr. Speaker, that it be built as a make-work project. I do not see any - well I do see some justification in paving the Great Northern Peninsula up as far as St. Anthony, Sir, but I think it would be a mistake just to stop at St. Anthony. I think we should go right across the Straights of Belle Isle. I am not sure whether I agree

with the honourable the Premier or not that a road should be built from Labrador West to the Province of Quebec. I think the people of Labrador would be more inclined to lean towards the Mainland part of Canada. While that may be all right, Mr. Speaker, as a temporary measure to get the people out of isolation for a year or two or three years, I do not think it is the real answer. I think if Labrador is going to be of any benefit to Newfoundland, Sir, that we have to make it a part of - we have to link the Island of Newfoundland to the mainland part of the province either by a tunnel or a causeway.

In this day and age, Sir, when the Government of Canada has adopted the principle of make-work programmes - and I understand right at the moment there is a team of engineers from Memorial University down doing a feasibility study on the currents and the tides and so forth in the Straights of Belle Isle and there is also, Mr. Speaker, a team of engineers from the Bedford Basin, from the Bedford Institute, down there doing a study.

MR. MARSHALL: This petition does relate to the roads on the Great Northern Peninsula and I think that the Bedford Basin is a little bit far removed from the Great Northern Peninsula.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is all tied in with the paving of the Great Northern Peninsula and if the honourable member for St. John's East will just be a little bit patient, Sir, I will show him how it is tied in.

So, I would go further than the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, I think we should not only pave the road right up the Great Northern Peninsula but establish a permanent link between the Island of Newfoundland and the mainland and build a road right across Labrador as a continuation of the Trans Canada Highway.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Was the honourable minister going to speak on this other matter? On this present matter, I am going to introduce another one.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may make one or two remarks with reference to this petition because this has been a hardy annual in this House for a great number of years. This one where there was not a foot of pavement and also St. Mary's district which were the two districts I think that were never paved. Each time I had pleasure when on the other side to support this petition and I do so now because of the fact of knowing the conditions of the people living on the Great Northern Peninsula and more especially I think the people in Labrador South.

I had been Minister of Labrador Affairs for a short time. I have very much pleasure in supporting this petition and I see now that this petition is timely perhaps because of the fact that the federal government is becoming very actively engaged in this particular area due to L'Anse-au-Meadows and the new Gros Morne Park and also in the Port au Choix area there. I am sure that this government in its wisdom and it has lots of it will do an awful lot more than (we are only one year now) in the twenty-three years that the other government were operating, I feel sure, Sir.

When they do I would like for them to have a hard look, whoever is concerned with the St. Barbe ferry there. Well, I have pictures taken of the French end in Quebec where the ferry terminates and also the Newfoundland end. I am sure (and I have discussed this with the member) that it is a great tragedy just what has happened on that coast.

Speaking of tourism, I hope that if we do develop tourism that it will be for Newfoundland and not for Quebec as has happened in the case of the other government.

Mr. Speaker, I have very great pleasure in supporting this petition and I am quite aware of the great problems that the member for St. Barbe North and White Bay North are facing. I mean, they are in districts that have been neglected for twenty-three years. I am sure that the Minister of Highways will help when the time comes and the money is available, when we recoup some of the monies that have been squandered during the past twenty-three years, we will certainly invest it in the

Great Northern Peninsula.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to present a petition from 140 employees of the Hospital for Chest Diseases which is situated in the district of St. John's South.

The petition has not a prayer as such but is rather a review of the situation, Mr. Speaker. These employees express considerable concern about the decision of the government to close the Hospital for Chest Diseases. Particularly, they feel that the location of that facility, although the facility itself was somewhat dilapidated, they feel that the location was such that perhaps consideration ought to have been given - perhaps it was - to repairing the facility because it was ideally suited to the treatment of tuberculosis.

They also draw to the attention of the House the fact that the regional treatment of active tuberculosis cases has been tried in Newfoundland and leaves something to be desired and feel that there should be a central facility in the province for the treatment of tuberculosis. They would ask the minister and they do ask the government and the department to review these matters and feel that perhaps the decision may have been made to hastily.

They say that there is an acute shortage of medical and prescribed facilities at present in the Province of Newfoundland and they feel that the amount of space which is made available at St. Clare's Hospital for the treatment of tuberculosis is not adequate and also that it does not provide the out-of-doors space which I understand is usual in the treatment of tuberculosis.

They feel that there has been a lack of communication between the department and these employees. They would ask the department to review that whole matter so that any changeover and re-routing as it were, of these employees to other facilities could be accomplished with the minimum of disruption.

In summation of the petition which is really the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, they feel that the decision and its implications

must be re-examined and reviewed toward the speedy and satisfactory settlement for the good of all. They request that in view of the seriousness of the T.B. problem in Newfoundland and the political ramifications such a decision will be provincewide and that this matter will be tabled and discussed at the earliest meeting of the House.

Mr. Speaker, a few general remarks: The sanatorium situated in St. John's South has progressed.

for a great many years been the principle facility for the treatment of tuberculosis in Newfoundland. Happily tuberculosis is not now the killing disease in Newfoundland that it once was and that is due obviously in no small measure to the work that is being carried on in this institution. It was an excellent site, Mr. Speaker, a very pleasant and a very worthwhile site for treatment of tuberculosis. The only difficulty was, and this is recognized by everyone, that the building was allowed to dilapidate to such an extent that rain came into it, wind blew through it and it was almost falling down and something had to be done and the government obviously took the decision of relocating that facility to the new wing of St. Clare's Hospital.

It is rather sad that in a new and modern institution such as the T.B. facilities will go to that they cannot get out of doors apparently to the same degree and the employees also are concerned that there may not be enough space allocated in St. Clare's for the adequate treatment of tuberculosis. So all these matters, I feel, Mr. Speaker, ought to be examined in the light of this petition and the representations made by the Minister of Health and the department concerned and accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be tabled and forwarded to the department to which it relates.

HON. DR. A.T. ROWE (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, I feel I must rise and make a few general remarks on behalf of government regarding the petition presented by my colleague, the hon. member for St. John's South. I can appreciate the feelings of the staff of the sanatorium and I can assure them that the decision to close the institution was one that was taken not at all lightly. A review of the situation indicated that the buildings were built during the second world war as temporary buildings and then had the habit as many temporary things do of becoming permanent. They have from a physical point of view completely outlived their usefulness. The buildings had been condemned

by building inspectors, been condemned by the fire marshal being very unhappy with the wooden structure. The cost of renovation is completely out of proportion to the value. The operating cost is approximately \$1,100,000 per year. The maintenance on the physical plant is approximately \$200,000 annually and so it will indicate from this that the physical plant is not in a state that one would wish to keep inpatients no matter what their disease or what their illness. I should say too that the modern trends in tuberculosis therapy indicate that cases are now being treated in general hospitals and with the modern therapeutic drugs that are being used, the dangers of infection that existed down through the years before these drugs became operative no longer works. It is accepted medical practice now that tuberculosis can be treated in a general hospital.

I would point out that a brand new sanatorium was built in Corner Brook I think and opened about the mid 1950's and because of the lowering incidents of tuberculosis in the early 1960's this institution was closed. I never understood why instead of closing the Corner Brook Institution one did not move the patients from St. John's Sanatorium to the new facility at Corner Brook but be that as it may, it was not done but I indicate to you that the Corner Brook Sanatorium was closed some eight or ten years ago when the incidents of tuberculosis thankfully was falling.

I would also indicate that I had given to my colleague, the member for St. John's South, a week or so ago, statistics on what is happening to the employees at the sanatorium. He has the statistics now, I do not, but this indicates that at the present time a month or two before closing over sixty per cent of the staff are being absorbed elsewhere and that it is the opinion of the department who are in communication with NAPE on this subject that the balance would be looked after. I believe that the hon. member has made this known to employees of the sanatorium.



There is just one final point that I would like to make. I would be very happy to meet a delegation any time to review the whole situation, to discuss with them any points they wish to but I hope that nobody would believe that this was in any way a political decision to close the sanatorium. Previous Ministers of Health have had the problem of the building condemned, the question of patients in unfortunate physical conditions in there and I do not think anybody could accuse the government of having taken a political decision. It is a decision taken with humane interest as the basic reason and I think that we should be grateful to St. Clare's that we can now close this unfortunately physically substandard institution. I would be very happy to meet and discuss this with them at any time.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may say a word or so about this petition: Let me begin by saying I support it wholeheartedly and without any reservation whatsoever. I have a copy of it here and while I do not propose to read it all, Sir, I think that after the remarks of the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Health, a few words from me and perhaps the reading of portions of the petition, the relevant portions, would be in order. Now I as a former Health Minister am aware of some of the reasons at least which led to the decision to close the sanatorium. It is not a new idea. It was certainly canvassed time and time again during my period in the Department of Health and when the member for Burin was the Minister of Health I assume it was canvassed too and indeed I suspect it goes back through the years. It is not a new idea but what seems to have happened here, Sir, and judging from the wording of the petition itself, and the copy I have is not signed by anybody but I am told that it is a true copy of the petition to which 140 employees, that would be just about every employee at the hospital, have signed their names, the force of this petition, the message of it, Mr. Speaker, is that there has been apparently a serious

breakdown in communications between the minister and his officials here and the staff of the sanatorium.

The minister said, and I think I am quoting him, Mr. Speaker, I think I am quoting him correctly that he did not see how anybody could call this a political decision. Well I prefer not to take a position one way or the other on that right now except to point out that the people who have signed this petition do feel it was a political decision. The second paragraph, Sir, of the petition says: "The undersigned take as a matter of urgency to bring to your attention the highly undesirable and unfavourable situation which presently exists at the hospital for chest diseases, (the name for the sanatorium) resulting from a political decision made by the Minister of Health in October during dedication ceremonies of St. Clare's Hospital." This announcement was startling and upsetting. It gives some reasons there: "We have felt it necessary to point out the foregoing in view of the fact that it is felt that a proper or thorough investigation was not made prior to the minister's decision. We feel it was essentially a political decision hastily made without proper regard to its implications or ramifications."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is not that this was or was not a political decision, I have no way to know. I was told at the time St. Clare's was open that the first knowledge St. Clare's had of it in detail was the minister's speech. Again I am not saying it is true. I am saying what I was told by sources that I find usually very reliable but I will take the minister's word whatever it is on it. The point about this is that the people at the sanatorium, 140 employees of the government, 140 civil servants, 140 qualified nurses and perhaps doctors and laboratory technicians and aides and nursing assistants, the whole staff of the sanatorium feel that they have not been informed and to the extent necessary and desirable they have not been consulted. They are worried about their jobs.

Now I do not know when the petition was written, Sir, as it is not dated. It may have been before the member for St. John's South communicated the information to which the minister referred. It may have been since but I do not know. But the petition, Mr. Speaker, speaks eloquently that the staff of the sanatorium feel, in very real terms, that they have not been dealt with fairly or properly or decently. Now I know not whether they have been dealt with properly, I just do not know, Mr. Speaker, but what I do know is that these people feel that way and I think it is incumbent upon the minister and his officials, the member for St. John's South, if he wishes to interest himself since the facility is physically located in his constituency

some of the workers probably live there. Many others live in other parts of the city or even outside St. John's. (Whoever else wishes to get into it). The point is that these people feel that they have a complaint, Sir. They have also made some serious statements but they are not charges. They do make allegations. They make them openly and honestly and honourably. I think they should be looked into and I think the Minister of Health at the very least, Mr. Speaker, should come back to this House shortly, if not by his estimates, then on his estimates and be prepared to deal at length with this to allay these fears. If mistakes have been made let them be set straight. If no mistakes have been made, then let the minister make the necessary statement and allay the fears. The fears are there, Sir. The petition - I do not know if it is a petition or not. I suspect in a legal sense that it would be difficult to class it as a petition. But certainly it is a statement by a number of citizens of this province directly of concern to this House and the government, a statement that they are not being treated properly and so it should properly come before this House and properly be dealt with. I do support the petition, Sir.

HON. DR. A. T. ROWE (Minister of Health): I beg your indulgence, Mr. Speaker. There are two points: With reference to the Leader of the Opposition and the question of St. Clare's not knowing about this until I made the statement, it is not correct. I have had meetings with Dr. Brownrigg and Sister Fabian at St. Clare's on this question of the movements. I would like to have this recorded that we have had meetings. The second point is that I will be quite happy when, during the estimates, further information will be brought back to this House. Thirdly, I would be quite happy to meet a delegation from the sanatorium to discuss it in detail. I am sorry that they feel that communications have gone off the rails. I have been assured by the meetings that have taken place between the department and NAPE that things were working out satisfactorily. I am surprised, because I made

the statement back in September and it is only now, the end of February, when we are coming to the point of moving that this petition is presented.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to deal with the medical aspects of this petition. I want to deal with the employment aspects of it. About a week ago when we were discussing the amendment to the St. Clare's Mercy Hospital Act in this House, I was the one who brought the situation out in the open, smoked it out, dragged it out of the minister, that there was something happening at the sanatorium because I had been hearing rumours for weeks that there were going to be lay-offs at the sanatorium as a result of transferring the patients to St. Clare's Mercy Hospital. The minister told me at that time, in reply to my question, that negotiations were going on between NAPE and his department to try and place all the workers at the sanatorium in alternative employment. Later we heard from the member for St. John's South, when one day (I think it was two or three days following that discussion) I saw the member on television - I do not know if this is how he communicated the information that the minister gave him to the employees at the sanatorium but if he did it via television or radio, then I would say that that was the wrong way to do it. He should have sat down and discussed this directly with the employees of the sanatorium. The honourable member nods, yes, that he did. Well I will take his word for it. I watched him very carefully on television as he told us about how all the employees down there were going to be taken care of.

As far as I can gather, Sir, sixty employees at the old sanatorium are going to be displaced. Is that a correct figure? About sixty employees will be displaced and I think the member said that over a period of a month or two (he just shrugged his shoulders, brushed it off) or a couple of months, three months, it may take a little longer, they may all be placed in jobs, the sixty who will be displaced in the beginning.

MR. WELLS: It was not sixty, as I recall the figure in doubt. I do not have

Mr. Wells.

that paper with me. It was fifty-two. Of the fifty-two who have not been placed (five or six refused employment, five were pensionable age) of the fifty-two, thirty were domestic staff and there were four or five each of stationary engineers, cooks, seamstresses, categories of that sort. It was felt by the department (I think this makes common sense) that of the thirty on the domestic staff, that it would take only a matter of weeks to find places for them in other institutions and likewise in the three or four specialized categories, with four or five persons in them each.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is what I said, somewhere in the vicinity of sixty employees would be displaced and there would be no jobs for them when the sanatorium closes. But over a period of a month or two, three, four months or maybe a year, all the employees of the sanatorium will be placed in alternative employment. Now, Sir, I think myself that the fifty-two employees, if that is the correct figure, who will be displaced when the sanatorium closes are too many. There are too many, Sir, and I think the Minister of Health should make a more strenuous effort.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well that might be a good idea to keep the sanatorium open, according to that petition. The honourable minister should read it. It might open his eyes for him. I think that is too many employees to be displaced, Sir. I would like for the Minister of Health to ensure this House that a more strenuous effort will be made on the part of his department to place all the employees of the sanatorium in alternative employment in the event that the minister and the department still go ahead, after reading that petition, with transferring the patients to St. Clare's Mercy Hospital.

HON. DR. T. C. FARRELL: (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I was asked for

Mr. Farrell

a detailed report on weather conditions in various parts of the island. If the honourable members would wish me to give it to them, I will table it for them. Whatever their wishes are, I would be delighted to do so. Anyway the Trans Canada Highway is open to Port aux Basques. On the West Coast, the section between Gallants and Steel Mountain Road, known locally as South West Bog, is experiencing heavy drifting and is causing some interference with traffic. A plow is patrolling this area to keep it open. In the Port aux Basques, Rose Blanche area, winds are still reported at sixty miles per hour, with heavy drifting and whilst plows are operating in this area, traffic is unable to move freely because of the drifting conditions. All roads in the Codroy Valley and Robinson's Area are open but narrow. All roads on the Port au Port Peninsula are open. The road from Stephenville Crossing to St. George's via the Gut Bridge is blocked and it is expected to be open by nightfall. All roads in the Bay of Island Area are open as are the roads to Reidville, Cormack and Howley. On the Great Northern Peninsula the road is open from Deer Lake to the junction of the Roddickton Road but roads beyond this are blocked with heavy drifting and plows are making little progress. The road to Roddickton is open but the road to Conche is blocked. The road to Hampden is open as well as the road to Sop's Arm and Jackson's Arm. This road is very narrow. On the Baie Verte Peninsula plows are expected to have the road to Fleur de Lys and the road to LaScie open by nightfall. All other roads on the Baie Verte Peninsula are open but narrow.

There is no late report from Southern Labrador but, "stormy conditions prevail in the morning hours, which indicate very little progress would be made until the high winds die down. On the Connaigre Peninsula there has been no change since this morning. Very stormy conditions are

reported on the road from Bay d' Espoir to Harbour Breton and as a result this road is blocked. Roads in the Hermitage Area are open but heavy drifting is reported.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to Question No. 56 on the Order Paper of February 26.



MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer Question No. (61), it a most unusual one - "Do the government maintain an office in Ottawa?" I have checked with all the departments and as far as I can ascertain, no we do not and that means that answers to (2a), (2b), (2c), (2d), (2e), (2f) are no.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the answers to Questions No. (47) and (48) on the Order Paper of Monday, March 26, asked by the honourable the member for White Bay South, the answer to No. (47) is 17.9 and the answer to No. (48) is 118.2.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, in answer to a supplementary question asked by the honourable member for Bell Island in connection with the Buchans Mining Company, the question was whether it was correct if they had ceased diamond drilling, I believe this was the question - the information which I have received is that the Buchans Mining Company spent \$300,000 on diamond drilling in 1972 and that they expect to spend about \$150,000 on drilling this year and this \$150,000 is only one item in an exploration programme which is expected to exceed \$500,000 this year.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to Question No. (57) on the Order Paper of February 26, asked by the honourable member for Twillingate.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the honourable Minister of Fisheries inform the House if he has had any representation yet from the people or the fishermen of Old Perlican concerning the breakwater for Old Perlican.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Mr. Speaker, in reply I can inform the honourable member, yes that we have had representation via telegram asking us to take some action on their behalf which has been done.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, might I direct a question to the honourable Minister of Fisheries, has his department had any success

MR. WINSOR: in attracting any fish plant operator to operate the plant at Change Islands? I have heard a rumor that Booth Fisheries may be interested, is this correct?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Mr. Speaker, to answer the honourable member is that there have been enquiries directed to the Department of Fisheries, the people concerned have been directed to the fisheries committee at Change Islands and I believe some negotiations have been carried on and there is some possibility that something will come about as a result of that. But beyond that I cannot be specific at this point.

MR. WINSOR: With Booth Fisheries?

MR. CHEESEMAN: No, I could not tell you. They have had meetings with several groups and we have been informed of the meetings.

MR. F. ROWE: I would like to direct a question to the honourable Minister of Education, in view of the fact that there is a petition being circulated to abolish the number of school tax authorities and set up a separate one central agency, is the minister giving any thought to reducing the number of school tax authorities and having a central agency for collecting such funds?

MR. SPEAKER: I will permit the honourable minister to ask a question if he so desires but I think it is a question that could very well be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now perhaps just to save printers ink I should answer it anyway. It is not a very specific answer and obviously the honourable gentleman does not expect one because it was not that specific a question, but the whole area of school taxation is under study. As a matter of fact I think it is the day after tomorrow I will be meeting in Corner Brook with the Provincial Association of School Tax Authorities and this and other matters are under discussion and study.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before we get in to Orders of the Day, on Answers to Questions, I would like to inform the House that no matter how much the opposition or for that matter my colleagues instruct, obstruct or distrust today, we are not going to sit tonight.

Motion second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Wild Life Act."

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, there is a first time for everything I guess. An "Act To Amend The Wildlife Act," The intent of this bill is fourfold. First of all to redefine the term "resident" as it is explained in the Wildlife Act, chapter (400) of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland 1970. Secondly to provide for the safety of both hunter and guides and thirdly to enable the payment of commission to venders who sell licences.

I am told that this particular item has been in force and this really is legalizing something that has been going on for a long time. Fourthly, to provide a penalty for anybody who impersonates a wildlife officer.

On the first item which redefines the word "resident", in effect it expands the word "resident" to take into consideration while stationed in the province any member of the Canadian Forces or the R.C.M.P. This I am told is now done in practically all the other provinces so in effect it is sort of a reciprocal bill.

The second part allows Newfoundlanders who are attending university or school elsewhere in Canada to be deemed as a resident as soon as they return home for a short period of time for purposes of obtaining a licence.

Section (4) is a safety aspect as I said for both hunters and guides. Section (4b) provides for the five per cent commission to be paid to venders, this is for the normal handling of licences and so on and so forth. Section (5) provides penalties for anyone who attempts to

MR. DOYLE: impersonate a wildlife officer.

In general, Mr. Speaker, that is the bill, "An Act To Amend The Wildlife Act, if anybody has any questions I will do my utmost to answer them.

MR. WM. ROWE: The bill, Mr. Speaker, appears to be a completely unobjectionable one, as a matter of fact it appears to be a salutary bill and we on this side have no objection to it at all. It seems that the time has come for all hunters in the woods of the province to make sure that proper clothing is worn. We are reaching the point now where - the same state as they have reached in other provinces of Canada where there are more hunters than wildlife killed during the course of a hunting season. I think that any regulations to that effect would be welcome here in the province.

I notice that the type of clothing to be worn is going to be set out in regulations and I would assume that the minister will be taking every possible step to make sure that these regulations, which are normally merely gazetted, will be brought to the attention of all the people in this province because very few people in my district, for example, of White Bay South, are regular subscribers to the Gazette. I doubt if they are going to have a chance to read these regulations unless the minister takes great pains to advertise them fully and to make sure, as every man in Newfoundland goes into the woods at some point or other, and I would hate to see any problems arising in my own constituency or any other constituency where you get calls on the phone saying that someone has been arrested or a gun has been confiscated or something because they did not have the proper clothing on in the woods, hunting, in accordance with some obscure regulations.

So I would ask the minister to make certain that this aspect of the regulations in the bill is fully explained to all

MR. WM. ROWE: the population of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, really there does not seem to be anything I can find in this regulation to be objectionable. The wearing of clothing, I believe is a very important step to be taken as far as hunters are - that is I presume the minister in the regulation, the colour of clothing. Not only, Mr. Speaker, should hunters be wearing a red colour, I presume this is what the minister has in mind, red type clothing

but also people who are not hunters in our forests. I am sure the minister must realize that during the hunting season, not only is the life of the hunters in danger but also many of our other citizens. While this may not necessarily come under the Wildlife Act, I believe it should be controlled, not by the Department of Tourism but by the Department of Forestry and Agriculture. I think that some department of government should give this thought some consideration as to making it compulsory for everyone who travels in our forests, particularly during the hunting season to wear some kind of protective clothing against possible accidents.

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

HON. T.M.DOYLE (MINISTER OF TOURISM): I thank both honourable gentlemen for those two good suggestions. I might as a matter of interest quote the following to give an example of the type of clothing or colour of clothing which the officials are thinking about: As part of the programme consideration is being given to making it mandatory for all hunters to wear while hunting a specific number of square inches of a bright coloured clothing perhaps in the form of a vest. Some states and provinces now require all hunters to wear such a vest of say a fluorescent blaze orange colour having a back of approximately 200 square inches and a two-piece front of approximately 160 square inches. It looks from this file that the homework is well done.

In reply to the honourable member for White Bay South, it is an excellent suggestion on the general publicity. Not only do we have to be sure that our own people get to know about it, but we will have to have it included in the normal tourist literature which is published and is available, as the "Hunting Guide" booklet and so on which I would hope would be incorporated by next year.

If there are no further comments I have pleasure in moving second reading of this bill.

On motion, a bill; " An Act To Amend The Wildlife Act." read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

Second reading of a bill: "An Act Further To Amend The Maintenance Act." (No. 12).

HON. J.G. POUSSEAU (MINISTER OF RECREATION AND REHABILITATION): Mr. Speaker, today is the day for firsts, may I be as lucky as my seatmate and colleague from Ferryland. Today's bill; "An Act Further To Amend The Maintenance Act," most of the changes proposed in this bill have been recommended by the Cushue Family Law Study. In addition to amending the long title of the principal act by substituting the word "spouses" for "wives" The amendment imposes certain obligations on a wife to support a deserted husband and any children in his care and control. The original act was limited to the obligation of a husband to support his wife and any children in her care and control.

Section 3A, the bill proposes to enlarge the definition of acts of cruelty by including such phrases as "an apprehension of danger" in addition to a danger to life, limb or health and apprehended in addition to actual personal violence and apprehended in addition to actual injury to health. The definition of acts of cruelty is also amended by changing the reference to "the husband" to " other spouse"

Section 3B, the definition of a child has been amended to include an illegitimate or adopted child as well as a grandchild, stepchild or foster child actually or apparently under the age of seventeen years and has been expanded to include a child under the age of majority, that is nineteen years old, who because of physical or mental disability is unable to provide himself with adequate food or other necessities.

Section 3C, this paragraph defines "deserted husband." The original act in paragraph E of section 2 defined a deserted wife. The purpose of this paragraph is to impose obligations on the wife to

support her deserted husband similar to those imposed in the original bill on the husband to support his deserted wife. It also expands the definition of a deserted husband to include not only one who is living apart from his wife but one who though living under the same roof with her has forsaken all or the greater part of the normal incidence generally implied by the term cohabitation of the matrimonial relationship.

Paragraph (d) provides for a similar redefinition of the term deserted wife although it includes all four subparagraphs of paragraph E in the principal act which describes the circumstances which make it necessary for the wife to live apart from her husband and the husband to live apart from his wife.

Section 4 of the act refers to the schedule at the back of the act and if I may, I am not a legal genius but I have had some of my learned colleagues on this side of the House suggest the schedule. It was suggested that there being no judge near I could read the head note. I shall not do that but merely to suggest that in Old English desertion had to be as I understand it physical and complete and the schedule here delivered by Justice J.A.Schroder suggest it gradually over years to be fairer to a wife, constructive desertion evolved as I understand it, allowing for both to live under the same roof but establishing that desertion is not the withdrawal from a place but from a state of things so that a husband and wife living together were not necessarily within the jurisdiction of living together. They could for all purposes of this schedule, if you interpret it, constitute a desertion if they were not living under the normal incidence of matrimonial life.

I will leave that at that for my learned friends to cling on to at a later time I am certain.

Section 5, How am I doing? Good eh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Fine.



MR. ROUSSEAU: Section 5, this section by introducing section 10A extends the provisions of the act to include common-law unions and in section 10B to provide for the application mutatis mutandis of the words man for woman and husband for wife and deserted husband for deserted wife in section 4 to 10A of the principal act.

In section 6, the simple substitution of the words "the judge shall order" for the words "and any person for whose benefit the order is made is a public charge or the judge making the order is of the opinion that if there is default in complying with the order any person is likely

Mr. Rousseau

to be a public charge he shall order." It eliminates the reference to the possibility of a person becoming a public charge. Section 12, in the opinion of the Gushue Family Law Study of the original act, it was deemed to be unworkable and it was felt that adequate safeguards were contained in subsection (1) of section 11 as amended which requires, "the person to make payments to report to an officer for such periods and at such times and places as may be deemed necessary to satisfy such officer that he has complied with the order for payment." The purpose of section 8 is to increase the maximum amount of the counsel's fees from fifty dollars to two hundred dollars, at the discretion of the judge. Section 9 provides for the judge to adjourn the proceedings at any time and from time to time if he is satisfied that there is a reasonable prospect of reconciliation to make an interim order for maintenance and to make an order for maintenance retroactive. Section 10 and 11 provides for the appeal of the schedule and the enactment of the new schedules, A and B which are attached to the bill, "An Act To Amend The Maintenance Act." I have pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of the bill.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is so much that you could say about this bill that it would take more than this afternoon's sitting of the Legislature. I personally think that it is a step in the right direction. It is virtually impossible to plug all the loopholes. When I was minister of that department one of most heartbreaking experiences I suppose that a minister could have is having a wife and family arrive at your office after being deserted by the father or the husband and having to come to the department and in some instances the mother had to make the children wards of the state.

Now while I was there also, Sir, I noticed that a little bit of a racket was developing. In a lot of cases people who learned the ropes would go down to the family court, get a legal separation and then they would qualify for welfare. As soon as they qualified for welfare (I think it was

Mr. Neary.

three months in those days, (I do not know if it is still the same or not) three months after you had the legal separation, you could qualify for long-term assistance, prior to that the department would give you short-term assistance. Even before the three months were up, the two of them were back living together again and it was probably months or even years after that the department found out that this was happening. People would deliberately do this, Sir. The husband would go out and work every day, come home in the evening and the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation was supporting the wife and family. Now this was morally wrong but it was a very difficult thing for the officials, the field staff of the department to detect.

Another problem, Sir, was that in a lot of cases where the judge ordered a settlement, nine chances out of ten, the payments would only continue for a limited period of time and then the husband would disappear. My hon. friend from St. John's South is nodding. He would disappear and never would be heard tell of after in a lot of cases or several months later or several years later the wife may find out where the husband was and then they would get after the authorities in the city, town or community, wherever he was, and he pony up again for another month, two months, three months and then disappear again. He kept on the move. It is very difficult to get support from that kind of a person. It was awfully embarrassing for the family. They were neither on social assistance nor off it. The payments were not coming through regularly and it was creating somewhat of a hardship on the family.

Now, Sir, I think this bill goes a little further than anything before this act inasmuch as women's lib do not have it all their own way. Now, Mr. Speaker, under this act, not only can a deserted wife

claim support from her husband who left her but the husband can also claim support from his wife in this case. This is just an example that from now on women's lib are not going to have it all their own way.

There is another aspect of this bill, Sir, that I agree with and that is the part dealing with the abuse of children. In a good many cases, Sir, when the family does break up - I would like to hear the minister's opinion on reconciliation because when I was minister in that department, it was almost hopeless, Mr. Speaker, although the judge here can set the proceedings aside for a month in order to give the parties an opportunity for reconciliation. I would say that the batting average is very, very poor. I do not know what the reason for it is, Sir. I suppose there is always that hope that the man and woman will get back together again. I would say that it is very, very remote. Once the relationship breaks down, it is very, very unusual that they can get back together again. But, nevertheless, it is probably a good clause because there is always that possibility and the officials of the department, the social counsellors, the welfare workers and social workers are all there, their minds are all oriented that way. They are trained to try and keep the family together, at all costs. I think this is quite importance, Sir, when in society today we see the breakdown in the family unit. I do not think there is anything else in here, Sir, that is new. Most of it results from the Gushue Report on Family Law.

Yes, I mentioned earlier, Sir, acts of cruelty on the part of the family. This happens in a good many cases, not only when families are breaking up but it also happens in cases where families continue to live together. I think probably one of the main contributing factors to child abuse and acts of cruelty, Sir, is caused by liquor, caused by alcoholism. I would suggest that that is another reason why the minister and the government should think about a hostel for alcoholics. I think there should be some place that alcoholics can go

Mr. Neary.

to be cured. All in all I would say that it is a fair piece of legislation, Sir, and I have no hesitation at all in supporting the bill.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: First of all I would like to thank the hon. member for Bell Island for his remarks and thank all honourable members on the other side of the House for giving me a chance to get my first bill through with the minimum of involvement. Thank you.

The points that the hon. member for Bell Island makes are legitimate I think. He can appreciate certainly the fact that even in a bill like this which is really a major piece of legislation, far-reaching implications, you cannot plug all the loopholes that are evident. I think the important thing here, and I might read if I may so that we understand the situation, desertion according to this bill and according to the schedule is established if one spouse willfully refuses to cohabit with the other in the normal relationship of husband and wife so that to all intents and purposes they may be said to be leading separate lives although they are living under the same roof.

I think this is a major piece of legislation. It is an attempt to rectify an injustice that existed and it goes in some direction in alleviating that situation. Certainly the problems of reconciliation that the member brings up are well taken and we are sure that government is concerned with keeping families together. As well the hostel for alcoholics is mentioned, certainly we have an obligation as government to this segment of society. The need for these people to have help and in my capacity now as Minister of Rehabilitation some thought certainly is being given to this help that we can provide for alcoholics.

So with these few closing remarks I move second reading of the bill.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Maintenance Act." read a second time, ordered referred to a committee of the whole House, presently.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act."

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, whilst the bill itself is rather lengthy the amendment is not much more than a routine amendment. This House

is aware that the Government of Canada has indicated that it is prepared to enter into an agreement with the provinces to provide some compensation or reimbursement to any fund or board that has been set up to administer a fund to benefit and pay the victims of criminal injuries. This simply means, Mr. Speaker, that if any person is a victim of a crime, suffers an injury, suffers damages and the person so convicted is not in a financial position to pay that then upon application to the board that was set up under this act compensation may be awarded. The Government of Canada has offered to participate to the extent of five cents per head which works out to about \$26,000 per annum for the province or ninety per cent of the cost, whichever is the lesser. Our experience to date would indicate that it is likely to be ninety per cent of the cost for quite some time.

To date the board which was set up under this act, and the chairman of that board is Mr. Herbert Morgan, O.C. and the members are Mr. Thomas O'Reilly and Mr. Frank O'Dea; have heard but two cases. These are the only two that have been dealt with so far. In one case the award was \$319.82. It was for a comparatively small damage claim and the other a decision has not been handed down. I understand there are two others pending. The intent of the bill is primarily that it adds to the number of offences as set forth in the schedule. In the original act there were twenty-six offences and now there are forty offences, that if in the commission of same a person sustains injury there maybe compensation provided upon application to the court. The description of the offences as set forth in the schedule to this bill is identical with the offences that will be covered in the proposed agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada.

The only other amendment here is the interpretation section again has been amended not drastically but to conform with

the suggested definition contained in the proposed agreement. The only other amendment that may be worthy of drawing hon. members' attention to is section 3 which contains what is now formally known in North America as a good samaritan clause which provides that if any person is rendering assistance and in the process of rendering assistance either under the Emergency Medical Aid Act or otherwise sustains injuries as a result of the commission of a crime he or she is qualified under the provisions of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act.

I think that it is worthy of note to that in this field the province I will not say led the way but my recollection is that we were the second province in Canada, or we brought it in the same year as Saskatchewan, to introduce a Criminal Injuries Compensation Act. I have forgotten the year but I recall it was when I occupied this portfolio before, I think it was 1967. The act was proclaimed and the board set up about a year and a half ago and to date fortunately, in a sense because I presume that this indicates that there has been no serious damages or injuries caused that at least were not recoverable from the offender, that the number of claims under the act are not very high at this time.

I move second reading.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I have very strong feelings about this bill, not about the amendment itself. I think that is all right. I remember when this Criminal Injuries Compensation Act was passed I thought it was a fine and forward looking piece of legislation and I still think so. But the one complaint I have with the way I understand the board has functioned up to now, actually I have two complaints. One is that the average individual in Newfoundland does not yet know that this remedy is available to him and I think that it is no good to have it on the books if people do not know it. I recall one case in which I



was involved. It was the case of a man who was set upon without rhyme nor reason by three people who attacked him and knocked his eye out and he did not even know these people nor was he involved in any sort of fight with them or anything else. He did not know that it was possible to get compensation being the victim of a crime until fortunately, in his case, it was brought to his attention and I believe he is one of the applicants before the board.

But there are a lot of people who all over Newfoundland suffer as a result of crime, I would almost go so far as to say every day, and the people whose degradations bring about their suffering and loss do not have any money so that it is no good to take a civil action against them and get a judgement. The judgement would not be worth the paper it was written on and I think it has to be somehow clearly brought to the attention of people that they have a right under the law of Newfoundland to seek this compensation. So that is one point.

The other point is, how does a Crimes Compensation Board look at its function? They are allowed a fairly broad latitude and I understand that the board looks at its function to compensate people for out-of-pocket expenses, which we usually call in civil matters, special damages, but that it has not really come to grips with the question of what we would call in a civil case general damages. In other words if you get your eye knocked out you will be paid your hospital bill, you will be paid perhaps your loss of wages and two or three other things but what happens when your eye is gone, where are your general damages? Now obviously in a motor accident or something like that you get paid special damages and then the court will make an award of general damages. But I understand the way the board has been looking at this is that general damages are nothing like the general damages which would be awarded in a civil case. Now I think if we are going to do this and if we are going to embark

on measures to bring about some element of social justice, Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to be very specific in these matters. In a sense this is breaking new ground and it is a good move and good ground to break. But I think that the act should set out, in my view, that the standard of damages or compensation awarded to individuals under this act should be a standard in line with what is awarded by the court in general damages.

Now this might cost a bit of extra money perhaps it might cost more money than the department envisages or that the Government of Canada envisages in this agreement. The agreement I think is a fine thing, but it is no good to say to a person who is injured as a result of a crime, "well, all right, here are your out-of-pocket expenses and here are a few pennies on top." It seems to me that he ought to be compensated just the same as he would be compensated if the person who did the damage to him had the money to pay him what a court would award. This I think should be the guide of the committee and I think that it should be written into the legislation so that a committee when considering this would go as near as it could to what a court would award if a court were awarding damages in a civil case, and should say, "There is your award, there is your special damages, there is your general damages, the total comes to "X"dollars." I think until that is done this is not going to be satisfactory.

I think it would be most unsatisfactory for a person to be just awarded his special damages, as it were, and very little for general damages. Yet I understand with these prime compensation boards that this is the view the boards sometimes in fact often take. But it is not the function of the board to make something that would be like an award in general damages in a civil case. I think that it ought to be spelled out in the

legislation that this is the approach that should be taken.

Now maybe honourable members will disagree with me, maybe honourable members would feel that an award of general damages or approximating general damages in a civil case would be too much. Personally, I do not think so, and I think that should be written in the legislation.

MR. WM. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have one or two brief remarks to make. First of all I agree completely with the first suggestion of the honourable member for St. John's South. On his second point I think that he is on the right track but I do not know if what he is saying is going quite far enough. For example, why should there be a disparity between somebody getting general damages as a result of a criminal act and somebody who suffers equal damage, for example, as a result of an act which is not criminal but merely negligent?

In the case of motor vehicle accidents, the problem is covered to a certain extent, not enough because of the lowness of the judgement recovery award - \$35,000 I think it is, but is covered to a certain extent.

If the government of a province and I believe that probably they should become this, but if a government of a province is going to start acting as an insurer, an insurance company to persons who are damaged by society or individuals in society, as they have done to a certain extent in the judgement recovery legislation, as they are doing in the criminal compensation board, under the main act to which this bill is an amendment, then perhaps the state should consider going even further and bringing in something which in cases where somebody who suffers damages general damages, big general damages, and a person who injured him, not by a criminal act but by a negligent act of some sort, does not have the wherewithal to pay up, then perhaps society itself,

the government itself, should take the responsibility to make sure that the victim of such a thing is not to suffer unduly.

I agree with the honourable member for St. John's South that the criminal compensation board should perhaps get into the field of awarding general damages, not only for out-of-pocket expenses but to take other things into consideration as well.

I think it would be illogical to stop there, but once we start doing that sort of thing, there is no end to it, nor should there be any end to it. I think that perhaps society does owe that sort of a function to victims of crimes or torts in society. When the perpetrators of those crimes or torts or wrongs do not have the wherewithal themselves, then those persons injured should not merely suffer their loss or their damages on a sort of whimsical situation. One does not choose who is going to injure one or damage or commit a crime against one. But if that person who does that does not have the wherewithal to make good his general damages, then the person cannot recover anything, by and large.

So I agree with what the honourable member for St. John's South has to say. Unfortunately merely restricting it to the operations of this bill will not do general justice. We would have an illogical situation and one that perhaps should be remedied by some other legislation to be brought before the House.

Now on the other question that he mentioned, namely, publicity, I must say, as a lawyer and a citizen of the province, I am absolutely flabbergasted to hear that only two people apparently have availed themselves so far of the procedures under this act. Did I understand the minister correctly?

MR. HICKMAN: Four applications so far.

MR. WM. ROWE: Four applications altogether and this thing has been going now for what? Two years I guess.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WM. ROWE: I see, I can remember when it was passed by the House 1967-1968, but it was not proclaimed until last January sometime.

MR. HICKMAN: Later than that.

MR. WM. ROWE: Or February, so it has been in operation for a year. So maybe I should not be as flabbergasted as I am.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WM. ROWE: Yes, but it has only been in operation for a year and the type of case that we are talking about here after all is where somebody is injured or damaged as a result of taking part in riot, hijacking of aircraft, endangering safety on aircraft, causing bodily harm, etc. You know, not the types of things that arise every day of the week.

Of course normally most people who are victims of an assault do not have any appreciable damage. Their pride is insulted, they might have a bruise or two but generally speaking most crimes do not result in say a person losing several thousand dollars, for example, which would be a great injustice.

But, Sir, four may not be bad, over the past year or so. I was under the impression that perhaps that four represented the number of applicants since the bill was passed. But even so, I think that the suggestion of the honourable member for St. John's South is well taken. I doubt if anybody in the province is aware of the existence of this bill and unless they happen to stumble on a lawyer somewhere along the way and generally speaking, how many times do people come to see lawyers.

I go to my district and I find that someone was knocked down by a car or something and he has allowed three or four years to go by and he has gotten around to seeing a lawyer and after hearing his

MR. WM. ROWE: statement of what happened, I inform him, "well it looks to me like you could have had a claim for \$2,000 or \$3,000."

People are just not generally aware in Newfoundland, around the coast of this province, away from where lawyers are, some people would call them ambulance-chasers, away from the courts, away from this sort of thing, they are not generally aware of all the remedies available to them. I think that perhaps a good benefit which the minister could do these people, a person who is a victim of this type of crime, is to perhaps instruct magistrates and judges that when cases are brought to court and usually the victim of a crime is going to be a witness in a case, especially if the criminal is known, that the judge or somebody in the court should tell him, inform him as a matter of routine duty, that this criminal compensation board does exist and that perhaps he would be well advised to seek some advice on it. That might not be a bad idea.

In cases where the criminal is not found and the person has suffered damages and therefore perhaps there is no case before the court, perhaps some other method should be found by the Department of Justice, either by having the doctor mention it to a man who has been treated or some such thing, to make sure the people are generally aware of this type of legislation, this type of beneficial legislation.

A great number of our people around Newfoundland and Labrador are not litigious at all. They are very reticent as a matter of fact when it comes to pushing themselves forward and trying to claim what in New York City everybody would recognize as rightfully theirs. We have basically a rural population and therefore there is a great duty incumbent on the Department of Justice in the province to make sure that people are not, because of reticence or isolation or anything else, deprived of the benefits

MR. WM. ROWE: of a very good piece of legislation. I am glad that the minister, along with the other provinces, has been able to come to the point where an agreement can be entered into with the Government of Canada to get some money from them.

It should be, after all, a Government of Canada responsibility. The criminal code is the responsibility of the Government of Canada

I am surprised that the Government of Canada have this requirement about ninety per cent or \$120,000 whichever is the lesser. They should as a matter of principle I believe say that victims of all crimes who are not otherwise compensated should be able to be compensated from a pool administered by the Government of Canada and the province would probably be in an administrative capacity only. I think the Government of Canada should take full responsibility for this but leave it to the province to administer it just as we do in our courts now judges are paid by and are federal appointments, but we look after the administration. Perhaps we can pay for the administration. But as far as the substance of the act and this amending bill is concerned, the Government of Canada I think should be responsible for it and they should not have any ceiling put on it. I mean what happens when \$20,000 is expended and the Government of Newfoundland have to dip into their pocket presumably. Well that is wrong, obviously. The Criminal Code of Canada is a federal act. Any compensation given to people will be a result of crimes committed under the Criminal Code of Canada and obviously the Government of Canada should be responsible for compensation, the payment of compensation.

I thank the House, Mr. Speaker, and I congratulate the minister for bringing the bill before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable minister speaks he will close the debate.

MR. T. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, just a couple of points in closing. On the question of publicity I am in full accord with the suggestion of the two honourable members who have participated in this debate. The magistrates have been advised, they are aware of the act and this was the subject matter I think of discussion at the last convention. How you get this information through to the public without a massive publicity campaign, I do not know. I suppose we could use information services, but then we would be criticized for using it.



Insofar as the amounts payable are concerned, this is set by regulation as provided for in the main act. This, Mr. Speaker, is the way it should remain because I am hoping that now the federal government have sort of gotten its foot wet, that they will be prepared as years go by to increase their contribution and of course any maximum figure that are set by regulation, will be governed to some extent at least by the contributions of the Government of Canada.

The regulations do provide for the awarding of general damages as well as pecuniary damages, pain and suffering. Again it is very desirable to keep this within this sphere of regulatory power rather than part of legislation.

In closing let me say that I am on all fours with the honourable the member for White Bay South with respect to the involvement of the Government of Canada in this type of programme. I said time and time again that the Government of Canada and the Fathers of Confederation in 1867 put one over on the provinces, all the provinces. We have a situation today where the Government of Canada are in the main, well let me say it this way, the Government of Canada, the Parliament of Canada makes all of the criminal laws. The Parliament of Canada has responsibility for bail and bail reform. They have responsibility to a limited degree for penitentiaries and penal services.

But having done all of that, having kept for themselves the exclusive jurisdiction in the field of criminal law, it is the criminal law that takes up so much time of provincial magistrates and provincial courts, the magistrate courts, having done all of that then with reckless abandon they say to the provinces, you have the responsibility for administering that. You know we can talk at great length about the disparity that exists in various Canadian provinces, between provinces, and that highways are better in Ontario than in Newfoundland or they are better in Nova Scotia than in Prince Edward Island, or hospitals

are more modern in certain places but the real disparity, a shocking disparity exists in the administration of justice from the point of view of facilities across Canada.

This past year I went to Ottawa and made a presentation and all I was told was that they thought it was a novel approach but they could not see where the Government of Canada should have any responsibility. It is a queer theory. It is an indefensible theory on the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion when they talk of infrastructure. When they say if communities are going to grow, that if you are going to provide the amenities to, to enable people to live with a great deal of satisfaction, that this means hospitals, schools, roads, water and sewerage; but it excludes the administration of justice. It is not a very defensible position. I am not at all happy with the attitude of the Government of Canada toward the administration of justice in this nation.

I move second reading.

On motion a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act."

MR. T. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I shall not delay the House on this bill, it is about as routine a bill as could possibly come before the House. There apparently was some doubt in the minds of some of the officials in my department as to the interpretation of that section. All it does it makes it abundantly clear that the crown when it registers documents does not have to pay itself a registration fee.

I move second reading.

On motion a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Registration And Regulation Of Collection Agencies."

HON. T. PICKEY (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the registration of collection agencies under which provisions would be made for strict regulation of the business, the operation of such agencies. It also provides for the investigation of complaints under the act and the regulations thereof.

Legislation will require collection agencies to keep proper books and records showing all monies received and paid out. Such records will include receipt books, cash books, etc., to be made available to the registrar upon request. Subject to regulations, every collection agencies shall be required to appoint auditors subject to the registrar. The auditors shall be required to examine the accounts of the collection agency. To be further required to forward to the registrar a copy of every report made by him.

The act further set forth a number of unlawful practices. for example, no collection agency shall send any telegram or make any telephone calls for which the charge be payable to the addressee or the person to whom the call is made, to a debtor for the purpose of demanding payment of a debt.

Under regulations, apart from the requiring certificate of registration providing the forms for applications, terms and conditions of registration, a number of other items may be regulated in the public interest, that is, to prescribe the nature and the amount of fees and other charges which collection agencies may recover or attempt to recover for their services, prohibiting the use of any particular method in the collection of debts of the collection agencies. Approval of forms and agreements and other instruments and documents to be used by the agencies as prescribed by the registrar.

This appeal is very important section of this act, Mr. Speaker, we find today a number of agencies are using forms and instruments similar

to one which I will very quickly read. Similar to forms used by the courts which are both frightening and intimidating to the unsuspecting public. I have a copy of one such form, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to just quickly run through. It says right on the top, in black bold print, "without prejudice, notice of summons" and of course to

the name and address and so on. It reads in part. "... are hereby notified that a writ of summons will be issued against you returnable to the court of the jurisdiction sitting in the province ... in favour of the person to whom the money is owed ... name of the creditor ... for the sum which is owed ... on or before a certain date..." It goes on to say that you can prevent this claim from being reduced to judgment by calling on us by the above mentioned date and making satisfactory arrangements for settlement

It has a fictitious seal attached as well and it bears all the similarities, Mr. Speaker, if in fact a writ of summons had been issued by the court. I am not sure how many agencies are using it but my officials managed to get this one and they tell me that they are fairly prevalent, certainly in the St John's Area. It is certainly, Mr. Speaker, a situation which must stop because, for a number of reasons, it is taking advantage or using a measure which in fact the court reserves the right to use. It is a form of intimidation. While we agree that whatever monies are owed by people, rightfully owed, should be rightfully paid to the person to whom the money is owed, however, the practices and the manner in which some collection agencies have been acting of late leaves much to be desired.

There is provision, Mr. Speaker, for prosecution of people who go outside this act or who contravene this act when it becomes law. It is one of many progressive pieces of legislation which will come before this House in an effort to protect the consumer. I hope we will see more of it because there is a great deal of work to be done in that area. The consumer for too long, Mr. Speaker, has been left at the mercy of people who are not always responsible and, Sir, as I have indicated by reading this document, some of whom could not care less as to the manner in which they collect such debts. I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would assume that this bill is designed primarily to have all the collection agencies registered in the province

and that in so doing, that in future any method that is considered unethical by the minister or the department can be checked on and action taken against the culprits.

Now, Sir, this bill sort of ties in with something that we have discussed in this House on a number of occasions, that is the privacy of the individuals that are involved in these, in the information that is collected by these agencies. Something has to be done, Mr. Speaker, to protect the individual Newfoundlanders against the ever increasing files that are being built up on these individuals especially now since we have computers.

There have been a number of studies done both on the national level and on the provincial level. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that every time a survey or study is made that it merely confirms that more personal information is being collected and made available to larger numbers of users than probably most of us care to realize. This situation, as I say, has been aided and abetted by the introduction of the computers.

Almost every act, Mr. Speaker, from buying a car to getting a passport leaves a trail of data behind it. Even, Mr. Speaker, I think we mentioned this before in some of the debates that we have had in this House, even in medical examinations, personal information on individuals is recorded. You never know, Sir, where it is going to turn up. Now I do not think that this bill really goes far enough. It is a step in the right direction but I do not really think that it will really curb the problem that I just mentioned. While we may not have a crisis as yet, Sir, I think all honourable members will agree that information on the privacy of individuals is increasing and I think that we are going to have to exercise more control and take more safeguards in the future against this type of thing.

I do not know if this - perhaps the minister can tell us when he is closing the debate on this - I do not know whether this bill will

give serious consideration to making agencies and companies that are collecting this kind of information if they have to register under this particular bill. If they do, Sir, I would say well and good. It is another bill? Well, I am glad to hear that, Mr. Speaker, because this is something that I am sure that bothers all members of this honourable House.

I would like for the minister to tell us also when he is closing the debate just how his department intends to enforce the regulations that will result from this bill, how he intends to enforce the various sections of this act. Will he be increasing his staff? Will he now have officers that will go around and investigate the complaints and so on so that action may be taken without too much delay because the longer the thing is put off, Mr. Speaker, apparently the less serious it looks or it appears to look. I think that is all we have to say on this particular bill, Sir. It is a step in the right direction and I hope that the bill will accomplish what it sets out to do.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the minister on this bill because this is a bill that is extremely necessary with relation to the orderly collection of debts because as the present situation now stands the collection agencies in Newfoundland have been abusing the powers which they had been given to the point of dunning people, some people who are in the unfortunate position of owing money, to the point of having nervous breakdowns.

Now, this act envisages the appointment of a registrar to make regulations with regard to the operation of the act itself which in effect will mean that the registrar will be a watch guard over the activities of collection agencies. I think this is very necessary because as the honourable the minister pointed out one of the collection agencies here in St. John's, at least one of them, has been using a paper which to any untuned eye would appear to be a summons from the Supreme Court of Newfoundland or from one of the courts of the province. This is

completely and absolutely unacceptable. It should not be. Such tactics which have been used in the past are questionable. It is somewhat regrettable that we had to bring in legislation to curb them but such is necessary.

Also, the collection agencies have from time to time been attempting to collect from people who owe money, not only the debt that is owed to their client but also the commission which the merchant who is collecting the debt, who lodges it with them, would normally have to pay. This act provides that in no circumstances shall any money in addition to the amount owing by the debtor be collected. In the event that the collection agency attempts to collect more than this amount of money then and in that event there will be the sanctions of the act applied to them. There are fines in this act up to \$25,000.



It also provides that no collection agency is allowed to send a telegram, a collect telegram or make a collect telephone call to a debtor which was one of the favourite modes of collection by some collection agencies in this province. They would place long-distance telephone calls, they would send collect wires, they would do practically anything without due regard to the rights of the person from whom they were attempting to collect money.

At the same time, there is still another protection in the act that no collection agency may enter an agreement, any agreement with a debtor with respect to the repayment of money in installments unless a copy of that agreement is filed with the registrar and the registrar has in fact powers under the act to approve this particular agreement. This is vital and this is necessary as well to protect the person, the individual owing the money.

Also, they have to deal - a collection agency may not deal with a debtor in any name other than that authorized by the registration. In other words, they cannot hide behind some facade. If they use form letters, Mr. Speaker, the collection agency wishes to use form letters, these form letters must be approved by the registrar who is really the enforcer of the regulations under this act. Here again this is vitally necessary as also there is a provision here to overcome that great inequity which the honourable the Minister for Provincial Affairs and the Environment has pointed out of sending out pseudo court forms, forms that look like court forms, to indicate to people that they are already before the courts.

Unfortunately, the collection agencies in this province have from time to time abysmally abused the rights which they have had. They are using tactics which are questionable and this government is determined to see that these particular tactics are no longer useable by them. If they do use them, the government has provided legislation here for the purpose of penalizing them.

There are also other beneficial provisions in this bill itself as we will see when we go through committee, empowering the registrar to exercise all functions necessary to cause investigation to be made, to conduct studies and make enquiries and go into collection agencies to determine whether or not they are abusing the act. As I say, this is a very beneficial piece of legislation which is perhaps long overdue, it should have been in years ago. I heartily compliment the honourable minister for bringing this before the House.

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

MR. R. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I will not go into a long list of reasons why I think this is a good piece of legislation. The minister and the member for Bell Island and the member for St. John's East have referred to some, like this business of curbing documents that look like writs, the add-on charges, the telephone calls, the collect calls, all this sort of thing which has been the bane of many Newfoundlanders hounded to death by people.

There is one point that I want to refer to. It was touched on by the honourable member for Bell Island and that is the lack of privacy or the extent to which people's privacy can be violated. I think you have to see one of these things to realize just what it is like. I did not know they existed until three or four years ago. I was negotiating on behalf of a client with another lawyer and I put forth certain claims that were based on information given to me. The lawyer across the table said; "Oh no, he does not earn that much, not only that, he drinks a drop and that is one of the reasons he does not earn as much. In fact, that fellow is just about an alcoholic and besides which he runs out on his wife and this sort of thing." It would be unparliamentary to give my reply, but I said anyway, in substance: "How do you know this?" He pulled out this and he said; "This is a retail credit report." I said; "For God's sake let me see that." It was the first time I had seen one of these things. By gathering information from neighbours, from heaven knows who, they had put together

a report the truth of which no one knows. No one could know whether that was true or not or how it was compiled. They put together a picture of this man which presumably they sold to people who would like to have it for whatever purposes or gave, I do not know how it is done, but it was available this is the point, to people who in this case were negotiating against this man and had an interest in portraying him to be something less than a desirable citizen.

I felt a feeling of outrage at that time and I wished and I hoped ever since that this sort of thing could be curtailed. Obviously, business has a right to exist and business has a right to a certain amount of information which can help them determine whether a man ought to be granted credit or not, but this was not a credit application this was a case of a person against whom that man had a legitimate claim and this company had access to this sort of information and was using it or hoping to, to try and defeat the amount of his claim.

I have looked at this, I think the guts of this bill are in section 21 which says; " certain unlawful practices" they are very clear. I have looked at the regulations and there is great power to make regulations here. In section 22, subsection 1 clause (k), it says; "prescribing the form and content of record to be kept by collection agencies and the length of time for which they might be kept," I think that is good. I think it would be nice perhaps if a sentence were added saying; "and what uses to which they shall be put." In other words, if they are records showing a person's credit rating only that is fine, but I do not think that they should be allowed to be given to any Tom, Dick or Harry who wants to have them or who would like to have a dossier on you, me or anybody else. I think maybe that this might be the proper act and these regulations might be the proper regulations to make it clear that there is a limitation in this province as I feel there should be on the use to which such records can be put.

I have no hesitation in supporting the principle of the bill,

Mr. Speaker, and commending the honourable minister for introducing it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador South.

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to say a few brief words on the point raised by the honourable member for Bell Island and the honourable member for St. John's South regarding invasion of privacy. I can speak from some experience I think when I say that the honourable member for Bell Island is dead right when he says that a man goes through life and cuts a great swath. It is not too hard in this day and age of massive reporting to be able to pick up every little detail of where a man has been and what he is. The unfortunate part of it is that in such instances as the credit reporting agencies where they do not hire people, or they are not required to hire people who are bondable and all this kind of thing, that the information that gets into these reports is all too often a conjectured opinion. I do not think that we can go too far in trying to limit or eliminate much of this kind of activity on the part of these reporting agencies. I think we should take a very close look at and perhaps expand beyond section 22, here.

I too, have no hesitation in supporting the principle of this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. John's Centre;

HON. A.J. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I had the pleasure to attend a consumers credit meeting in another part of Canada where all the provinces were represented. This is the thinking that is going along, invasion of privacy and so on and so forth. The great feeling at the time was that everybody is scared about the invasion of privacy which we are in this bill trying to protect people from. There was one expression there an expression of opinion by people who had been brought in there and they had representatives from banks and this sort of thing and this deals with further legislation that is coming up, I think there are two or three. The question is this, how far now can a businessman go to protect his business as to the legitimacy if you like or the credibility of a client.

Everybody goes overboard now to protect if you like and perhaps this is good, that you should not be able to check on anybody. We are living in a credit era where we have this installment plan and this type of thing. With this here and as I say, this is the general feeling of every province I would say, that this type of thing as I say, I think there are two more bills -

Mr. Murphy.

credit card and this sort of thing with this. I just bring this out. The feeling generally is: how far can a businessman go to protect himself against unscrupulous credit seekers? I have heard the hon. member for St. John's South here refer to the retail credit group who are basically a very reputable group across Canada. I think they are used by most insurance companies to report on people and there would perhaps be areas where they might go outside and make information available, perhaps, where it should not be. As I say and I am just repeating the feeling of this meeting that I attended, (there were some fifty or sixty people there from all provinces) that this is what we want, to protect the individual's invasion of privacy. How far can a business or any business venture go to find out with whom they are dealing basically? I am just wondering about that thing and perhaps the honourable minister may be able to tell us that. Can you any more check on a client? In what way and in what way can you do it? Can you use a collection agency? A collection agency here is perhaps recovering a debt but basically the granting of credit which I think ties in with this type of thing, I just want to say that everybody, every province has been enacting pretty well the same legislation but everybody goes overboard today, everybody has cause to protect the human rights and invasion of privacy. There is another sector of the economy of the world that deals in granting credit and where is their protection, how far can they go to recover monies that they are legitimately owed? I just thought I would say that. As far as this bill is concerned, I am supporting it one hundred per cent. I think it is one of the very fine types of legislation that are in use right across Canada today.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry in a way that I did not get an opportunity to speak before the hon. Minister of Social Services because there were one or two things that I wanted to mention that he might have been

Mr. Rowe (W.N.).

able to comment on but perhaps we will have further opportunity.

AN HON. MEMBER (Inaudible).

MR. W.N. ROWE: No, I was thinking about the Minister of Welfare.

The honourable minister who will be closing the debate has been the Minister of Welfare so he might have some comments on it.

First of all, before I get to that, I would like to assure him that the type of document which he produced in this House (I am glad he produced it) is a fairly wide-spread document. I have had three refer to me, as the member for the District of White Bay South, one of them in respect of a debt which was about ten years old and its judgment was statute barred. There was no way of collecting the debt, yet this collection agency still continued to send out that document, a similar document to that, maybe the exact document, sent it out to him and he was scared to death. He did not know what was going on. He had been advised that he did not have to bend, there was some doubt about his liability in any event. He gets this and he figures that he has to go to court and everything, he was frightened to death. Two or three other people as well, Mr. Speaker, in my constituency had received those documents and really it is a very pernicious practice. There is no doubt about that. It is using the force, respect and prestige of the law courts of this province for the wrong purpose. There is no doubt about that at all. I am glad the minister has brought it out. Perhaps, as a result of this public exposure, people who even might want to circumvent this very good bill which the minister is bringing into the House today, even if they wish to circumvent it in some way. as a result of this public exposure they will not resort to this kind of tactic any more.

The other question I wanted to get on to, and I believe it is involved in the whole principle of this bill, Mr. Speaker and that is the case or again the dozen or so cases that I have had in my own district

Mr. Rowe (W.N.)

and I am sure members throughout this House have had the same problem occurring and it has been brought to their attention; namely, a person in good faith enters into an agreement with a financial lending institution, and subsequently falls on bad times of some sort. Now I understand that if that person goes on long-term social assistance, there is usually in some of the documents an insurance provision whereby he does not have to pay back the debt. Perhaps the insurance premium that he has been paying in, in association with the interest, looks after the debt and they will not hound him, although I am not certain on that point. I do know that there is another category of people who do fall on bad times; namely those people who do not go on long-term social assistance (I have mentioned this in the House before ) those people who because of some physical disability are not able to carry on and do hard work, labour type of work, which in many cases that is the type of work they are suited for. They are not turned down completely by the doctor so that they get on long-term social assistance but they are stuck on short-term assistance with the proviso they are able to do light work. Now the chances of this type of person getting light work is absolutely nil, Mr. Speaker, and I believe most members of the House will agree with me. You get a man who has worked in a mine all his life, underground or you see a man who has worked on road work all his life and suddenly he is relegated to the point where because of a health problem, he has to look for light work and the janitorial jobs are few and far between and certainly that man is not very often in the position where we can do office work or any work of that type.

In that case, you have a man who like all the rest of us is up to his neck in debt because of borrowing money from various financial institutions, in most cases lending institutions, finance companies and that sort of thing. I am wondering if perhaps it might not be a good idea for the minister, both ministers concerned in this directly, to come up with



Mr. Rowe (W.N.).

some type of legislation whereby finance companies and banks for that matter might be obligated to put in their agreement or loan agreement something to the effect that there is an insurance policy covering the pay back of the money. If a person does fall on bad times, cannot get a job, no hope of getting a job, perhaps a board could decide it (I do not know how you decide whether a man is going to come under the benefit of such legislation or not) or something to the effect that when that situation occurs that insurance of some sort built into the loan agreement would then pay off his debt. I have loans myself, i.e., where if I am killed, the loan is paid off

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Some sort of a disability insurance. It would have to cover in Newfoundland certainly, where we have a high number of people who do labour type work, not only total disability but partial disability and that would have to be decided on some reasonable basis. How many times have I gone into houses, in the District of White Bay South, and I am sure other members have done it as well, where the mother of six or seven kids says to me, "I got another call today, Sir, from the finance company. The collection agents are after me. I am getting \$125 a month," or something or whatever the rate is. "I cannot afford to feed my family, talk about pay back this money." I always tell them, invariably, I say to them; "Do not pay back the money. Forget about the money and certainly do not accept any collect phone calls." (I understand that that point is looked after by the bill here now) "Do not pay back the money until such time as your husband, if ever, is in a position to repay this money from his earnings. Do not take any money from your social assistance, take bread and milk out of your children's mouths to pay back some finance company." Now that might be wrong social advice for me to be giving but I invariably give it because I think it is wrong for these people who are living on short-term assistance to be forced to pay back money which they

Mr. Rowe (W.N.)

entered into in good faith, at a time when the head of the household was working and drawing in good wages, to now force them to pay back this money out of short-term social assistance. I commend that suggestion to the minister for his consideration and perhaps something can be done about it, I do not know. It might be one of those problems where no legislation can adequately cover it, but I think it does merit some consideration. I made the same suggestion during the last sitting, during this present session of the House of Assembly. I think that some legislation should be considered in any event to try to take this great number of people - I do not know how many are involved but I would say that there are thousands throughout the province - to get this monkey off their backs, to get this intolerable burden of their backs so that they do not find themselves faced with these incessant demands, by phone calls, telegrams, letters, this kind of tripe that the minister showed us today, so that that burden is relieved from them when they do fall on hard times in a bad situation. I would like to hear the honourable minister's comments on that, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, certainly one cannot argue with a number of the points that have been made, particularly of the last speaker with regard to recipients of welfare and other allowances. I have to agree with him first of all that something has to be done. Some way has to be found to protect those people who to all intents and purposes are innocent, are victims of circumstance, who if they had their way or had employment, certainly no collection agency would have to come after them.

I should first of all say that, right within that department under the rehabilitation programme and as more and more of the staff are more professional, professionally trained, more emphasis is being placed now on helping people with such problems as financial ones and dealings with collection agencies or finance companies. I am not sure that that is as far as we should go. I think I have to agree with him that something else will undoubtedly have to be done. It is rather difficult as to how it can be done. As the hon. member for St. John's Centre, my colleague, pointed out, there is the other side of the coin and that is of course the people who advance credit. They too much have some protection.

But I would like to say at this time and to set aside any fears that he might have that there is nothing in this legislation which is before the House now, to my mind, which endangers the company who advances credit. All we are doing really is protecting the innocent public from the kind of harassment that has gone on and the kind of treatment that has been handed down to many of our people which to all intents and purposes, Mr. Speaker, is most unnecessary and unethical because it really solves no problem. The accounts, according to my officials who have done a fair amount of investigating, the accounts are not paid any quicker and it does not bring any quicker results and the sum and substance of the whole thing is that people are frightened and harassed and threatened and intimidated and this is really what this bill is all about.

The other point which was made by the member for Bell Island with regards to the policing of this law when it is proclaimed and my only answer that I can give him at this point is that it is the government's intention to completely reorganize the consumers affairs division of my department. This will undoubtedly have to mean additional

staff and I think that while additional staff is necessary in both consumer and corporate affairs in this department I think one cannot overlook the great value there is in public relations and publicity of this kind of legislation. I think one of the ways to make the unsuspecting public aware of the dangers and on the other hand now some of the advantages of this legislation for their own protection is through a public relations programme. Certainly this matter has not gone unattended as we are looking at it very seriously and I hope that something can be done to really do a job in this area because I have to agree with the hon. gentleman who have spoken on this debate that you can have all the laws you wish if they are not policed and if they are not carried out and adhered to or indeed if they are not followed up and if the people who contravene them are not prosecuted then it is all to no avail.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Registration And Regulation Of Collection Agencies," read a second time, ordered referred to a committee of the whole House, presently.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Registration And Regulation Of Credit Reporting Agencies."

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, there has already been some debate on it, but the purpose of this bill is to register credit reporting agencies operating in the province and to make certain regulations for such agencies. It also provides for the investigation of complaints regarding the operation of such agencies. Credit reporting agencies applying for registration will be entitled to the registration except where the past conduct of such agencies and the financial responsibility would not be in the best interest of the public or where such agency has contravened this act or regulation thereof. The registrar may register an agency under specific terms and

conditions or restrictions to be imposed by him or by regulation. The registrar may suspend or cancel the registration when the agency has violated any provision of this act or regulation or has made any misstatement in application for registration or has been guilty of a fraud, misrepresentation, dishonesty or has demonstrated incompetency or untrustworthiness to carry on the business of credit reporting.

This act also provides for the control of advertising in that the registrar can order the cessation of such advertising if considered false and misleading. Credit reporting agencies would be controlled to the extent of being only permitted to collect, store and report certain information as set forth by the act and must be in a position to corroborate this information from another reliable source. They will further be required to supply upon request information on persons on whom they have made reports where such request is made by them.

Mr. Speaker, that is a very important section because too often reports are made on people and are certainly inaccurate and unjustified or certainly unsubstantiated. Now when the persons heretofore made representation to such agencies they were at the mercy of those agencies because they in effect could not even get access to the report that was made about them while all and sundry of the general public might well have had access to it. In other words, Mr. Speaker, everyone who should not know would know except the person who indeed would be entitled to know. So this controls this and prevents it. When this act pass a person who has reason to believe that a report which is unfounded or incorrect has been made by an agency may upon request have that report and may defend himself or herself, whatever the case may be.

Under the regulations of this act provision is made for the setting of fees, application for registration and other items such as prescribing the forms for the purpose of this act, the requiring of agencies to be bonded, the governing of books, accounts and records

to be kept, the exemption of persons or classes of persons from registration under the act such as credit reporting agencies reporting on dealings with industrial or commercial enterprises only.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal one could say about this particular bill but certainly I think it is sufficient to say that it is long overdue. It is an area where people have been persecuted innocently for too long for information that has been passed on either deliberately or otherwise to whom really there is no entitlement, where one's private business becomes to all intents and purposes public and really there has been a complete disregard for the privacy or the basic rights of the individual.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I move second reading and as I have said it is just one other piece of legislation of many which are to come before the House.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I believe it desirable to have a word on this bill which I think goes very well with the bill that went immediately before it. I think that this is good legislation and necessary legislation. It deals of course with the registration of credit reporting agencies. I think the real guts or gist of the bill again in this case appears in section 20 which says in the note at the side, "What credit reporting agencies may do and may not do." This is very important and it says, "A credit reporting agency shall not collect, store or report any information other than information as to judgements or judicial proceedings, bankruptcies and certain other things." That is what this bill is really all about. I will tell hon. members a true story about why such a thing is necessary and it may be of interest to the members for Labrador because it concerned Labrador and it

MR. WELLS: took place about eight or nine years ago when a man in business on the Coast of Labrador was sued, in the Supreme Court of Newfoundland here in St. John's, on an account of \$9,000 and the man from Labrador consulted a lawyer and put in a defence and the matter went to trial. He was sued, shall we say one year, and it was six or eight months later before the matter actually went to trial. An interesting and very sad thing happened in the intervening period, once a writ was issued on him it was reported and the people who do this sort of thing quite naturally go to the Registry of the Supreme Court and the other courts and they get a list of the actions that have been taken and they publish them. So what this meant was that when action was taken against the man in Labrador, it appeared in the credit reporting accounts, purely as an action taken against him, not as a judgement because there was no judgement at that time, and as a result he could not get any credit here in St. John's or on the Island of Newfoundland in order to get supplies in for his store and business in that fall. As a result, he went out of business.

That was fine. In the spring as I recall it, in June, the matter went to trial, the man from Labrador defended the action and the plaintiff put in his evidence of how he was owed \$9,000 and the defendant who had been put out of business by the reporting of this action, put receipt after receipt after receipt and money order stubs into court until he was only \$100 only off the \$9,000 for which he had been sued and that \$100 was in dispute because of some shoes that had been returned by the defendant and that was not certain.

Needless to say, after the receipts were put in court, the plaintiff went no further with the action and to this day - well it just died on the books and the court was never asked to give judgement.

MR. WELLS: Now that is an actual fact and it is down in the records of the court. The reason I mentioned that was because it is not enough it seems to me and I know that a lot of people in business will perhaps disagree with this, but there is an actual account of what happened, not because a judgement was reported but because a writ was reported. Not every time a writ is issued does the person really owe the money. In most cases perhaps yes, but in some cases no, and the reporting of the issue of writs can be a very, very damaging thing as in this case, because it put a man out of business and he had the receipts and he afterwards produced them in court \$8,900 from \$9,000.

I hope that the regulations in this act can prevent this sort of thing but I look here at section 20, subsection (1), clause (a) - information as to judgements or judicial proceedings. I wish that would be amended to be " judgement" only, because I think when a judgement is entered against a person either as a result of a hearing, and judgement by the court in that sense or judgement by default, once judgement is entered I think that is fine, that should be reported and anybody in business should have the right to know that a judgement has been entered against that individual, but not a writ. It seems to me that it is dangerous to report the mere issue of a writ. It was certainly dangerous for that man in Labrador and it put him out of business without just cause, yet there was no redress for him, he could not get credit, he could not get his supplies in because of that.

So I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see a system whereby judgements are reported but not merely the issue of a writ. I think that is very important. I hope that this bill can do this and maybe I will have something to say in committee stage on this section 20, which is the gist of the bill, I think



MR. WELLS: this is very important, I think a lot of injustice is done by the reporting of the issue of writs but the reporting obviously of judgements is another matter altogether and should be.

But I certainly draw the attention of the House to this and I hope that we can see fit to ensure, if honourable members agree, that writs alone are not reported.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on this bill. I welcome the legislation. I think it is very good. In the experience which I had over a number of years in business, I think there is great need of very adequate and strict control of credit reporting agencies for the simple reason that

in my experience they are often very inaccurate, inaccurate in both directions, inaccurate in favour of creditors and sometimes inaccurate very much against them. Some of these systems of collecting information are deplorable and I find very, very unfavourable. For instance, if they sign up a lot of members as members of a particular agency, it is customary for these agencies to send out to these members and ask for reports on various accounts. Now I think a lot of varied reports are received but they may not necessarily be accurate and they are not properly checked on. I have even attended meetings of credit associations where people are asked to give verbal comments on the condition of certain creditors and so on. I think it is altogether too loose that a man's reputation can be blasted completely by some loose comment on his credit standing. They just throw an open question which is not in my opinion accurate enough. This particularly applies to Newfoundland companies that are dealing sometimes with mainland companies who have very strict credit terms. A local firm may have very good credit standing in this province and be buying stuff on agreed terms with a company here which in the eyes of mainland suppliers are rather long and drawn out terms. But these are the terms on which he has bought the goods, it is quite agreed between his supplier and himself that these are the terms of payment. But if this were reported to some mainland company who is used to collecting from its nextdoor neighbour at seven or ten day terms credit, he looks aghast at thirty or sixty days not taking into consideration the local conditions where sometimes the delivery of goods itself can be as long as two or three weeks before the man ever receives the goods to start selling them. Yet because he is perhaps a little slow in paying, with complete understanding of his supplier, he is blasted as being a poor credit risk.

I feel that any irregularity of credit reporting agencies, this whole subject needs to be looked at very carefully. As I said in my opening

remarks it can be sometimes altogether too much in favour of a creditor. For instance, if the credit reporting is not accurate a man may owe far more than he is reported to owe because there has not been a sufficient check. Therefore he is a poor creditor. On the other hand he may owe a lot of money but doing it with complete understanding and agreement of the suppliers and he is a good credit risk.

So I think that this legislation is welcomed and it may not go far enough. But the whole field of credit control and credit regulation in Newfoundland I think needs very careful study indeed.

MR. MARTIN: I support entirely the points raised by the honourable gentleman for Fortune. I would say again that we cannot give too much attention to this. I speak as I said before, with some experience of this, being a credit investigator. The collection and recording and collation and dissemination of any kind of information is a science and that fact is not acknowledged by too many people. It is a science the knowledge of which is not easily acquired, it would take some time to become professional in that. It is a profession.

So, therefore, while I think this is a good piece of legislation, I would agree with the gentleman for Fortune that it does not go quite far enough. Maybe an amendment could be brought in later respecting the creditation of investigators and investigation agencies, because the only way that we are going to be able to control the quality of reports is to be able to establish some kind of a code of ethics. The only way that we are going to be able to control the kind of people involved in investigations is to be able to licence them and hold them on penalty of having their licences rescinded.

I would just like to suggest that maybe the honourable minister could give some thought to that.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Mr. Speaker, this is the type of legislation which brings just about everybody to their feet in the House because everybody have strong feelings about invasions of privacy and this sort of thing.

Now I had intended, Mr. Speaker, to make a lot of suggestions to the honourable minister as to how this legislation could be improved. We had a full-fledged debate on this last year, during the last session of the House, a private member's motion put on by I believe my friend, the honourable member for Bell Island, and

MR. WM. ROWE: everybody in the House got into the act then. But I think by making these suggestions, we would probably be rehashing that, that might not serve any useful purpose.

But there are one or two things which I would like to mention, I do not think the bill, as good as it is, and the minister should be given all the compliments possible for bringing the bill into the House today, as good as it is, it does not go far enough and there are many reasons why I think that but suffice it for the moment for me to give two.

One was a suggestion which a number of people made last year - anybody who keeps confidential reports on people from God knows where, or God knows what sources they get this information from, should be required by law to have this filed in some central agency in the province, if the person is a resident of the province, so that that person can go and by giving correct identification, not available to anyone else in the public, but by giving his own identification, he can look through that file and see what information is legally being kept on him by credit reporting agencies in this province.

I notice there is one section there which says that a member of the public can approach any collection agency and demand or have a look, have a copy of the information kept on him by that collection agency.

Well I would submit, Sir, that if I now, and I am fairly knowledgeable in these things, if I now were to try to figure out what kind of a credit rating or what kind of report is being done on me by credit agencies, I would have no idea where to look, here or on the mainland or wherever it might be. I have no idea where to look. You know some names, Dunne and Bradstreet and that sort of thing, where is the information kept? Is it here? Is it up in their head office, wherever that is, where is the information?

MR. WM. ROWE: Nobody knows and I would say that for the ordinary individual not trained in any particular profession, going about his business, using credit and this sort of thing, I would say that it is an impossible task for him ever to find out, to get whatever reports might be on him by credit reporting agencies. So that was one suggestion we threw out last year and I think that would be an improvement to this present bill.

The second one is the point made by the honourable member for St. John's South and that is a point well taken. I have only resumed the practice of law for the past two or three months but already I have had one client come to me, Mr. Speaker, with a copy of the Dunne and Bradstreet reports and there is his name, the name of his company, a writ issued against him. He had not even had the writ served on him at that point. He had no idea, he did not even know what it was for, and two or three days later, a week or so, a writ is served on him, he comes back to me again. We lashed out a demand for particulars to the other lawyer and this thing died on the vine but when the plaintiff was put the test to show what kind of a claim he had, you know it was one of these general issues, the plaintiff claims from the defended \$5,000 and the cost of his actions or something like that, without any particularity at all.

But this is reported by everybody. That client told me that the day that that appeared in Dunne and Bradstreet, he got dozens of phone calls from creditors of his saying "what is going on? has he gone bankrupt? Is he paying his bills? What is he doing? doing?" and he told me that he had a hard time staving off some difficulties. Not quite so bad as the honourable member mentioned in the case of the resident of Labrador, because this person was able to assure his creditors that nothing was amiss.

MR. WM. ROWE: But if there had been, if he had been in a dodgey situation financially, I am sure that, as reported irresponsibly, in my opinion, would have brought about the bankruptcy of this firm. There is no doubt about it in my mind.

So I think that I would join with the honourable member for St. John's South and perhaps join him in a motion when the bill goes through committee, to delete that reference to writs of summons I think, or judicial proceedings and merely restrict it to judgements, actual judgements. Because I can walk down today to the court and issue a writ against the honourable minister for anything. I can claim anything against him. I do not have to substantiate at that time. I do not have to give any validity for it. I do not have to show any validity for my claim at all unless the thing appears on the face of it to be frivolous and vexacious. The writ of summons and statement of claim goes out and is served on the honourable minister and the honourable minister is then put to his defence.

But in the meantime, nobody who has the reports of these credit reporting agencies coming into him knows anything about that. All they see is a writ of summons, it must be bad. So I think I would agree wholeheartedly with the member for St. John's South in trying to get that particular provision deleted when the time comes.

Now I will not go any further, Mr. Speaker. There are a number of other things. I think I have mentioned two of the most important but there are a number of other things which are not covered by this bill and which make the bill defective. The bill is good as far as it goes and perhaps we should allow the minister to

have the administration of this bill when it becomes an act, have the administration of that bill for a year or so. See what happens. See how the credit reporting agencies deal with it. See if there are any attempts to circumvent it. See if they threat it frivolously or seriously. See how far they go themselves in trying to police their own activities. Then in a year or two perhaps we can come back into this House and pass another piece of legislation which could incorporate some other improvements.

I, as a member of the House, am generally pleased with the bill as it is now before us. You know, anyone who has had any experience can bring in some particular case that should be covered by this bill but that of course would lead us into infinity. I think we should give it a year or two of testing and then at that time the minister or whatever minister happens to be in his portfolio at that time can bring in a new improved bill along the same lines.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, just a couple of points. I certainly can not disagree with the honourable gentleman in his suggestions. I can assure him that this is only a start, as I have indicated. It is difficult to know how far to go in this area because there are so many things to be done. As my colleague, the Minister of Social Assistance, has indicated, concern on the one hand for the people advancing credit. We do not want to scare people at this point of time by going to far but rather to proceed responsibly and slowly but nevertheless to go far enough when we get some experience from this act when it is implemented, when it becomes law.

As regards to the suggestion from my friend from St. John's South, I have to agree that there is a very vital need there. I certainly will be glad to take it under advisement. I would have to check with the Department of Justice to see if in fact this is permissible. If it is, then certainly we will be glad to entertain a motion in committee stage to make that change.



Very often, Mr. Speaker, too often I would think writs do have reporting agencies report them. They do not bother to investigate to see whether or not they are well-founded. As the member just mentioned, it is a bit late when the damage is done.

Another point has to be made and hopefully this legislation will cure it, is that sometimes when people are notified of certain actions, they are given so many days and so on. One of my officials told me a few days ago of a case where a person was notified of legal action presumably at the issuance of a writ and he was to be given so many days but the letter that was typed to him had one date on it and by the time that it got to the mail it was ten days later, or ten or fifteen days later, I am not sure. Subsequently, a few days later than that, the writ was issued. This just points out that some people or some agencies are irresponsible in this particular area and certainly it is an area of great concern.

The matter raised by the member for Labrador South is a very interesting one and I can assure him that the people in my department are very interested in it too. There has been some discussion as to or in regard to a code of ethics. My Assistant Deputy Minister for Provincial Affairs, while with a background in social work, was very interested in social legislation of this kind. I have asked him or I have assigned him to do a thorough investigation in regard to legislation gaps that are on the books of other provinces.

The point which he made in regard to the licensing of investigators is probably, certainly it is a new one to me. I think it is a very worth while suggestion. I assure him I shall be glad to take it up with my officials and discuss it and maybe on a later date we can pursue that matter which might well round out the whole area of credit reporting and certainly give added protection to the consumer.

On motion bill read a second time, ordered referred to a committee of the whole house on tomorrow.

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

A bill, "An Act Respecting Persons In An Intoxicated Condition in Public Places."

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I am going to move an amendment to clause 4, in conformity with the observations which were made in the House on second reading. I would move, Mr. Chairman, that the words from the proviso in the clause from "provided however" down to "upon recovering such capacity" be stricken and replaced with the following words: "Provided, however, that a person shall not remain in custody under the provisions of paragraph (a) longer than forty-eight hours unless two duly qualified medical practitioners shall view his condition and furnish a written certificate in duplicate, signed by both practitioners, that in their opinion he has not recovered the capacity referred to in that paragraph, but he shall thereafter be released immediately upon recovering such capacity." The new sub-paragraph 2 to read: "the person having custody of the person who is subject of the certificate referred to in subsection 1, shall as soon as reasonably possible, transmit one of the duplicate certificates to the Minister of Justice." This is the amendment, Mr. Speaker, that the Justice Department has put together in the hope to compromise the various views which were expressed in the House when it came up in second reading.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is excellent, Mr. Chairman. I hope nobody got the wrong idea about anything that went on in the House about this bill. This bill is basically an excellent piece of legislation. The only thing we were concerned about and I would suggest that oppositions are a little more concerned than governments about some of the matters which

were raised regarding this bill and had the oppositions been reversed, probably the exact same thing would have happened from different people in the House - I think this is an excellent amendment to the bill and we support it wholeheartedly.

On motion amendment carried.

Motion that the committee report having passed the bill, with amendment, carried.

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

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

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

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

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act."

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

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act."

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

On motion that the committee rise and report Bills No. 19, 12, 22, and 46 without amendment and Bill No. 16 with one amendment, and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair:

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion amendments read a first and second time.

On motion bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 27, 1973 at 3:00 p.m.

10  
11  
12

13  
14  
15

16  
17  
18

11

12

13